

SCHOOLS FORUM REPORT

Subject: DfE consultation - National funding formula for Schools Stage 2.

Summary

The government has launched Stage 2 of the National Funding Formula for Schools setting out detailed proposals for the design of the new NFF for schools and the central services block for local authorities.

This consultation seeks views on the detailed proposals and builds on the consultation launched in March 2016. It is open until 22 March 2017 and the outcome will be published in June.

The proposals

The main consultation paper together with an executive summary and detailed tables is available [HERE](#) The key features of the proposals are:

- The National Funding Formula (NFF) will be introduced from 2018-19. In 2018-19 (only) a notional NFF will be used to calculate the Schools Block for LAs. Once allocated to the LA school budgets can then be distributed to schools according to the locally agreed formula.
- The NFF (a 'hard' formula) will then be used to allocate funding to schools from 2019-20.
- The NFF will continue to feature a Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) at -1.5% per pupil.
- To ensure stability there will be a 'funding floor' so that no school will face a reduction of more than 3% per pupil overall as a result of the formula.
- Gains will be capped at 3% per pupil in 2018-10 and 2.5% in 2019-20. The cap levels from 2019-20 onwards will be decided at next spending review.
- The pupil premium continues in its current form
- A new 4th Block of DSG for central school services to include LA responsibilities previously funded through centrally retained DSG (i.e. admissions). Ongoing responsibilities are to be funded on a per-pupil factor and an element according to deprivation. .
- The LA will continue to make decisions about early years, high needs and the new central school services blocks.

- The Schools Block will be ring fenced but with some limited ability to move between the Schools and High Needs blocks with the explicit agreement of Schools Forum and the majority of schools.
- The NFF will use the original proposed 12 factors plus addition of a Mobility factor (which will be allocated on a historic basis based on what LAs allocated in previous year).

Table 1

A	Basic per-pupil funding	Age-weighted pupil unit						
B	Additional needs funding	Deprivation	Low prior attainment	English as an additional language		Mobility		
C	School-led funding	Lump sum	Sparsity	Premises				Growth
				Rates	PFI	Split sites	Exceptional circumstances	
D	Geographic funding	Area cost adjustment						

- School-led factors for Rotherham are premises factors rates, PFI, the lump sum and growth fund. These factors will be allocated on the basis of historic spend in 2018-19, but with an adjustment to the PFI factor so that it is automatically updated in line with inflation, using the RPIX measure.
- The area Cost Adjustments (ACA) have been used to recognise variation in labour market costs – Rotherham’s area costs adjustment is weighted at 1.
- The NFF will maintain the national average distribution of funding between the primary and secondary phases. This means that the formula would allocate 29% more funding overall to secondary compared to primary a significant shift from Rotherham’s current 42% (a 13% shift).
- There are also significant shifts between formula factors when compared with Rotherham’s current distribution via LA formulae.
- Table 2 shows the proposed weightings (the percentage of the total budget spent on each factor) and total spend through each factor in the national funding formula. Also included are the individual factor values (i.e. the amount per pupil or school that follow from the proposed weightings).

Table 2

Figure 3: The factor values and weighting we propose for the national funding formula								
Factor		Proposed weighting for the national funding formula	Total we propose to spend through factor in the formula. NB These include area cost adjustment funding		Per-pupil/school funding under the proposed national funding formula. NB These exclude area cost adjustment funding.			
					Primary		Secondary	
Basic per-pupil funding (£ per pupil)		72.5%	£23,255m		KS1	£2,712	KS3	£3,797
					KS2		KS4	£4,312
Deprivation (£ per pupil)	Ever6 FSM	9.3%	£1,746m	£2,985m	£540		£785	
	Current FSM		£980		£1,225			
	IDACI A		£575		£810			
	IDACI B		£420		£600			
	IDACI C		£360		£515			
	IDACI D		£360		£515			
	IDACI E		£240		£390			
	IDACI F		£200		£290			
Low prior attainment (£ per pupil)		7.5%	£2,394m		£1,050		£1,550	
English as an additional language (£ per pupil)		1.2%	£388m		£515		£1,385	
Mobility (allocated to LAs on basis of historic spend)		0.1%	£23m		N/A			
Lump sum (£ per school)		7.1%	£2,263m		£110,000		£110,000	
Sparsity (£ per school)		0.08%	£27m		£0 - £25,000		£0 - £65,000	
Premises (allocated to LAs on basis of historic spend)	Rates	1.8%	£569m	N/A				
	PFI							
	Split sites							
	Exceptional circumstances							
Area cost adjustment			£792m		A multiplier that is applied to certain factors. Shown in italics because it is already included in the total spend through each factor.			
Explicit spend on growth (allocated to LAs on basis of historic spend)		0.5%	£167m		N/A			
Total			£32,071m					

Summary of proposals in Table 2

- To secure a funding system which relates to the characteristics of the pupils in the school and is matched transparently to need
- Maximise pupil-led factors and reduce school-led factors. The consultation proposal is to allocate 91% of total funding through pupil-led factors (currently Rotherham allocates 90%). Although the percentage split proposal is 73% basic-per pupil and 18% additional needs currently Rotherham's is 84% and 6% respectively.
- Funding allocated through the Additional needs factors will increase and the basic per-pupil funding will decrease
- Deprivation factor will be the largest of the additional factors and will be allocated on a combination of free school meals (ever 6) and the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI)
- The lump sum has been set at £110,000 lower than the current average.

The following tables compare the proposed per-pupil/school funding values following implementation of the NFF and Rotherham's 2016-17 current values.

Basic Amount for each Pupil Some for Additional Needs

The consultation proposal is that the basic entitlement amount that every pupil attracts to their school (currently the AWPU) should remain the largest formula factor. There are wide variations of basic funding across the different LA's.

The consultation proposals to spend approximately 73% of the total schools block, which is less than current LA spend. (Rotherham currently spends allocates 84%) A corresponding change is proposed to increase the amount spent through the additional needs factor

Table 3

Basic per pupil funding	Illustrative NFF	Rotherham	% age change
Primary R - Y6	£2,712.00	£3,147.00	-14.00%
KS2	£3,797.00	£4,985.00	-24.00%
KS3	£4,312.00	£5,190.00	-17.00%

Increasing Total Spend on Additional Needs Factors

The 4 additional needs factors used by the LA's in their formulae are deprivation, low prior attainment, English as an additional language and mobility. Mobility will be allocated on a historic spend basis initially.

