

Bristol Schools Forum
Schools Block School Funding Formula 2021/22

Date of meeting:	24 th November 2020
Time of meeting:	5:00 pm
Venue:	Virtual Meeting : Zoom

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To inform and seek agreement of the Schools Forum on the principals of the funding formula for mainstream schools and academies for 2021/22, prior to final allocations being made available by the ESFA in December, for final formula agreement in January 2021.

2. Recommendations

Schools Forum is invited to:

- 2.1 Note the changes in the formula methodology for 2021/22
- 2.2 Provide feedback, as appropriate on the proposed arrangements for the 2021/22 mainstream funding formula, including the amount set aside for the Growth Fund to allow final proposals to be made and agreed on the Schools Budget for 2021/22 in January 2021. Specifically;
- a. transfer 0.5% to High Needs Block
 - b. set MFG at 0.5%
 - c. retain lump sum at current level
 - d. allocate any spare funding (after mandated items) to AEN
 - e. allocate £2m to Growth Fund
- 2.3 Agree the submission of the disapplication of the present MFG and use of a recalculated MFG for Avanti Gardens in 2021/22.

3. Changes between the 2020/21 NFF and the 2021/22 NFF

- 3.1 The main formula in 2021/22 is similar in operation to the formula in 2020/21. However, the ESFA has introduced some changes for 2021/22.
- 3.2 NFF Unit values have been increased as set out in **Appendix A**.
- 3.3 The ESFA has used 2019 data from the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) in place of 2015 data. The ESFA has also changed the basis on which pupils are assigned to the seven IDACI bands: they are now assigned based on rank rather than score. For example, Band A now consists of pupils in the most deprived 2.5% of lower super output areas (LSOAs), instead of consisting of pupils in LSOAs with an IDACI score greater than 0.5. More details are given in **Appendix B**.

- 3.4 From 2021/22, funding previously received through the Teachers' Pay Grant (TPG) and Teachers' Pension Employer Contribution Grants (TPECG) to mainstream schools for pupils from reception to year 11 will be allocated through the schools block NFF by adding to the baseline, by increasing the basic per pupil funding and by increasing the minimum per pupil funding.
- 3.5 The LA-level protection has not been continued after being introduced in 2020/21

4. Funding available

- 4.1 Provisional allocations announced in July 2020 are set out in the table below, and are based upon the October 2019 school census data. Schools Forum is cautioned to note that final allocations will be different, being based upon the October 2020 school census data.

This indicates that the funding for Schools Block in 2021/22 is provisionally to be £278.76m plus an as yet unannounced allowance for Growth. **Table 1** sets out how this funding is composed.

Table 1: Initial indicative Schools Block Budget 2021/22

	Unit of funding	2020/21 pupil numbers	£ total
Primary	£4,616	36,151	£166,884,146
Secondary	£6,001	19,181	£115,101,375
Actual 2021-22 funding through the premises factors			£9,753,070
Growth funding element			Not yet announced
Provisional NFF 2021-22 schools block funding (excluding funding through the growth factor)			£291,738,591
Element of Schools Block relating to Teachers Pay Grant and Teachers Employer Contribution Pension Grant			
Primary	£179.88	36,151	£6,502,842
Secondary	£264.78	19,181	£5,078,745
Total			£11,581,587
Provisional allocation(excl. growth)			£291,738,591

Less Provisional element related to TPG & TECPG			£(11,581,587)
Schools Block sub-total to calculate transfer			£280,157,004
Less 0.5% transfer to High Needs (if enacted)			£(1,400,785)
Balance remaining in Schools Block for formula			£278,756,219

