

**Bristol Schools Forum**  
**Schools Block School Funding Formula 2024/25**

<b>Date of meeting:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> November 2023
<b>Time of meeting:</b>	5:00 pm
<b>Venue:</b>	City Hall

## 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 2024/25, prior to final allocations being made available by the ESFA in December, for final formula agreement in January 2024.

## 2. Recommendations

Schools Forum is invited to:

- 2.1 Note the changes in the formula methodology for 2024/25
- 2.2 Provide feedback, as appropriate on the proposed arrangements for the 2024/25 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 2024/25 in January 2024; specifically:
- a. On the transfer 0.5% to High Needs Block. In line with consultation response the LA is seeking this transfer.
  - b. set MFG at 0.0%. In line with the consultation response the LA is proposing to set the MFG at 0.0%
  - c. set the value of the lump sum. The LA is seeking to set the lump sum to the maximum allowed
  - d. how to allocate remaining funding (after mandated items). The LA is seeking to maximise the AEN factors, and then direct the remainder to the AWPU with no bias towards any phase.
  - e. the value to allocate for the Growth Fund. The LA is seeking to set at £2.0m for 2024/25.

## 3. Changes between the 2023/24 formula methodology and the 2024/25 methodology

- 3.1 The main formula in 2024/25 is similar in operation to the formula in 2023/24. However, the ESFA have announced some changes for 2024/25 which were presented to schools forum at the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2023. In summary these included:
- Local factor values must move a further 10% closer to NFF factor values
  - New formulaic approach to allocating split sites funding
  - Rolling the MSAG into the NFF

- Introducing a methodology for calculating and allocating funding for falling rolls.
  - New local formulaic requirements for growth funding.
- 3.2 Additional to the changes in methodology, the minimum per pupil funding amounts have been increased from the 2023-24 levels. KS1 & KS2 are now £4,610 from £4,405. KS3 is now £5,771 from £5,503 and KS4 is now £6,331 from £6,033.
- 3.3 All other NFF factor unit values have been increased. The increases in NFF unit values are as set out in **Appendix A**.

#### 4. Funding available

- 4.1 Provisional school block allocations were announced by ESFA in July 2023. However, in October the ESFA announced that an error was made during the initial calculations of the 2024-25 schools NFF which resulted in the overall cost of the schools NFF being underestimated. Therefore, the original NFF figures published in July 2023 were incorrect. This error has now been corrected and revised allocations were published by ESFA on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2023.
- 4.2 The provisional allocations are set out in the table below and are based upon the October 2022 school census data. Schools Forum is cautioned to note that final allocations will be different, being based upon the October 2023 school census data.

This indicates that the provisional funding for Schools Block in 2024/25 is £341.187m. The equivalent figure for 2023-24 was £330.574m\* (increase of £10.6m). In addition, there will be an as yet unannounced allowance for Growth. For 2023-24 this was £2.2m. **Table 1** sets out how the indicative 2024-25 funding is composed.

\*This figure includes MSAG totalling £10.714m

**Table 1: Revised indicative Schools Block Budget 2024/25**

	Unit of funding	2023/24 pupil numbers	£ total
Primary	£5,200.70	35,001	£182,029,793
Secondary	£6,873.45	21,376	£146,927,963
Funding through the premises factors			£12,229,486
Growth funding element			Not yet announced

<b>Provisional NFF 2024-25 schools block funding (excluding funding through the growth factor)</b>			<b>£341,187,242</b>