Evidence points to pupils eligible for one of these factors being likely to face barriers in their education which can impact on their future attainment.

The consultation seeks to support schools as they work to break the link between these factors and attainment. The NFF proposes significant investment in the additional needs factors as the way forward. The proposal to increase the weighting of the additional needs factors to 18% of the total schools block (Rotherham currently spends 6%)

Deprivation

Deprivation will be the largest of the additional factors and as shown on Table 1 will be allocated on a combination of free school meals (ever 6) and the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI). Half of the proposed 18% total schools block to be allocated via additional needs factors will be driven by the deprivation factors. Currently Rotherham allocates 4% of the total schools block via free school meals (ever 6) at a primary value of £548 per pupil and secondary value of £625 per pupil. The DfE propose 9.3% of the schools block.

Increase Funding Distributed According to Low Prior Attainment

Table 4

Factor per pupil	Illustrative NFF Primary	Illustrative NFF Secondary	Rotherham current Primary	Rotherham current Secondary	% age change	% age change
Low prior attainment	£1,050.00	£1,055.00	£537.00	£437.00	95.00%	225.00%

Propose to distribute 7.5% - Rotherham currently 2.1%

Increase Funding Distributed via English as an Additional Language

Table 5

Factor per pupil	Illustrative NFF Primary	Illustrative NFF Secondary	Rotherham current Primary	Rotherham current Secondary	% age change	% age change
EAL	£515.00	£1,385.00	£367.00	£367.00	40.00%	360.00%

Propose to distribute 1.2% - Rotherham currently 0.35%

Lump Sum factor

This factor is intended to contribute towards the fixed costs that do not vary with pupil numbers, and to give schools (especially small schools) certainty that they will receive a certain amount each year in addition to their pupil-led funding.

There is a wide variation in the amounts of lump sum paid by LA's across the country and the proposal is to set the lump sum at a lower level than the current national average so that more funding can be directed through the pupil-led factors.

Table 6

Factor per pupil	Illustrative NFF Primary & Secondary	Rotherham current Primary & Secondary	% age change
Lump Sum	£110,000.00	£117,000.00	-6.00%

The impact in Rotherham

Overall Rotherham schools and academies would lose £645k (a 0.35% decrease) when the formula is fully implemented in 2019-2020. (Regional illustrative impact Appendix A)

In comparison with the current Rotherham formula the NFF allocates more for deprivation which is reflected in the outcome for all Rotherham schools listed in Appendix B.

Also reflected is the national average distribution of funding between the primary and secondary phases which has been retained at 1:1.29. Where the current primary to secondary ratio is greater (as in Rotherham) primary schools will, on average, gain.

Where schools are currently funded more generously than the proposed national funding formula would do these schools on average are more likely to lose from the national funding formula.

Outcomes for individual schools vary from +13.9% to -3% if fully implemented, as detailed in appendix B with 50 % of primaries gaining and 50% seeing a reduction whereas all our secondary schools lose but one. The overall total loss is £645k (0.35% decrease).

In the first year of transition the loss is £400k (0.22% decrease).

The impact nationally.

Appendix C shows the current and post NFF local authority 'league tables'. As a consequence of the NFF Rotherham drops from 32nd to 37th.

Neighbouring authority Barnsley jumps from 78th position to 35th, a rank change of 43 along with Derby which moves up from 120th to 58th, a rank change of 62. This is explained by the affect of PFI where the local formula has had to include a substantial PFI factor, tying up funding that would otherwise be invested in the pupil-led factors. Following the introduction of the NFF, local authorities will be funded for PFI on the basis of historic spend, uprated for inflation and the per-pupil funding will be calculated based on the same national formula therefore reflected in the substantial increase.

Re-alignment exercise

The DfE will be holding a further DSG baselining exercise in late March and early April 2017. This exercise will inform a starting position for the first year of the schools and high needs national funding formulae for 2018 to 2019.

Appendix A - Regional illustrative impact (for information)

Proposed National Funding Formula Variations to Yorks & Humber - Transitional Period (2018-19)					
First Year	Schools	High Needs	Central Services	Total	Ranking
Barnsley	3,136,381	566,338	21,794	3,724,514	4
Bradford	-2,868,461	1,566,140	52,438	-1,249,883	14
Calderdale	1,229,335	477,457	22,442	1,729,234	9
Doncaster	1,533,894	785,923	30,832	2,350,649	7
East Riding of Yorkshire	3,524,535	575,460	-39,772	4,060,223	3
Kingston upon Hull City of	2,276,578	711,360	-39,606	2,948,331	6
Kirklees	-3,352,909	896,544	-51,643	-2,508,008	15
Leeds	6,762,908	1,647,627	60,288	8,470,822	1
North East Lincolnshire	-465,914	463,860	-19,493	-21,547	12
North Lincolnshire	583,419	422,033	12,257	1,017,710	10
North Yorkshire	3,344,574	0	-64,043	3,280,531	5
Rotherham	-400,352	664,789	19,966	284,403	11
Sheffield	4,631,903	1,357,650	48,276	6,037,829	2
Wakefield	-1,830,729	704,452	32,293	-1,093,983	13
York	2,142,124	0	-17,401	2,124,722	8
Proposed National Funding Formula Variations to Yorks & Humber - Fully Implemented (2019-20)					
Full Year	Schools	High Needs	Central Services	Total	Ranking
Barnsley	9,112,343	2,764,965	83,887	11,961,194	3
Bradford	-5,334,712	8,155,339	641,551	3,462,178	9
Calderdale	1,687,989	1,654,398	90,697	3,433,084	10
Doncaster	3,276,258	2,002,948	74,879	5,354,086	7
East Riding of Yorkshire	5,180,516	2,118,895	-319,426	6,979,986	5
Kingston upon Hull City of	4,685,927	2,637,951	-440,993	6,882,886	6
Kirklees	-6,388,071	5,962,101	-143,533	-569,503	15
Leeds	12,640,833	8,840,375	60,288	21,541,495	1
North East Lincolnshire	-1,205,799	802,830	-83,949	-486,918	14
North Lincolnshire	1,275,224	623,010	213,042	2,111,276	12
North Yorkshire	7,445,554	0	-323,572	7,121,982	4
Rotherham	-645,337	2,900,429	435,143	2,690,235	11
Sheffield	14,138,482	6,580,341	262,085	20,980,908	2
Wakefield	-3,365,451	3,970,238	116,998	721,786	13
York	4,716,869	0	-22,045	4,694,824	8