5. Funding formula

- 5.1 The DfE continues to base the calculations for each authority on a soft National Funding Formula (ie the NFF is calculated on a per pupil, per school basis, but this determines how much the Local Authority gets, not how much each individual school is entitled to – a local formula for distributing DSG still prevails).
- 5.2 A number of changes have been made to the Schools Block Funding Formula for 2021/22, these are the key points that impact most on BCC;
- 5.3 **Minimum per pupil funding levels.** Minimum funding levels per pupil are set as part of the NFF, for 2021/22 these will be £4,180 for primary schools and £5,215 for KS3 and £5,715 for KS4 in secondary schools (the calculation includes the lump sum but excludes other premises factors). This averages at £5,415 across secondary phases.
- 5.4 This minimum per-pupil funding was introduced as a mandatory factor in the local formula for the first time in 2020/21, and now it has been raised in value for 2021/22. There are currently 41 primary schools and 8 secondary schools in Bristol that are funded below these levels (bearing in mind current per pupil funding doesn't include the pay and pension elements).
- 5.5 It should be noted that these increased minimum per pupil funding levels include the allocations for the Teachers Pay Grant and Teachers Employer Contributions Pensions Grant. See 5.9 for detail on this element of the increase.
- 5.6 **Positive Minimum Funding Guarantees (MFG).** For 2021/22 funding formula the MFG can be set within the range +0.5% and +2.0%.
- 5.7 For the 2020/21 funding formula, the MFG had to be set within the range of +0.5% to +1.84%. An MFG of +0.5% was agreed and applied, as both the LA and Schools Forum recognises the effect the MFG has in protecting funding that is no longer due to schools, for reasons of changing pupil characteristics.
- 5.8 For 2021/22 the LA is proposing setting at the minimum allowable again, at +0.5% for the same reasons as last year, and in line with discussions at School Forum,

the sub-group and in line with the consultation results (**the consultation is discussed at 6.46 and full consultation results are shown in Appendix C**).

5.9 **Introduction of the Teacher Pay and Teacher Employer Contribution Pensions Grants into the formula..:** From 2021/22 the previously separate Teacher Pay Grant and Teacher Pension Employer Contribution Grant funding streams are being incorporated into the mainstream school funding formula.

5.10 The ESFA is achieving this through two means:

- Adding the per pupil amounts onto the age-weighted pupil (AWPU)
- Adding the same per pupil amounts to the minimum per pupil funding levels (MPPLs)
- Adding an amount representing the funding schools receive through the grants and supplementary fund into the baselines

5.11 The amounts for these items per pupil are:

£	TPG	TPECG	Total
Primary	47	133	180
Secondary	69	196	265

5.12 LAs looking to make block transfers out of Schools Block must calculate the transfer value after deducting the TPG and TPECG funding element from the Schools Block allocation

5.13 **Growth Funding.** The DfE continues to struggle to develop a fair and sustainable way of including sufficient resource in the formula to take account of growing pupil numbers. Previously they have used historic spend as the basis, but this did not help authorities with new, rapid growth. For 2021/22, the DfE are continuing with the formulaic basis for distributing growth funding, based on population changes in medium super-output areas, that was introduced for 2019/20. The allocation for 2021/22 will not be known until it is announced, which is expected during December 2020.

5.14 Growth funding is discussed in greater depth later in the paper, however as in previous years it is expected that the final allocation into Schools Block to be similar to the anticipated commitment.

5.15 **Movements between blocks.** The government's announcement of more funding into schools will raise expectations that the additional funding will be passed on to them, and indeed a number of the changes to the formula for 2021/22 enforce this. However LAs retain much discretion over where and the amount passed on.

5.16 As in previous years, the position of the High Needs budget remains of concern. Whilst additional funding has been made available for the High Needs block directly, in 2020/21 we transferred 0.5% of the Schools Block (£1.3m) to assist with the High Needs Transformation programme. For 2021/22 the LA has scope to

again seek permission to transfer up to 0.5% of the Schools Block (up to an estimated £1.4m) into the High Needs Block.

- 5.17 The Authority continues to explore all options in closing the High Needs funding gap, and this includes considering the transfer of funding from Schools Block. Transfers between blocks is discussed elsewhere in this document, however for the purposes of this paper the maximum transfer that can be locally agreed has been modelled, based on current funding announcements, alongside the results with no transfer.
- 5.18 **Use of IDACI 2019 data.** As mentioned in the section above, the ESFA has updated the formula to use the 2019 IDACI data set.
- 5.19 IDACI is a relative measure of Income Deprivation. The new data set suggests a relative reduction in deprivation in Bristol's LSOAs when compared to the rest of England.
- 5.20 The effect of the updated data set is most apparent when compared to the 2015 data set. **The tables in Appendix D** compare the APT results from the two data sets, using the 2019 school census data and the 2020/21 funding formula values in both instances, and show a reduction in targeted IDACI funding of £1.2m.
- 5.21 Schools Forum is reminded that the actual effect of the change will depend on the 2020 school census data, however Forum may wish to consider this effect of the update when considering where to target any unallocated funding, once commitments such as the minimum per pupil funding and the minimum funding guarantees have been met.