## 5. Funding formula

- 5.1 The DfE is moving to a hard funding formula, and 2023-24 was the first year of formal transition. As in previous years, the school block funding received into the LA is calculated on National Funding Formula, and there are increasing restrictions and requirements on how the Local Authority may distribute this funding to schools via the local formula. For 2024/25, Local Authorities must move their local formula factor values at least 10% closer to the NFF.
- 5.2 **Minimum per pupil funding levels.** Minimum funding levels per pupil are set as part of the NFF, for 2024/25 these will be £4,610 for primary schools and £5,771 for KS3 and £6,331 for KS4 in secondary schools (the calculation includes the lump sum but excludes other premises factors).
- 5.3 **Positive Minimum Funding Guarantees (MFG).** For 2024/25 funding formula the MFG can be set within the range +0.0% and +0.5%. This is the same as 2023/24.
- 5.4 For the 2023/24 funding formula, an MFG of +0.0% 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.
- 5.5 **For 2024/25 the LA is proposing setting at the minimum allowable again, at +0.0% for the same reasons as last year.** This is in line with discussions at the sub-group and in line with the consultation results (the consultation is discussed at 6.33 – 6.36 and summary consultation results are shown at 6.37).
- 5.6 **Growth Funding.** Developing a fair and sustainable way of including sufficient resource in the formula to take account of growing pupil numbers continues to be a challenge for the DfE. Previously the DfE have used historic spend as the basis, but this did not help authorities with new, rapid growth. For 2023/24, the DfE is 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 2024/25 will not be known until it is announced, which is expected during December 2024.
- 5.7 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.

- 5.8 **Movements between blocks.** The government's announcement of more funding into the 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 2024/25 enforce this. However, as LAs retain some discretion over the application of the formula, some discretion over how these increases are passed on remains.
- 5.9 As in previous years, the position of the High Needs budget remains of concern. Whilst additional funding again has been made available for the High Needs block directly, in 2023/24 we transferred 0.5% of the Schools Block (£1.6m) to develop the Education Transformation programme. For 2024/25 the LA has scope to again seek agreement to transfer up to 0.5% of the Schools Block (up to an estimated £1.7m) into the High Needs Block.
- 5.10 The Authority continues to explore all options in closing the High Needs funding gap and create a stable platform for the future, and this includes considering the transfer of funding from Schools Block. In the past, transfers between blocks have supported the Education Transformation Programme and Delivering Best Value (DBV) in SEND Programme. However, for 2024/25 the transfer would be to increase the overall funding available to high needs block, rather than being earmarked for specific areas. For the purposes of this paper the maximum transfer that can be locally agreed has been modelled, based on current funding announcements and in line with the feedback from the consultation, alongside the results with no transfer.

## 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 A block transfer was one of the areas consulted upon, with 13 of the 19 responses supporting a transfer of up to 0.5%. **The LA is therefore proposing the 0.5% transfer from Schools' Block to the High Needs Block.**
- 6.3 **Minimum Funding Guarantee:** The allowed MFG value must again be set between +0.0% and +0.5%.
- 6.4 The LA has discussed this in previous years with Schools Forum and this term 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 all available funds remaining after applying the dominant formula commitments, to target areas of local priority.
- 6.5 The consultation with schools also sought their views on the level of MFG for 2024/25 and out of the 19 schools who answered this question, 14 were in favour of setting the MFG at +0.0%.

- 6.6 Given the strong preference expressed, and previous practice, **the LA once again proposes to set the MFG at the lowest allowable value, this time at +0.0% for 2024/25.**
- 6.7 Application of the formula funding for 2024/25: Once mandated formula commitments such as the minimum per pupil funding, minimum funding guarantee, 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.**
- 6.8 In previous years formula funding has been targeted at preserving the value of the lump sum and prioritised the Additional Educational Needs (AEN) factors: Deprivation, EAL and Prior Attainment.
- 6.9 Due to the tighter restrictions around factor values, once all mandated requirements have been met, it is no longer possible to distribute all remaining funding through the Additional Education Needs factors alone. Therefore, following discussions with schools' forum sub-group on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2023, the LA has completed modelling for schools' block funding based on increasing the lump sum and the AEN factors to maximum allowed (apart from mobility), with remaining funding being distributed through AWPU. These factor values can be found in Appendix A.
- 6.10 Forum is being asked whether it supports the above method or if the AWPU should be prioritised, or any other component of the funding formula such as supporting unit values for a specific sector.
- 6.11 The question as to the method of distributing funding was put to schools in the consultation. Schools were free to choose from nine options, in various combinations of the AWPU, the AEN and the lump sum. Out of 19 responding schools, 17 answered this question, with 10 opting to keep the lump sum at minimum allowed and support the AEN over the AWPU, 2 schools voted to increase the lump sum and prioritise the AEN factors to maximum allowed, 2 schools voted to keep the lump sum at minimum allowed and support both AWPU and AEN. 2 schools voted to increase the lump sum and support AWPU and AEN, 1 school voted to support AWPU and AEN and not preserving the lump sum.
- 6.12 **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.
- 6.13 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 any primary schools are experiencing a decline in roll.
- 6.14 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.