Appendix B Illustrative NFF outcome for Rotherham schools

	The school's baseline funding is the total core funding received through the schools block and MFG in 2016-17 (or 2016/17 if an academy). Other grants/funding sources are excluded.	These columns show illustrative NFF funding if the proposed formula had been implemented in full and without any transitional protections in 2016-17. We use pupil numbers and characteristics from 2016-17 to illustrate the NFF impact, and compare to the school's baseline funding, including MFG.		In the first year of transition towards the formula, LAs will continue to determine funding locally. This column illustrates the change in the amount the department would allocate to LAs in respect of each school, taking into account the maximum change proposed in NFF year 1 (gains of up to 3% and an MFG of -1.5% per pupil).	
School Name	Baseline funding	Illustrative NFF funding if formula implemented in full in 2016-17, without transitional protections		Illustrative NFF funding in the first year of transition	
	Funding the school received in 2016-17 or 2016/17	Illustrative total NFF funding	Percentage change compared to baseline	Illustrative NFF year 1 funding	Percentage change compared to baseline
Thurcroft Junior Academy	£908,000	£884,000	-2.6%	£896,000	-1.3%
Coleridge Primary	£1,021,000	£1,101,000	7.9%	£1,046,000	2.5%
East Dene Primary	£1,370,000	£1,493,000	9.0%	£1,405,000	2.6%
Badsley Primary	£2,232,000	£2,389,000	7.0%	£2,294,000	2.8%
Blackburn Primary	£1,092,000	£1,063,000	-2.7%	£1,078,000	-1.3%
Broom Valley	£1,696,000	£1,815,000	7.0%	£1,743,000	2.7%
Eastwood Village					
Brookfield	£994,000	£1,041,000	4.7%	£1,021,000	2.7%
Ferham	£987,000	£1,062,000	7.6%	£1,010,000	2.3%
Thrybergh	£846,000	£826,000	-2.4%	£835,000	-1.3%
Monkwood	£1,375,000	£1,433,000	4.3%	£1,413,000	2.8%
Wickersley Northfield	£1,501,000	£1,460,000	-2.8%	£1,480,000	-1.4%
Herringthorpe Junior	£1,259,000	£1,296,000	2.9%	£1,293,000	2.7%
High Greave Junior	£862,000	£977,000	13.3%	£885,000	2.6%
High Greave Infant	£659,000	£700,000	6.3%	£675,000	2.5%
Redscope	£1,364,000	£1,419,000	4.0%	£1,401,000	2.7%
Kimberworth	£955,000	£998,000	4.5%	£978,000	2.4%
Meadow View	£1,113,000	£1,205,000	8.2%	£1,141,000	2.5%
Maltby Manor	£1,323,000	£1,326,000	0.2%	£1,326,000	0.2%
Thornhill	£1,371,000	£1,477,000	7.7%	£1,406,000	2.5%
Thorpe Hesley	£1,675,000	£1,630,000	-2.7%	£1,653,000	-1.3%
Herringthorpe Infant	£1,015,000	£1,022,000	0.7%	£1,022,000	0.7%
Roughwood	£1,012,000	£1,062,000	4.9%	£1,038,000	2.6%
Sitwell Junior	£1,193,000	£1,161,000	-2.7%	£1,177,000	-1.4%
Rockingham	£1,171,000	£1,211,000	3.5%	£1,202,000	2.7%
Sitwell Infant	£877,000	£887,000	1.2%	£887,000	1.2%
Aston Fence	£834,000	£813,000	-2.5%	£823,000	-1.3%
Swallownest	£778,000	£759,000	-2.5%	£769,000	-1.3%
Bramley Sunnyside Junior	£1,209,000	£1,203,000	-0.5%	£1,203,000	-0.5%
Brampton Cortonwood	£565,000	£551,000	-2.4%	£558,000	-1.2%
Brinsworth Manor Junior	£1,145,000	£1,170,000	2.1%	£1,170,000	2.1%
Brinsworth Manor Infant	£865,000	£898,000	3.8%	£887,000	2.6%
Dalton Listerdale	£912,000	£888,000	-2.6%	£900,000	-1.3%
Dinnington	£1,178,000	£1,160,000	-1.5%	£1,162,000	-1.3%
Harthill	£684,000	£667,000	-2.5%	£675,000	-1.2%
Crags Community	£1,811,000	£1,878,000	3.7%	£1,858,000	2.6%
Ravenfield	£772,000	£752,000	-2.6%	£762,000	-1.3%
Rawmarsh Ashwood	£790,000	£837,000	5.8%	£811,000	2.6%
Rawmarsh Rosehill Junior	£901,000	£928,000	2.9%	£925,000	2.6%
Rawmarsh Ryecroft Infant	£663,000	£671,000	1.1%	£671,000	1.1%
Kilnhurst	£894,000	£874,000	-2.3%	£883,000	-1.3%
Swinton Queen	£1,206,000	£1,247,000	3.4%	£1,237,000	2.6%
Laughton	£697,000	£680,000	-2.5%	£689,000	-1.2%
Wales	£906,000	£882,000	-2.6%	£894,000	-1.3%
Kiveton Park Infant	£624,000	£649,000	3.9%	£639,000	2.4%
Kiveton Park Meadows	£805,000	£784,000	-2.6%	£794,000	-1.3%
Wath Victoria	£972,000	£981,000	0.9%	£981,000	0.9%