6. Funding formula proposals

- 6.1 **Block transfer of up to 0.5% to High Needs:** The LA seeks School Forum views on whether a transfer of up to 0.5% of the available Schools Block to High Needs would be supported.
- 6.2 The LA is aware of School Forum's previously expressed concerns around transfers supporting general High Needs activities and so, just as with the transfer last year, any funds transferred would be used to support the continuing High Needs transformation programme. This amount would be ring-fenced for this purpose and there will be clear and transparent reporting to Schools Forum on the use of this money. The prime focus of the continuation of the Transformation Programme will need to be in addressing the deficit in the High Needs Block.
- 6.3 A block transfer was one of the areas consulted upon, with 19 of the 25 responding schools supporting a transfer of up to 0.5%

- 6.4 Comments were received both in support of any transfer, and opposed to any transfer:
- a. *Ensure the funds are clearly utilised to support with the transformation programme and other priorities to support HN pupils*
 - b. *How and where is it reported how this funding is used in more detail? It would be good to have some feedback on this Eg how much the work to provide additional SEND places is costing?*
 - c. *It is useful to know how the transfer will be used – at the consultation briefing it was mentioned that this would be ringfenced to fund the Educational Transformation programme. Is all of the funding transferred ringfenced for this programme or is some of it used for Top Up/AP?*
 - d. *We do not receive enough funding for children in high needs. The transfer does not appear to help our school.*
 - e. *This request is similar to one made 12 months ago and clearly indicates that BCC still hasn't got full control over its High Needs funding. This is another "short term" response to a long term failure to manage High Needs funding effectively. This will not be an option in the future at the point when a "Hard" formula is introduced. Therefore, we need a very clear strategy in place to bring the High Needs budget into balance in the long term without drawing from the Schools Block indefinitely. It is important that the High Needs budget is sustainable moving forward without constantly raiding the Schools Block funding. The Local Authority needs to be aware of the possible implications of the funding unknowns hitting schools, such as unfunded additional COVID expenditure and future pay increases. It is therefore important to maximise the impact of any potential funding increases to provide schools with long term security.*
 - f. *If/when NFF is introduced this will not be allowed and High Needs is going to need to become self-sufficient. Whilst we acknowledge this may reduce our top-up funding it will increase our per pupil funding and allow us to manage the money ourselves and direct it as we see appropriate.*

6.5 **Minimum Funding Guarantee:** One of the changes for 2021/22 is that the range within which LAs have local discretion to set the MFG has moved.

6.6 For 2021/22 LAs can set the MFG within the range +0.5% to +2.0%. The LA has previously discussed this with Schools Forum and worked with the finance sub-group, where the prevailing view has been that the MFG should be set at the lowest allowed value in order to avoid overly protecting schools with reducing AEN characteristics, and also to maximise any available funding remaining after dominating formula commitments to target areas of local priority.

6.7 The consultation with schools also sought their views on the level of MFG for 2021/22 and the unanimous view of all 25 respondents was to support the MFG being set at +0.5%.