6.15 This question was asked of schools responding to the consultation. Of the 19 schools in the voting pool, 17 schools responded to this question, 7 schools wanted to see Primary targeted exclusively, with the remaining 10 responding schools wanting no distinction between sectors made.

Given the consultation outcome **the LA is proposing no bias of this distribution to Primary and Secondary and maximising the lump sum and AEN factors (apart from mobility) and distributing remaining funding through AWPU.**

6.16 **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**

6.17 **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 C**. This projection is based on the current policy, the growth anticipated in September 2023 and the current rates at which the LA supports growth.

6.18 This table also includes a forward projection of growth in these schools through to September 2027.

6.19 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.

6.20 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.

6.21 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 2023/24 funding values.

6.22 Existing growth pressures continue to shift away from Primary Schools and into Secondary Schools. The degree at which there will need to be expansion of existing secondary schools in September 2024 and beyond is not yet certain, but the projection allows for some expansion of existing schools.

6.23 The commitment on the Growth Fund for 2024/25 – projected in the appendix at 2023 funding levels – is projected at £0.719m. The actual cost will depend on actual pupil numbers recorded in the Autumn 2024 census, the prevailing 2024/25 funding formula values, and the possible need to identify further expansions resulting from the Spring 2024 admissions round. Therefore, the actual cost is likely to be higher than £0.719m, but this increase cannot be quantified at this time.

6.24 The LA proposed and School Forum supported establishing a Growth Fund of £2.0m for 2023/24. Whilst commitments in Primary schools is expected to reduce in 2024/25, commitments to secondary school growth will increase, so again **the LA is proposing to allocate £2.0m to the Growth Fund.**

- 6.25 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 2023 alongside the release of the final DSG allocations and the final school census data.
- 6.26 Allocations will be available once the ESFA releases the data on their website and will be shared with School Forum at the January 2024 meeting, alongside presentation of the proposed final formula.
- 6.27 **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.
- 6.28 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.
- 6.29 The School Forum finance sub-group revisited consideration of a Falling Rolls fund for 2020/21 at their meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> July 2019. The decision was not to re-establish a Falling Rolls fund for 2020/21.
- 6.30 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 B**
- 6.31 **At this time the LA is not proposing to reinstate the Falling Rolls fund for 2024/25.**
- 6.32 **Summary of LA's proposals:**
- a. Note the changes made to the formula by the ESFA
  - b. That the MFG be set at +0.0%
  - c. The transfer of 0.5% of the Schools Block to High Needs
  - d. The lump sum be set at maximum allowed, £139,850 for both Primary and Secondary
  - e. That fund remaining after meeting mandated requirements be distributed to the AEN factors to maximum allowed with remaining funding through AWPU
  - f. No bias of this distribution to either primary or secondary
  - g. Premises factors (NNDR and PFI) 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

6.33 **Consultation with schools:** the LA consulted with schools on various aspects of the funding formula for 2024/25. The consultation was communicated to schools through the Service Director Education, Skills regular newsletter, via email and through school forum members. The consultation ran from 3<sup>rd</sup> October to 14<sup>th</sup> November 2023.

6.34 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

6.35 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.