	The school's baseline funding is the total core funding received through the schools block and MFG in 2016-17 (or 2016/17 if an academy). Other grants/funding sources are excluded.	These columns show illustrative NFF funding if the proposed formula had been implemented in full and without any transitional protections in 2016-17. We use pupil numbers and characteristics from 2016-17 to illustrate the NFF impact, and compare to the school's baseline funding, including MFG.		In the first year of transition towards the formula, LAs will continue to determine funding locally. This column illustrates the change in the amount the department would allocate to LAs in respect of each school, taking into account the maximum change proposed in NFF year 1 (gains of up to 3% and an MFG of -1.5% per pupil).	
School Name	Baseline funding	Illustrative NFF funding if formula implemented in full in 2016-17, without transitional protections		Illustrative NFF funding in the first year of transition	
	Funding the school received in 2016-17 or 2016/17	Illustrative total NFF funding	Percentage change compared to baseline	Illustrative NFF year 1 funding	Percentage change compared to baseline
Aston Lodge	£787,000	£792,000	0.6%	£792,000	0.6%
Wath Central	£1,686,000	£1,720,000	2.0%	£1,720,000	2.0%
Whiston J & I	£801,000	£781,000	-2.4%	£790,000	-1.3%
Bramley Sunnyside Infant	£902,000	£901,000	-0.1%	£901,000	-0.1%
Anston Park Junior	£1,055,000	£1,068,000	1.2%	£1,068,000	1.2%
Thurcroft Infant	£793,000	£827,000	4.2%	£814,000	2.5%
Maltby Lilly Hall	£1,433,000	£1,393,000	-2.8%	£1,413,000	-1.4%
Springwood Junior	£723,000	£758,000	4.8%	£742,000	2.5%
Sandhill Primary	£870,000	£893,000	2.7%	£893,000	2.6%
Anston Park Infant	£851,000	£841,000	-1.2%	£841,000	-1.2%
Bramley Grange	£1,106,000	£1,081,000	-2.3%	£1,091,000	-1.4%
Todwick	£752,000	£733,000	-2.5%	£743,000	-1.3%
Brinsworth Whitehill	£1,127,000	£1,115,000	-1.1%	£1,115,000	-1.1%
Rawmarsh Thorogate	£775,000	£796,000	2.7%	£794,000	2.5%
Whiston Worry Goose	£813,000	£792,000	-2.6%	£802,000	-1.3%
Maltby Redwood	£784,000	£764,000	-2.6%	£774,000	-1.3%
Catcliffe	£771,000	£753,000	-2.3%	£761,000	-1.3%
West Melton	£707,000	£689,000	-2.5%	£698,000	-1.2%
Brinsworth Howarth	£767,000	£755,000	-1.5%	£757,000	-1.3%
Aughton	£717,000	£699,000	-2.5%	£708,000	-1.3%
Anston Greenlands	£801,000	£789,000	-1.5%	£790,000	-1.3%
Anston Hillcrest	£856,000	£834,000	-2.6%	£845,000	-1.3%
Flanderwell	£1,098,000	£1,069,000	-2.7%	£1,083,000	-1.3%
Aston Hall	£977,000	£951,000	-2.6%	£964,000	-1.3%
Woodsetts	£743,000	£725,000	-2.5%	£734,000	-1.3%
Greasbrough	£875,000	£905,000	3.4%	£898,000	2.6%
St Ann's	£1,639,000	£1,867,000	13.9%	£1,683,000	2.7%
Canklow Woods	£979,000	£953,000	-2.6%	£966,000	-1.3%
Anston Brook	£604,000	£590,000	-2.4%	£597,000	-1.2%
Kilnhurst St Thomas CofE	£800,000	£805,000	0.6%	£805,000	0.6%
Wentworth CofE	£526,000	£514,000	-2.3%	£520,000	-1.2%
St Mary's Catholic	£803,000	£794,000	-1.2%	£794,000	-1.2%
Wath CofE	£997,000	£1,020,000	2.3%	£1,020,000	2.3%
Thrybergh Fullerton	£499,000	£493,000	-1.2%	£493,000	-1.2%
Laughton All Saints CofE	£472,000	£461,000	-2.3%	£466,000	-1.1%
Brampton Ellis CofE	£1,507,000	£1,506,000	-0.1%	£1,506,000	-0.1%
St Alban's CofE	£762,000	£742,000	-2.6%	£752,000	-1.3%
Aston All Saints CofE	£792,000	£771,000	-2.6%	£782,000	-1.3%
Trinity Croft CofE	£523,000	£556,000	6.4%	£535,000	2.4%
St Mary's Catholic	£730,000	£754,000	3.4%	£748,000	2.5%
St Gerard's Catholic	£508,000	£524,000	3.0%	£520,000	2.4%
Our Lady and St Joseph's	£807,000	£824,000	2.1%	£824,000	2.1%
St Joseph's Catholic	£644,000	£703,000	9.2%	£660,000	2.5%
St Joseph's Catholic	£757,000	£808,000	6.8%	£776,000	2.6%
St Bede's Catholic	£1,053,000	£1,100,000	4.5%	£1,081,000	2.7%
Treeton CofE	£1,063,000	£1,097,000	3.2%	£1,091,000	2.7%
Swinton Fitzwilliam	£1,174,000	£1,152,000	-1.9%	£1,159,000	-1.3%