- 6.8 Comments received stated:
- a. *The school think that a hard funding formula is more fair for everyone, this proposed funding guarantee really helped us last year.*
 - b. *Obviously we would like more, but we understand the budget constraints BCC are operating within.*

- 6.9 Given the consensus of opinion and previous practice, the LA once again proposes to set the MFG at the lowest allowable value of +0.5% for 2021/22.
- 6.10 **Lump Sum for 2021/22:** When setting the 2020/21 funding formula, the LA and Schools Forum discussed whether to move towards the lower NFF funding values for the lump sum or retain the higher local value. In the final consideration the LA proposed and School Forum supported retaining the higher local level, primarily to support smaller schools and primary schools who disproportionately benefit from the lump sum formula factor.
- 6.11 For the 2021/22 formula, the ESFA has raised the value of the NFF lump sum to £117,800 for both Primary and Secondary – so is now much closer to the LA's value of £125,000 for Primary and Secondary schools.
- 6.12 The funding formula allows a separate lump sum value at primary and at secondary, and so opinion is requested as to whether the local level of £125,000 should be retained again for primary, secondary, both or neither, or if either sector should have a different lump sum value.
- 6.13 There are 106 primary schools in Bristol and 22 secondary/all through schools. The table below shows the difference in cost to the formula of funding each at these levels.

		<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	
Schools		125,000	117,800	Difference
Primary	106	13,250,000	12,486,800	763,200
Secondary	22	2,750,000	2,591,600	158,400
	128	16,000,000	15,078,400	921,600

- 6.14 As the table demonstrates, funding all schools at the lower level will reduce the cost of the lump sum factor by £0.92m. Reducing secondary only will reduce by £0.16m and the reduction for primary is £0.76m.
- 6.15 Forum is reminded that lump sum funding is not protected by the MFG, and the LA is obliged to allocate the Schools Block in full. Therefore any reduction in the lump sum factor will result in more funding being applied to the other factors in the formula.
- 6.16 The question of supporting the lump sum was put to schools participating in the consultation. Schools were given a choice from six options, three of which options involved preserving the lump sum at the existing value. 25 schools answered the question, with 24 of them opting to preserve the lump sum, and one school preferring not to preserve the lump sum.

- 6.17 **Remaining formula funding:** Once mandated formula commitments such as the minimum per pupil funding, minimum funding guarantee, lump sum and premises factors, growth fund and any falling rolls fund allocations have been met, the LA seeks the views of School Forum as to how to apply any remaining available funding remaining within the Schools Block.
- 6.18 In previous years any remaining funding has been targeted at the Additional Educational Needs (AEN) factors: Deprivation, EAL and Prior Attainment.
- 6.19 Forum is being asked whether it will continue to support targeting the AEN factors, or if the AWPU should be prioritised, or any other component of the funding formula.
- 6.20 In its deliberations, Forum may wish to consider the effect of the new IDACI dataset too, which has seen Bristol's LSOAs reduce in relatively to the rest of England, and so will now attract less funding based on current unit values.
- 6.21 The question as to whether the AWPU or the AEN should be targeted by any remaining available funding was put to schools in the consultation. Schools were free to choose from six options, in various combinations of the AWPU, the AEN and the lump sum. 25 schools answered this question, with 19 opting to support the AEN and not the AWPU, 4 schools opted to support the AWPU and not the AEN, whilst two schools wanted to support both the AWPU and the AEN with any remaining funding.
- 6.22 **Preference to target any particular sector in the unit funding:** Forum will have noticed that the school funding formula uses differing unit values for factors for primary and secondary schools. This has been a feature of the funding formula since its inception and remains a feature of both the LA local formula and the NFF.
- 6.23 In previous discussions Forum has noted that locally the shift towards the NFF has benefitted larger schools to a greater degree than smaller schools. Forum has also noted that primary schools are no longer seeing substantive growth in pupil numbers, and indeed some schools are experiencing a decline in roll.
- 6.24 The LA seeks Forum's views on whether the LA should target or prefer the primary unit values over the secondary unit values to any degree when allocating any remaining available formula funding.
- 6.25 This question was asked of schools responding to the consultation. Of the 25 schools that replied: seven schools wanted to see Primary targeted exclusively, ten schools wanted no distinction between sectors made, whilst eight schools suggested a third way, where 70% of any available funding be targeted to primary school unit values and 30% to secondary school unit values.
- 6.26 Comments received stated:
- *We have considered Q6 above in a Senior Leadership Meeting and opted for 'Prioritise primary school factors'. We discussed how small primary schools such as ours cannot benefit from economies of scale in the same way that large secondary schools are able to. There has been an increase to additional costs this year due to the Covid-19 pandemic which means that primary schools may*

have incurred higher costs, in proportion to the size of the schools, due to remaining open for vulnerable children etc.