6.36 Nineteen schools responded to the consultation:

	Maintained	Academy
Primary	6	6
Secondary	0	4
All-through		0
Special	2	0
PRU		1
Nursery		0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>

6.37 The summarised responses to the questions were:

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Q1 Agree to Block transfer	13	6
Q2 Comments received	2 from "Yes"	6 from "No"
Q3 Agree to MFG 0.0%	14	5
Q4 Comments received	13 from "Yes" A=10, B=2, C=0, D=0, E=0, F=0, G=2, H=2,	5 from "No" response I=1
Q5 Preferred formula option		
Q6 Prefer any sector? All / Primary	All = 10, Primary = 7	
Q7 Comments received		Twelve comments

Note: Comments received in response to Question 1 are available in Appendix D.



## 7. Future funding arrangements

7.1 2023/24 was the first firm year of transition to a hard funding formula, and although no end of target date has yet been set, the transition will continue in 2024/25. In particular:

- Local Authorities must move their local formula factor values at least a further 10% closer to the NFF
- Local Authorities must use the new national formulaic approach to split sites. This could lead to some BCC schools no longer being eligible under the new NFF criteria
- Local Authorities must follow the new local formula requirements for growth funding
- Local Authorities with a falling rolls find, must follow the new requirements

7.2 Bristol's Schools Block is funded at a level above that needed to implement a hard NFF in full. Whilst it is not clear whether that once any hard NFF is in operation if Bristol schools will be protected at this higher funding level by any future MFG or other floor mechanism, it seems likely that NFF minimum per pupil funding levels will grow to a point to provide floor protections to Bristol schools.

### Appendix A - comparison of 2024/25 NFF unit values to Bristol's 2023/24 formula unit values

Factor	2024/25 National Funding Formula values (with ACA applied)	Range in which 2024/25 Local Formula value must be applied	Local 2023/24 Formula Values	Factors used for 2024/25 modelling (Mandatory minimum factors highlighted in Green)	
				0% block transfer	0.5% block transfer
Basic Entitlement (Primary)	£3,616	£3,502 - £3,706	£3,317	£3,558	£3,527
Basic Entitlement (KS3)	£5,098	£4,938 - £5,226	£4,677	£5,017	£4,973
Basic Entitlement (KS4)	£5,746	£5,566 - £5,891	£5,271	£5,655	£5,605

Free School Meals (Primary)	£498	£485 - £560	£556	£560	£560
Free School Meals (Secondary)	£498	£485 - £560	£556	£560	£560
Free School Meals Ever 6 (Primary)	£832	£812 - £853	£725	£853	£853
Free School Meals Ever 6 (Secondary)	£1,218	£1,188 - £1,249	£1,059	£1,249	£1,249
IDACI (P F)	£239	£233 - £267	£265	£267	£267
IDACI (P E)	£289	£282 - £321	£319	£321	£321
IDACI (P D)	£452	£440 - £506	£507	£506	£506
IDACI (P C)	£492	£480 - £548	£549	£548	£548
IDACI (P B)	£523	£510 - £583	£585	£583	£583
IDACI (P A)	£690	£673 - £769	£767	£769	£769
IDACI (S F)	£345	£337 - £384	£384	£384	£384
IDACI (S E)	£457	£445 - £512	£513	£512	£512
IDACI (S D)	£640	£624 - £716	£714	£716	£716
IDACI (S C)	£700	£683 - £781	£779	£781	£781
IDACI (S B)	£751	£732 - £839	£838	£839	£839
IDACI (S A)	£959	£935 - £1,071	£1,068	£1,071	£1,071
EAL3 (P)	£599	£584 - £671	£668	£671	£671
EAL3 (S)	£1,609	£1,569 - £1,800	£1,800	£1,800	£1,800
Low Attainment (P)	£1,188	£1,158 - £1,327	£1,326	£1,327	£1,327
Low Attainment (S)	£1,802	£1,757 - £2,015	£2,013	£2,015	£2,015
Primary mobility	£975	£219 - £999	£120	£219	£219
Secondary mobility	£1,401	£315 - £1,436	£173	£315	£315
Primary sparsity	£57,966	£12,765 - £59,415	£6,901	£12,765	£12,765
Secondary sparsity	£84,259	£18,512 - £86,366	£10,046	£18,512	£18,512
Lump Sum P	£136,439	£133,028 - £139,850	£126,627	£139,850	£139,850
Lump Sum S	£136,439	£133,028 - £139,850	£126,627	£139,850	£139,850
Split Sites - Basic	£54,515	£53,152 - £55,877	Not used	£53,152	£53,152
Split Sites - Distance	£27,308	£26,625 - £27,991	Not used	£26,625	£26,625