	<p>The school's baseline funding is the total core funding received through the schools block and MFG in 2016-17 (or 2016/17 if an academy). Other grants/funding sources are excluded.</p>		<p>These columns show illustrative NFF funding if the proposed formula had been implemented in full and without any transitional protections in 2016-17. We use pupil numbers and characteristics from 2016-17 to illustrate the NFF impact, and compare to the school's baseline funding, including MFG.</p>		<p>In the first year of transition towards the formula, LAs will continue to determine funding locally. This column illustrates the change in the amount the department would allocate to LAs in respect of each school, taking into account the maximum change proposed in NFF year 1 (gains of up to 3% and an MFG of -1.5% per pupil).</p>
School Name	Baseline funding	Illustrative NFF funding if formula implemented in full in 2016-17, without transitional protections		Illustrative NFF funding in the first year of transition	
	Funding the school received in 2016-17 or 2016/17	Illustrative total NFF funding	Percentage change compared to baseline	Illustrative NFF year 1 funding	Percentage change compared to baseline
Clifton	£5,913,000	£6,294,000	6.4%	£6,072,000	2.7%
Rawmarsh	£4,762,000	£4,622,000	-2.9%	£4,692,000	-1.5%
Oakwood High School	£5,536,000	£5,373,000	-2.9%	£5,455,000	-1.5%
Winterhill School	£7,134,000	£6,946,000	-2.6%	£7,043,000	-1.3%
Wingfield Academy	£4,536,000	£4,419,000	-2.6%	£4,480,000	-1.2%
Wath Comprehensive	£8,607,000	£8,379,000	-2.7%	£8,497,000	-1.3%
Wickersley School	£9,029,000	£8,788,000	-2.7%	£8,912,000	-1.3%
Thrybergh Academy	£4,200,000	£4,093,000	-2.6%	£4,149,000	-1.2%
Aston Academy	£7,808,000	£7,577,000	-3.0%	£7,692,000	-1.5%
Dinnington High School	£5,290,000	£5,135,000	-2.9%	£5,212,000	-1.5%
Swinton Academy	£4,276,000	£4,153,000	-2.9%	£4,215,000	-1.4%
Brinsworth Academy	£6,296,000	£6,111,000	-2.9%	£6,204,000	-1.5%
Wales High School	£7,017,000	£6,810,000	-3.0%	£6,914,000	-1.5%
Saint Pius X Catholic	£3,565,000	£3,461,000	-2.9%	£3,513,000	-1.4%
St Bernard's Catholic	£3,887,000	£3,774,000	-2.9%	£3,830,000	-1.5%
Maltby Academy	£4,851,000	£4,709,000	-2.9%	£4,780,000	-1.5%

Appendix C – Impact of NFF on Local Authority ‘League Tables’ (for reference)