- *It is important to spread any unallocated funding across all schools and not to single out any particular school sector.*
- *I found the briefing yesterday evening very helpful but would question the timing. The majority of people attending are not teachers (and even if they were would finish at 3.30pm) and therefore the meeting (especially as it was held remotely) could have happened a lot earlier. By 5.30pm the majority of school staff have finished work.*

6.27 Other formula factors – premises factors: In addition to other considerations, and in keeping with established practice, the LA is proposing to continue with:

- Appropriate allocations for NNDR
- Appropriate allocations for PFI
- Retaining the current split-sites policy

6.28 GROWTH FUND: The forecast costs of growth, funded from both the Growth Fund and via the APT for “new and growing schools” are set out in **Appendix F**. This projection is based on the current policy, the expected growth in September 2020 and the current rates at which the LA supports growth.

6.29 This table also includes a forward projection of growth in these schools through to September 2024.

6.30 As reported to the finance sub-group in August, there are no new growth or Growth Fund commitments expected in Primary Schools, and all existing growth commitments are expected to end by 2022. There are no new commitments expected in Secondary Schools for 2020/21 either, however the expectation is for growth in the Secondary sector in 2021/22, particularly with the delay to Oasis Temple Quarter opening.

6.31 New school openings are treated as “New and Growing Schools”, and funded as such via the Schools Block formula rather than as bids to the Growth Fund.

6.32 Whilst the projection is for no new growth commitments in existing schools for 2021/22, it should be noted that the growth in secondary schools will be moving through year groups, and some will move from KS3 to KS4, becoming proportionately more expensive to support due to the higher KS4 AWPU, over the KS3 AWPU. This will increase the cost to the Growth Fund.

6.33 The actual level of cost will depend on actual pupil numbers recorded in the census and on the final formula considerations in those financial years. The projections shown are at an average of the current 2020/21 funding values.

6.34 What is becoming clear is that existing growth pressures are shifting away from Primary Schools and into Secondary Schools. The degree at which there will need to be expansion of existing secondary schools in September 2021 and beyond is not yet certain, but the projection includes a small level of expansion of existing schools.

- 6.35 The commitment on the Growth Fund for 2021/22 – projected in the appendix at 2020 funding levels – is projected at £1.4m. The actual cost will depend on actual pupil numbers recorded in the Autumn 2021 census, the prevailing 2021/22 funding formula values, and the possible need to identify further expansions resulting from the Spring 2021 admissions round. Therefore the actual cost is likely to be higher than £1.4m, but this increase cannot be quantified at this time.
- 6.36 The LA proposed and School Forum supported establishing a Growth Fund of £2.0m for 2020/21. Whilst commitments in Primary schools is expected to reduce in 2021/22, commitments to secondary school growth will increase, so again the LA is proposing to allocate £2.0m to the Growth Fund.
- 6.37 Funding for the Growth Fund is primarily supported from the as yet unannounced Growth element of the Schools Block. The actual allocation is expected to be announced in December 2020 alongside the release of the final DSG allocations and the final school census data.
- 6.38 Allocations will be available once the ESFA releases the data on their website, and will be shown to School Forum at the January 2021 meeting, alongside presentation of the proposed final formula.
- 6.39 **FALLING ROLL FUND:** The LA may set aside some of the school block funding in order to create a small fund to support Good or Outstanding schools with falling rolls, where planning data shows the surplus places will be needed within the next three financial years.
- 6.40 BCC last operated the Falling Rolls fund in the 2016/17 financial year. At the meetings of November 2016 and January 2017, Forum received reports on the Falling Rolls fund and subsequently decided against continuation of the fund.
- 6.41 The School Forum finance sub-group revisited consideration of a Falling Rolls fund for 2020/21 at their meeting of 16th July 2019. The decision was not to re-establish a Falling Rolls fund for 2020/21.
- 6.42 The wording of the current (though dormant) locally agreed criteria restricts eligibility to secondary schools. Given the current and expected pupil population in secondary schools, it is questionable whether any school would qualify for support under the current criteria. Any re-establishment of a falling rolls fund would be at the expense of funding applied through the mainstream formula, reducing the available funds to all schools. The wording of the currently dormant Falling Rolls fund is reproduced in **Appendix E**
- 6.43 At this time the LA is not proposing to reinstate the Falling Rolls fund for 2021/22.
- 6.44 **Summary of proposals:**
- a. Note the changes made to the formula by the ESFA
 - b. That the MFG be set at +0.5%
 - c. The transfer of 0.5% of the Schools Block, after TPG and &TECPG consideration