## **Appendix B – 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:

<b>Year Group</b>	<b>Year 7</b>	<b>Year 8</b>	<b>Year 9</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 11</b>	<b>Total</b>
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 **1<sup>st</sup> 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 C – Current and projected Growth commitments

Type of Growth	Sector	School	Additional Forms of Entry				
			Sep-23	Sep-24	Sep-25	Sep-26	Sep-27
Growth Fund	Primary	Perry Court	1	1	1	1	1
Growth Fund	Secondary	Orchard	1	1	1	1	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	City Academy	2	1	1	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Bristol Brunel	2	1	1	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Bristol Met	1	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	Colston Girls	2	1	1	1	0
Growth fund	Secondary	Trinity	1	1	1	1	0
Growing school APT	Secondary	Trinity	6	6	0	0	0
Growing school APT	Secondary	Oasis Temple Q	6	6	8	8	8
Growing school APT	Secondary	Oasis S Bristol	4	6	6	6	6
<b>TOTAL number of forms of entry (ie classes of 30)</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>
Type of Growth	Sector	Average amount for 7/12ths of year	Sep-23	Sep-24	Sep-25	Sep-26	Sep-27

Growth Fund	Primary	£3,033	1	1	1	1	1
Growing school APT	Primary	£3,033	0	0	0	0	0
Growth Fund	Secondary	£4,190	9	5	5	3	0
Growing school APT	Secondary	£4,190	16	18	14	14	14
<b>TOTAL number of forms of entry (ie classes of 30)</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Forecast cost (£'000)</b>			<b>£3,233</b>	<b>£2,982</b>	<b>£2,479</b>	<b>£2,228</b>	<b>£1,851</b>

Growth fund cost (£'000)	1,222	719	719	468	91
Growing schools cost (£'000)	2,011	2,263	1,760	1,760	1,760
Total (£'000)	3,233	2,982	2,479	2,228	1,851

## Appendix D – Comments for Q1: 0.5% transfer to High Needs Block

Comments from establishments who voted 'Yes':

- It is reassuring to know the LA is cognisant of the continuing pressures on schools' budgets, however reducing the amount available to schools through the HNB will only serve to add to these pressures as it will equate to less monies being available for TUF applications. Additionally, the increased mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels and the requirement to set MFG in the range 0% to +0.5% ensuring schools receive at least the same or higher level of protected per-pupil funding than in 2023/24 negates the need to not give support to this transfer.
- Funds transferred should be used directly for the benefit of SEN provision in mainstream schools where increasing needs are having a significant financial impact.

Comments received from establishments who voted 'No':

- I feel that a complete overhaul of the SEND funding is needed and that this money can be better spent in the schools block
- What would be the direct benefit to schools?
- Factors which have informed me of this is that an overhaul of the High Needs funding needs to be done and this money can be better spent in the schools block.
- High needs should be fully funded in its own right – do not support a transfer.
- This brings many challenges. Schools do not receive enough funding to support the day to day running without then having to support a 0.5% transfer to the high needs block. We have had to strip back to the bare essentials this year just to balance the budget removing extra-curricular activities, reducing forest schools, reducing the number of trips that we offer. The school is in an area of high deprivation and so school is often the only place where a lot of our pupils

experience wonderful things which we are now having to reduce due to budget constraints.