Local Authority	16/17 Schools Block pupil count	16/17 Baseline	per pupil	16/17 Rank	Full NFF	Full NFF change	Full NFF per pupil	NFF rank	Rank change
Tower Hamlets	36,684	£248,220,395	£6,766.45	1	£241,463,981	-2.72%	£6,582.27	1	Same
Hackney	29,490	£190,649,172	£6,464.88	2	£185,346,584	-2.78%	£6,285.07	2	Same
Lambeth	32,169	£205,680,557	£6,393.75	3	£200,004,404	-2.76%	£6,217.30	3	Same
Camden	18,709	£115,975,949	£6,198.94	4	£112,768,954	-2.77%	£6,027.52	4	Same
Hammersmith and Fulham	16,246	£98,477,929	£6,060.93	5	£95,804,718	-2.72%	£5,896.40	5	Same
Newham	52,591	£312,134,231	£5,941.91	6	£304,072,984	-2.58%	£5,788.45	7	-1
Islington	21,040	£124,861,024	£5,934.46	7	£122,977,834	-1.51%	£5,844.95	6	1
Kensington and Chelsea	10,862	£62,733,873	£5,775.54	8	£61,124,638	-2.57%	£5,627.38	9	-1
Westminster	18,739	£107,555,772	£5,739.68	9	£106,316,874	0.71%	£5,780.29	8	1
Lewisham	36,579	£208,764,476	£5,707.22	10	£203,006,261	-2.76%	£5,549.80	10	Same
Haringey	33,059	£187,220,547	£5,663.23	11	£182,077,620	-2.75%	£5,507.55	11	Same
Greenwich	34,968	£194,771,354	£5,569.99	12	£190,331,222	-2.28%	£5,443.01	12	Same
Brent	41,466	£225,207,821	£5,431.14	13	£220,977,724	-1.88%	£5,329.13	14	-1
Barking and Dagenham	36,200	£195,491,012	£5,400.30	14	£195,285,032	-0.11%	£5,394.51	13	1
Wandsworth	26,764	£144,076,414	£5,383.22	15	£141,952,898	-1.47%	£5,303.87	15	Same
Waltham Forest	37,326	£196,074,595	£5,253.03	16	£192,056,133	-2.05%	£5,145.37	16	Same
Manchester	70,706	£366,364,518	£5,181.52	17	£356,717,194	-2.63%	£5,045.08	18	-1
Nottingham	38,050	£192,956,805	£5,071.40	18	£188,200,131	-2.47%	£4,946.13	21	-3
Southwark	36,870	£179,952,675	£5,016.80	19	£175,082,914	-2.71%	£4,881.04	26	-7
Birmingham	170,265	£852,099,059	£5,003.96	20	£831,979,721	-2.36%	£4,885.81	25	-5
Enfield	49,687	£247,234,058	£4,977.83	21	£253,529,742	2.55%	£5,104.59	17	4
Liverpool	57,763	£287,264,978	£4,973.17	22	£284,170,582	-1.08%	£4,919.60	23	-1
Ealing	44,811	£219,801,488	£4,927.07	23	£224,940,517	2.34%	£5,042.27	19	4
Hounslow	35,248	£170,713,190	£4,843.20	24	£171,171,966	0.27%	£4,856.22	27	-3
Middlesbrough	19,608	£94,953,197	£4,842.57	25	£94,704,079	-0.26%	£4,829.87	28	-3
Barnet	47,640	£228,484,349	£4,796.08	26	£226,096,119	-1.05%	£4,745.93	36	-10
Sandwell	49,300	£236,938,300	£4,785.77	27	£236,126,576	0.08%	£4,789.57	31	-4
Rochdale	31,674	£151,662,740	£4,785.72	28	£149,792,513	-1.16%	£4,729.19	39	-11
Salford	30,905	£147,426,101	£4,770.30	29	£151,309,074	2.63%	£4,895.94	24	5
Luton	35,102	£167,249,517	£4,764.67	30	£163,134,940	-2.46%	£4,647.45	47	-17
Knowsley	17,676	£84,162,547	£4,760.84	31	£88,906,052	5.65%	£5,029.76	20	11
Rotherham	38,704	£183,989,271	£4,753.75	32	£183,343,934	-0.35%	£4,737.08	37	-5
Merton	24,220	£114,451,646	£4,725.50	33	£119,404,216	4.33%	£4,929.98	22	11
Wolverhampton	34,728	£163,371,012	£4,704.30	34	£167,226,139	2.36%	£4,815.31	29	5
Coventry	46,998	£220,396,985	£4,689.50	35	£215,093,316	-2.41%	£4,576.65	63	-28
Halton	17,416	£81,467,556	£4,677.74	36	£83,279,715	2.22%	£4,781.79	32	4
Hillingdon	42,862	£200,496,732	£4,677.73	37	£206,637,792	2.56%	£4,797.67	30	7
Hartlepool	13,083	£61,102,913	£4,670.41	38	£60,229,688	-1.43%	£4,603.66	52	-14
Havering	35,534	£166,854,358	£4,667.48	39	£166,925,762	0.66%	£4,697.63	42	-3
Blackburn with Darwen	24,214	£112,918,984	£4,663.38	40	£112,026,376	-0.79%	£4,626.51	49	-9
Walsall	41,817	£194,939,763	£4,661.73	41	£194,678,660	-0.13%	£4,655.49	46	-5
Slough	24,560	£114,080,433	£4,644.97	42	£111,502,172	-2.26%	£4,539.99	72	-30
Harrow	31,373	£146,612,133	£4,641.32	43	£144,553,466	-0.73%	£4,607.68	50	-7
Oldham	38,489	£178,243,955	£4,631.04	44	£180,005,336	0.99%	£4,676.80	44	Same
Durham	62,119	£286,796,606	£4,616.89	45	£289,919,324	1.09%	£4,667.16	45	Same
Bromley	42,560	£196,272,628	£4,611.67	46	£196,677,064	-0.30%	£4,597.68	54	-8
North East Lincolnshire	21,384	£98,568,822	£4,610.40	47	£97,393,023	-1.22%	£4,554.01	70	-23
Sutton	29,979	£137,998,872	£4,603.18	48	£140,600,481	1.89%	£4,689.97	43	5
South Tyneside	18,486	£85,073,886	£4,602.07	49	£87,791,638	3.20%	£4,749.09	34	15
Kirklees	60,537	£278,480,273	£4,600.17	50	£272,092,202	-2.29%	£4,494.64	77	-27
Hull	34,139	£156,974,744	£4,598.11	51	£161,660,671	2.99%	£4,735.37	38	13
Newcastle upon Tyne	32,691	£150,166,543	£4,593.51	52	£154,361,950	2.79%	£4,721.85	40	12
Redcar and Cleveland	18,858	£86,574,486	£4,590.88	53	£86,579,888	0.01%	£4,591.15	59	-6
Bristol, City of	50,599	£232,082,936	£4,586.71	54	£231,392,545	-0.30%	£4,573.07	64	-10
Sunderland	35,390	£161,738,418	£4,570.17	55	£161,343,163	-0.24%	£4,559.00	68	-11
Bradford	84,973	£386,459,888	£4,548.03	56	£381,126,177	-1.38%	£4,485.25	79	-23
Tameside	32,623	£148,327,766	£4,546.72	57	£149,984,472	1.12%	£4,597.51	55	2
Wakefield	44,940	£204,081,198	£4,541.19	58	£200,715,748	-1.65%	£4,466.31	83	-25
Southend-on-Sea	24,900	£113,046,001	£4,540.00	59	£110,171,612	-2.54%	£4,424.56	97	-38
Bexley	37,678	£171,605,854	£4,530.49	60	£173,394,114	1.04%	£4,577.70	62	-2
Leicester	48,263	£216,163,716	£4,520.31	61	£226,658,955	3.99%	£4,700.47	41	20
Croydon	49,810	£225,111,292	£4,519.40	62	£237,641,353	5.57%	£4,770.96	33	29
Cumbria	60,774	£274,355,637	£4,514.36	63	£276,900,455	1.66%	£4,589.14	60	3
Gateshead	23,189	£104,670,087	£4,513.78	64	£106,786,067	2.02%	£4,605.03	51	13
Southampton	29,121	£131,368,484	£4,511.13	65	£133,006,246	1.25%	£4,567.37	65	Same
Peterborough	31,514	£142,124,136	£4,509.87	66	£145,909,032	2.66%	£4,629.97	48	18
Stoke-on-Trent	33,493	£150,671,773	£4,498.60	67	£153,915,488	2.15%	£4,595.45	56	11
Doncaster	41,048	£184,633,173	£4,497.98	68	£187,909,431	1.77%	£4,577.80	61	7
Wigan	42,950	£193,011,726	£4,493.87	69	£188,878,090	-2.14%	£4,397.63	101	-32
Portsmouth	23,836	£107,103,766	£4,493.36	70	£108,434,207	1.24%	£4,549.18	71	-1
Kingston upon Thames	20,703	£92,779,646	£4,481.46	71	£93,746,511	1.04%	£4,528.16	73	-2
Sefton	34,842	£155,729,398	£4,469.59	72	£152,791,265	-1.89%	£4,385.26	103	-31