- d. The lump sum be preserved at £125,000 for both Primary and Secondary
- e. That funds remaining after meeting mandated requirements be distributed to the AEN factors
- f. No bias of this distribution to either primary or secondary
- g. Premises factors (NNDR, PFI, Split Sites) are appropriately funded, consistent with previous years
- h. £2.0m be allocated to the Growth Fund
- i. No re-establishment of a Falling Rolls fund
- j. Agree to the disapplication application being made in regard of Avanti Gardens historic MFG, derived when all-through

6.45 The table below sets out the position of the proposals, based on the 2020-21 pupil data. Both the funding into the LA and the formula expenditure will change with the 2021-22 pupil data, as will the balance between the formula components as funding is awarded to the factors.

	£m	£m
Provisional Schools Block excl. Growth	291.7	
Growth funding	not yet announced	
	<hr/>	291.7
tfr to HN Block	1.4	
Minimum cost of formula	287.0	
	<hr/>	288.4
-with MFG at +0.5%		
-lump sum is £125k for all schools		
- includes allocation of TPG and TECPG		
- includes minimum per pupil funding		
-includes premises factors		
Balance remaining to support:		3.3
-difference in growth		
-AEN priorities		
-any Falling Roll fund		

6.46 **Consultation with schools:** the LA consulted with schools on various aspects of the funding formula for 2021/22. The consultation was issued via the Head Teachers Bulletin and ran from 13th October to 6th November. The LA also provided a virtual presentation and question and answer session via Zoom on 4th November.

6.47 The consultation consisted of two main sections. The first was open to all schools and sought opinion on:

- a. any block transfer to High Needs
- b. on the MFG
- c. on the prioritisation of any available funding after mandated commitments
- d. on whether primary should be prioritised in the distribution of any remaining available funding
- e. any other comments

6.48 The second section was open to the maintained mainstream schools only and asked their views on the areas open to de-delegation. The results of the de-delegation section are discussed in a separate paper elsewhere on the agenda.

6.49 Twenty-five schools responded to the consultation:

	Maintained	Academy
Primary	7	10
Secondary	2	4
All-through		1
Special		1
PRU		
Nursery		
Grand Total	9	16

6.50 The summarised responses to the questions were:

		Yes	No
Q1	Agree to Block transfer	19	6
Q2	comments	Three from "Yes"	Three from "No"
Q3	Agree to MFG 0.5%	25	0
Q4	comments	Two from "Yes"	No "No" responses
Q5	Preferred formula option	A=19, B=0, C=3, D=1. E=2. F=0	
Q6	Prefer any sector? All / Primary	All = 18 , Primary = 7	
Q7	comments	Three comments,	

6.51 Appendix C contains the anonymised results received.

7. Disapplications

- 7.1 Forum should note that **we have submitted** a disapplication of the MFG relating to Avanti Gardens Academy Bristol due to the change of age range (to 4-11 from 4-16) from September 2020. This is to ensure their historic MFG derived from being all-through does not continue to apply now that they are primary age range only.
- 7.2 Forum members may remember this disapplication was originally submitted last year. The subsequent advice from the ESFA was as the school had not yet at that point changed from all-through to primary age only, an in-year adjustment would be made after the change in age range had occurred, for 2020/21, and that a disapplication request should be submitted for the 2021/22 funding year.

8. Future funding arrangements

- 8.1 The DfE still intends to introduce a hard National Funding Formula however the timescale for this remains unknown. Some of the mandated changes to the formula options for 2021/22 continue the move towards a hard formula, such as increased restrictions on block transfers and minimum pupil funding levels.
- 8.2 Whilst not formally announced by the ESFA, officers from the ESFA continue to indicate that future years will see greater restrictions on block movements (and possibly prohibited entirely), and tightening of local decision making on the allocation of funding.

Appendix A - comparison of 2021/22 NFF unit values to Bristol's 2020/21 formula unit values

	2021/22 National Funding Formula values	Local 2020/21 Formula Values
Factor		
Basic Entitlement (Primary)	£3,123.00	£2,857.00
Basic Entitlement (KS3)	£4,404.00	£4,018.00
Basic Entitlement (KS4)	£4,963.00	£4,561.00
Free School Meals (Primary)	£460.00	£482.64
Free School Meals (Secondary)	£460.00	£482.64
Free School Meals Ever 6 (Primary)	£575.00	£600.62
Free School Meals Ever 6 (Secondary)	£840.00	£874.12
IDACI (P F)	£215.00	£225.23
IDACI (P E)	£260.00	£268.14
IDACI (P D)	£410.00	£402.20
IDACI (P C)	£445.00	£434.38
IDACI (P B)	£475.00	£466.56
IDACI (P A)	£620.00	£643.52
IDACI (S F)	£310.00	£321.76
IDACI (S E)	£415.00	£434.38
IDACI (S D)	£580.00	£573.81
IDACI (S C)	£630.00	£622.07
IDACI (S B)	£680.00	£670.34
IDACI (S A)	£865.00	£900.93
EAL3 (P)	£550.00	£573.81
EAL3 (S)	£1,485.00	£1,544.46
Low Attainment (P)	£1,095.00	£1,142.26
Low Attainment (S)	£1,660.00	£1,726.79
Lump Sum P	£117,800.00	£125,000.00
Lump Sum S	£117,800.00	£125,000.00

Appendix B – IDACI methodology

Socio-economic deprivation – Area-level deprivation data: Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)

The IDACI element of the deprivation factor is based on the IDACI dataset for 2019, which is published by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). IDACI is a relative measure of socio-economic deprivation: an IDACI 'score' is calculated for a lower super output area (LSOA, an area with typically about 1,500 residents) based on the characteristics of households in that area. The IDACI score of a given area does not mean that every child living in that area has particular deprivation characteristics: it is a measure of the likelihood that a child is in a household experiencing relative socio-economic deprivation. LSOAs are ranked by score, from the most deprived LSOA, with the highest score, to the least deprived LSOA.

For school funding purposes, the NFF uses IDACI ranks to group LSOAs into seven bands of decreasing deprivation; The six bands that attract funding are shown in the table below. In the past the ESFA has defined IDACI bands on the basis of scores. The 2021/22 NFF uses ranks instead of scores to define bands. For example, Band A comprises the most deprived 2.5% of LSOAs.

The ESFA matches IDACI data to pupils' home postcode data recorded in the October 2019 school census in order to find their LSOA, and hence the IDACI band for each pupil in a school. It is not possible to do this for schools that opened after the date of the October 2019 school census, so the ESFA uses the 2015 IDACI data in the 2020/21 APT. The amount of IDACI funding received by a school depends on the IDACI band of each pupil.

Factor	Ranks	Band	Primary funding	Secondary funding
Pupils in the most deprived 2.5% of LSOAs	1 to 821	A	£620	£865
Pupils in next the most deprived LSOAs	822 to 2463	B	£475	£680
Pupils in next the most deprived LSOAs	2464 to 4105	C	£445	£630
Pupils in next the most deprived LSOAs	4106 to 5747	D	£410	£580
Pupils in next the most deprived LSOAs	5748 to 9032	E	£260	£415
Pupils in next the most deprived LSOAs	9033 to 12316	F	£215	£310

Appendix C – Consultation results (separate Excel document)

Appendix D – IDACI comparison (separate Excel document)

Appendix E – Falling Rolls bid criteria (dormant document, from September 2016)

Falling Rolls Fund Bid Criteria

As outlined in the EFA document “2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements”, Local Authorities may topslice the DSG in order to create a small fund to support good schools with falling rolls where local planning data show that the surplus places will be needed in the near future.