Local Authority	16/17 Schools Block pupil count	16/17 Baseline	per pupil	16/17 Rank	Full NFF	Full NFF change	Full NFF per pupil	NFF rank	Rank change
Northumberland	38,876	£173,538,595	£4,463.90	73	£175,614,220	1.20%	£4,517.29	75	-2
Norfolk	101,779	£454,224,094	£4,462.85	74	£458,969,888	1.05%	£4,509.48	76	-2
Dudley	43,156	£192,401,396	£4,458.28	75	£193,602,954	0.63%	£4,486.12	78	-3
Lancashire	156,494	£697,340,313	£4,456.02	76	£697,074,696	-0.04%	£4,454.32	87	-11
Wirral	42,517	£189,223,963	£4,450.55	77	£188,227,643	-0.53%	£4,427.11	95	-18
Barnsley	29,894	£132,819,857	£4,443.03	78	£141,932,199	6.86%	£4,747.85	35	43
Herefordshire	21,617	£95,974,380	£4,439.76	79	£96,193,385	0.23%	£4,449.90	88	-9
Cheshire West and Chester	42,843	£190,116,855	£4,437.52	80	£185,885,392	-2.23%	£4,338.76	115	-35
Leeds	102,530	£454,735,082	£4,435.14	81	£467,375,915	2.78%	£4,558.43	67	14
North Lincolnshire	22,399	£99,181,582	£4,427.95	82	£100,456,807	1.29%	£4,484.88	80	2
Blackpool	17,768	£78,408,357	£4,412.90	83	£81,588,946	4.06%	£4,591.90	57	26
Sheffield	69,209	£304,260,173	£4,396.25	84	£318,398,655	4.65%	£4,600.54	53	31
Stockton-on-Tees	26,242	£115,257,203	£4,392.09	85	£116,420,566	1.01%	£4,436.42	92	-7
North Tyneside	25,687	£112,769,766	£4,390.15	86	£113,408,178	0.57%	£4,415.00	98	-12
Cornwall	66,065	£289,583,112	£4,383.31	87	£294,409,275	1.67%	£4,456.36	86	1
Redbridge	46,038	£201,600,371	£4,379.00	88	£209,859,805	4.10%	£4,558.40	68	20
North Yorkshire	73,189	£320,406,144	£4,377.79	89	£327,851,698	2.32%	£4,479.52	82	7
Bolton	42,959	£187,838,850	£4,372.51	90	£192,544,252	2.51%	£4,482.05	81	9
Milton Keynes	39,743	£173,694,872	£4,370.45	91	£181,111,010	4.27%	£4,557.05	69	22
Isle of Wight	15,319	£66,892,740	£4,366.65	92	£67,781,727	1.33%	£4,424.68	96	-4
Shropshire	34,769	£151,723,610	£4,363.76	93	£153,163,715	0.95%	£4,405.18	100	-7
St Helens	23,193	£101,180,764	£4,362.56	94	£102,836,972	1.64%	£4,433.97	94	Same
Hertfordshire	161,653	£703,406,021	£4,351.33	95	£706,711,877	0.47%	£4,371.78	106	-11
Thurrock	24,558	£106,846,058	£4,350.76	96	£109,027,826	2.04%	£4,439.61	89	7
Telford and Wrekin	23,979	£103,957,375	£4,335.35	97	£108,466,354	4.34%	£4,523.39	74	23
West Berkshire	22,135	£95,908,958	£4,332.91	98	£95,691,304	-0.23%	£4,323.08	120	-22
Brighton and Hove	29,840	£129,265,267	£4,331.95	99	£128,902,044	-0.28%	£4,319.77	121	-22
Derbyshire	95,545	£413,604,517	£4,328.90	100	£424,124,598	2.54%	£4,439.00	90	10
Reading	18,243	£78,767,051	£4,317.66	101	£80,920,088	2.73%	£4,435.68	93	8
Gloucestershire	76,876	£331,462,419	£4,311.65	102	£333,990,982	0.76%	£4,344.54	112	-10
Nottinghamshire	102,843	£443,281,952	£4,310.28	103	£446,852,249	0.81%	£4,344.99	111	-8
Darlington	14,559	£62,576,414	£4,298.13	104	£63,212,004	1.02%	£4,341.78	114	-10
Central Bedfordshire	36,643	£157,290,451	£4,292.51	105	£159,235,874	1.24%	£4,345.60	110	-5
Cheshire East	46,544	£199,587,061	£4,288.14	106	£195,490,542	-2.05%	£4,200.12	147	-41
Devon	88,065	£377,194,948	£4,283.14	107	£378,743,945	0.41%	£4,300.73	127	-20
Windsor and Maidenhead	18,403	£78,749,412	£4,279.16	108	£79,045,773	0.38%	£4,295.27	128	-20
Medway	38,158	£163,239,678	£4,277.99	109	£167,656,349	2.71%	£4,393.74	102	7
Worcestershire	70,310	£300,657,301	£4,276.17	110	£307,178,986	2.17%	£4,368.92	107	3
Rutland	5,286	£22,551,640	£4,266.30	111	£22,318,470	-1.03%	£4,222.18	140	-29
Suffolk	89,744	£382,734,554	£4,264.74	112	£393,135,415	2.72%	£4,380.63	104	8
Essex	185,486	£790,890,883	£4,263.88	113	£811,163,938	2.56%	£4,373.18	105	8
Calderdale	31,642	£134,835,902	£4,261.30	114	£136,523,891	1.25%	£4,314.64	124	-10
East Sussex	61,519	£262,007,533	£4,258.97	115	£268,529,136	2.49%	£4,364.98	108	7
Plymouth	33,104	£140,416,990	£4,241.69	116	£147,835,904	5.28%	£4,465.80	85	31
Northamptonshire	100,669	£426,752,864	£4,239.17	117	£436,089,750	2.19%	£4,331.92	117	Same
Warwickshire	70,893	£300,322,947	£4,236.28	118	£302,553,621	0.74%	£4,267.75	131	-13
Torbay	16,494	£69,774,628	£4,230.30	119	£72,668,968	4.15%	£4,405.78	99	20
Derby	36,378	£153,858,424	£4,229.44	120	£167,043,931	8.57%	£4,591.89	58	62
East Riding of Yorkshire	41,161	£173,769,552	£4,221.70	121	£178,950,068	2.98%	£4,347.56	109	12
Bury	27,020	£113,946,411	£4,217.11	122	£119,880,724	5.21%	£4,436.74	91	31
Richmond upon Thames	23,601	£99,454,511	£4,214.00	123	£100,655,692	1.21%	£4,264.89	133	-10
Trafford	34,070	£143,420,369	£4,209.58	124	£142,898,065	-0.36%	£4,194.25	148	-24
Wiltshire	60,467	£254,331,925	£4,206.13	125	£261,063,992	2.65%	£4,317.46	123	2
Staffordshire	107,484	£451,946,611	£4,204.78	126	£459,869,939	1.75%	£4,278.50	130	-4
Hampshire	166,336	£699,293,055	£4,204.10	127	£703,826,225	0.65%	£4,231.35	139	-12
Oxfordshire	81,510	£342,530,445	£4,202.31	128	£347,095,128	1.33%	£4,258.31	134	-6
Stockport	37,043	£155,663,137	£4,202.23	129	£156,991,367	0.85%	£4,238.08	136	-7
Bedford Borough	23,938	£100,585,808	£4,201.93	130	£106,913,007	6.29%	£4,466.25	84	46
Surrey	137,282	£576,051,838	£4,196.12	131	£594,012,906	3.12%	£4,326.95	118	13
North Somerset	27,118	£113,752,807	£4,194.73	132	£114,784,130	0.91%	£4,232.77	138	-6
Warrington	29,048	£121,824,791	£4,193.91	133	£122,585,369	0.62%	£4,220.10	142	-9
Solihull	33,486	£140,040,434	£4,182.06	134	£144,283,930	3.03%	£4,308.78	126	8
Lincolnshire	92,238	£384,383,500	£4,167.30	135	£400,681,098	4.24%	£4,343.99	113	22
Swindon	29,798	£124,146,999	£4,166.29	136	£127,957,124	3.07%	£4,294.15	129	7
Dorset	49,105	£204,548,162	£4,165.53	137	£209,549,097	2.45%	£4,267.37	132	5
Kent	197,620	£823,029,471	£4,164.71	138	£852,575,679	3.59%	£4,314.22	125	13
Cambridgeshire	77,061	£319,022,647	£4,139.87	139	£325,317,847	1.97%	£4,221.56	141	-2
Poole	17,288	£71,498,012	£4,135.70	140	£72,290,783	1.11%	£4,181.56	149	-9
Leicestershire	87,045	£359,619,978	£4,131.43	141	£368,795,694	2.55%	£4,236.84	137	4
Somerset	65,121	£268,121,990	£4,117.29	142	£281,703,995	5.07%	£4,325.85	119	23
Bracknell Forest	15,524	£63,798,860	£4,109.69	143	£67,038,916	5.08%	£4,318.40	122	21
Bath and North East Somerset	22,995	£94,276,720	£4,099.88	144	£99,692,789	5.75%	£4,335.41	116	28
Bournemouth	20,464	£83,844,313	£4,097.16	145	£86,874,543	3.61%	£4,245.24	135	10
South Gloucestershire	35,818	£146,478,766	£4,089.53	146	£150,705,694	2.89%	£4,207.54	145	1
Buckinghamshire	70,893	£288,501,119	£4,069.53	147	£298,480,184	3.46%	£4,210.29	144	3
West Sussex	101,940	£413,737,904	£4,058.64	148	£428,309,913	3.52%	£4,201.59	146	2
York	21,941	£87,812,438	£4,002.21	149	£92,529,308	5.37%	£4,217.19	143	6
Wokingham	22,308	£84,342,433	£3,780.82	150	£86,107,135	2.09%	£3,859.92	150	Same

Appendix D – DfE Consultation Questions

1. In designing our national funding formula, we have taken careful steps to balance the principles of fairness and stability. Do you think we have struck the right balance?

Difficult to answer based on the evidence presented.

2. Do you support our proposal to set the primary to secondary ratio in line with the current national average of 1:1.29, which means that pupils in the secondary phase are funded overall 29% higher than pupils in the primary phase?

Simply using the national average without any justification seems unfair. Historically Rotherham's ratio has been significantly higher which may be reflected in our attainment outcomes at secondary level. We do understand the need to reduce our ratio as it is one of the highest nationally but you have presented no evidence to support setting it at 1:1.29 other than a national average.

3. Do you support our proposal to maximise pupil-led funding, so that more funding is allocated to factors that relate directly to pupils and their characteristics?

Yes as it is in line with our current proportion

4. Within the total pupil-led funding, do you support our proposal to increase the proportion allocated to the additional needs factors (deprivation, low prior attainment and English as an additional language)?

The summary of LA's spend through formula factors for in 2016-17 indicates that 76% is allocated to basic per-pupil funding (AWPU) and 13% is allocated to additional needs factors (deprivation, low prior attainment and EAL).

The formula will recognise educational disadvantage in its widest sense including those who are not eligible for the pupil premium but whose families may be only just about managing. It increases the total spend on additional needs factors compared to the funding explicitly directed through these factors in the current system. We are therefore proposing to increase the proportion of the total schools block funding allocated to additional needs to 18%, with 73% allocated to basic per-pupil funding (AWPU).

As the increase is at the detriment of the per-pupil funding and considering schools also receive PPG for deprivation could the proposed increase be less of an increase in order to prevent those schools attracting relatively low levels of additional needs funding have confidence that the basic funding is sufficient to cover the school costs.

5. Do you agree with the proposed weightings for each of the additional needs factors?

No evidence to support the proposed weightings therefore unable to comment. Understand the introduction of the IDACI driver as relative to just managing families but not sure why the weighting in favour of secondary schools especially in EAL.

6. Do you have any suggestions about potential indicators and data sources we could use to allocate mobility funding in 2019-20 and beyond?

Ensure mobility data collected robust and confirm accuracy by adjusting for newly converted academies and the early registering of Year 7 pupils

7. Do you agree with the proposed lump sum amount of £110,000 for all schools?

Yes

8. Do you agree with the proposed amounts for sparsity funding of up to £25,000 for primary schools and up to £65,000 for secondary, middle and all-through schools?

No views - as not relative to Rotherham

9. Do you agree that lagged pupil growth data would provide an effective basis for the growth factor in the longer term?

The growth factor will be based on LA's historic spend in 2018-19. For the longer term we intend to develop a more sophisticated measure.

Yes as an interim.

10. Do you agree with the principle of a funding floor that would protect schools from large overall reductions as a result of this formula? This would be in addition to the minimum funding guarantee.

Yes

11. Do you support our proposal to set the floor at minus 3%, which will mean that no school will lose more than 3% of their current per-pupil funding level as a result of this formula?

Yes

12. Do you agree that for new or growing schools the funding floor should be applied to the per-pupil funding they would have received if they were at full capacity?

Yes

13. Do you support our proposal to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5% per pupil? This will mean that schools are protected against reductions of more than 1.5% per pupil per year.

Reasonable and consistent with many previous years

14. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed schools national funding formula?

15. Do you agree that we should allocate 10% of funding through a deprivation factor in the central school services block?

16. Do you support our proposal to limit reductions on local authorities' central school services block funding to 2.5% per pupil in 2018-19 and in 2019-20?

17. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed central school services block formula?

Vera Njegic: Principal Finance Officer