In Bristol, a small fund is available for those secondary schools & secondary academies to **bid for funding** if they meet **all** of the following criteria:

- 1) The school was deemed good or outstanding at their last Ofsted inspection (an EFA stipulation).
- 2) The School has a falling roll in this financial year or the school had a falling number on roll in the last financial year.
- 3) School is deemed to be significantly below PAN, (15%), when looking at total pupil numbers.
- 4) Where local planning data suggests vacant spaces will be needed within the next 3 years.
- 5) The School needs to show how it cannot support its number of pupils with the funding allocation. The School will be expected to cover the temporary funding shortfall from existing carry forward balances prior to application to the falling rolls fund.

If after review the bid meets these criteria, the allocation would be based on the following formula.

Formula Calculation

The formula would look at the actual census and compare it to the PAN of the school, funding an average of the difference between 85% of the PAN and the actual census across all the year groups.

Example:

Year Group	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Total
Actual Census: October 2014	122	134	147	133	151	687
School PAN	216	216	216	216	216	1080
85% of the PAN	184	184	184	184	184	920
Difference between 85% of PAN and actual census	65	50	37	51	33	233

The total difference between 85% of PAN and actual census of 233 pupils is divided by 5 year groups to get an average of 46.6 pupils under PAN (233/5).

The 46.6 pupils are multiplied by the KS3 basic entitlement rate £4,103 (currently for 15/16) = **£191,200.**

Notes

- 1) Falling rolls bids are capped at a maximum of £200,000 per establishment per annum.
- 2) The deadline for applications to the falling rolls fund is **1st December** each year.
- 3) Unspent falling rolls funding will be used to support the overall DSG fund as directed by the Service Director of Education and Skills in consultation with the Head of Finance (People).

Appendix F – Current and projected Growth commitments

Type of Growth	Sector	School	Additional Forms of Entry				
			Sep-20	Sep-21	Sep-22	Sep-23	Sep-24
Growth Fund	Primary	Ashton Gate	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Primary	Cotham Gardens	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Primary	St Werburgh	1	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Primary	Southville	1	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Primary	Whitehall	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Primary	St Bernard's	1	0	0	0	0
Growing school APT	Primary	Redfield	1	0	0	0	0
Growing school APT	Primary	Marksbury	1	1	0	0	0
Growing school APT	Primary	Fairlawn	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Orchard	1	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Bristol Free Sch	1	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Cathedral	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	City Academy	1	2	2	2	2
Growth Fund	Secondary	Fairfield	1	1	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Redland Green	2	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Bristol Brunel	2	3	2	2	1
Growth Fund	Secondary	Bristol Met	2	2	2	1	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Colston Girls	2	2	2	1	0

Growth Fund	Secondary	Cotham	1	1	1	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	St Bedes	1	1	1	0	0
Growing school APT	Secondary	Trinity	4	6	6	6	6
Growing school APT	Secondary	Oasis Temple Q	0	0	8	8	8
Growing school APT	Secondary	Oasis S Bristol	0	0	6	6	6
TOTAL number of forms of entry (ie classes of 30)			28	24	30	26	23

Type of Growth	Sector	Average amount for 7/12ths of year	Sep-20	Sep-21	Sep-22	Sep-23	Sep-24
Growth Fund	Primary	£2,013	6	3	0	0	0
Growing school APT	Primary	£2,013	3	2	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	£3,022	15	13	10	6	3
Growing school APT	Secondary	£3,022	4	6	20	20	20
TOTAL number of forms of entry (ie classes of 30)			28	24	30	26	23

Forecast cost (£'000)	£2,266	£2,024	£2,720	£2,357	£2,085
------------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Growth fund cost (£'000)	1,722	1,359	906	543	271
Growing schools cost (£'000)	543	664	1,813	1,813	1,813
Total (£'000)	2,266	2,024	2,719	2,357	2,085

	Sep-20	Sep-21	Sep-22	Sep-23	Sep-24
TOTAL number of forms of entry (ie classes of 30)	28	24	30	26	23
Forecast cost (£'000)	£2,266	£2,024	£2,719	£2,357	£2,085