

Appendix B

Q1 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?

The principles of fairness, and stability cannot really be challenged, nor the idea that money should go directly to schools, and support opportunity. Barnet has always applied these principles in its own formula.

Q2 Do you support our proposal to set the primary to secondary ratio in line with the current national average?

Yes, and the national average of 1:1:29 matches Barnet's existing primary to secondary ratio.

Q3 Do you support our proposal to maximise pupil-led funding?

Yes, Barnet has always aimed to maximise devolved funding to schools including as much pupil-led funding as possible. Our current funding formula reflects this.

Q4 Within the total pupil-led funding, do you support our proposal to increase the proportion allocated to the additional needs factors?

Yes, as this will direct funding to pupils that need additional support.

Q5 Do you agree with the proposed weightings for each of the additional needs factors?

Deprivation - pupil based at 5.5% (FSM/ FSM6)	Allocate a higher proportion	The proportion is about right	Allocate a lower proportion
Deprivation - area based at 3.9% (IDACI)	Allocate a higher proportion	The proportion is about right	Allocate a lower proportion

Low prior attainment at 7.5%	Allocate a higher proportion	The proportion is about right	Allocate a lower proportion
English as an additional language at 1.2%	Allocate a higher proportion	The proportion is about right	Allocate a lower proportion

The proposed weightings should be nearer the current national average (2016/17) spend. With regard to FSM/ FSM6 weighting, Barnet has a number of communities where FSM is not claimed and we would prefer a more even weighting between FSM/ FSM6 and IDACI. This weighting also gives an over-reliance on FSM6 funding, when taking into account that this is also used to calculate Pupil Premium allocations.

Q6 Do you have any suggestions about potential indicators and data sources we could use to allocate mobility funding in 2019-20 and beyond?

The indicator should be any pupil joining outside the first term of the relevant age range/ year group, still with a threshold of 10% of total cohort, but paid for 2 years only.

School-led factors

Q7 Do you agree with the proposed lump sum amount of £110,000 for all schools?

Primary	Allocate a higher amount	This is about the right amount	Allocate a lower amount
Secondary	Allocate a higher amount	This is about the right amount	Allocate a lower amount

We accept that the proposed lump sum may be reduced to £110,000 provided the difference is protected within the per-pupil Minimum Funding Guarantee calculation as suggested. The figure of £110,000 is slightly below the current lump sum of £122,000 allocated to all schools (primary and secondary) in Barnet.

Q8 Do you agree with the proposed sparsity factor of £25,000 for primary and up to £65,000 for secondary, middle and all-through schools?

Primary	Allocate a higher amount	This is about the right amount	Allocate a lower amount
Secondary	Allocate a higher amount	This about the right amount	Allocate a lower amount

No comment. Not a factor that is required/ relevant in Barnet.

Q9 Do you agree that lagged pupil growth data would provide an effective basis for the growth factor in the longer term?

No. As most growth is being delivered by new Free Schools and Academies agreed by the EFA, funding should be based on the projected growth in pupil numbers. Barnet's growth is now reaching secondary schools, so any per pupil growth allocation would need to be similar to NFF secondary pupil funding rates. Two secondary free schools have already opened in Barnet and three more have now been given permission to open. Such a large increase in provision over a short period presents a significant burden on the local schools budget.

Funding floor

Q10 Do you agree with the principle of a funding floor?

Yes. This is needed to minimise turbulence to schools.

Q11 Do you support our proposal to set the funding floor at minus 3%?

No. It should be set at the same level as the floor proposed for the Central Services Block, i.e. -2.5%

Q12 Do you agree that for new or growing schools (i.e. schools that are still filling up and do not have pupils in all year groups yet) the funding floor should be applied to the per-pupil funding they would have received if they were at full capacity?

Yes. Growing schools should be treated in the same way as schools with pupils in all year groups otherwise their per pupil funding will be distorted.

Transition

Q13 Do you support our proposal to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5%?

Yes. In light of the significant proposed changes upon implementation of the National Funding Formula, the -1.5% MFG is needed to ensure minimal turbulence at school level, although this will obviously mean that movement onto the national formula funding will take some time.

Further considerations

Q14 Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed schools national funding formula?

No additional comments.

Central school services block

Q15 Do you agree that we should allocate 10% of funding through a deprivation factor in the central school services block?

Yes, it recognises that there is likely to be a greater number of pupils in need of additional support through central services.

Q16 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?

Yes. Otherwise authorities that have managed their central services efficiently/ minimised costs will be penalised and not be able to gain under the central services block formula.

Q17 Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed central school services block formula?

Further clarification on the s251 lines of the central school services block regarding which items will continue to be permitted and which services will have to become optional/ traded. Also, what flexibility the LA will have to transfer funding between blocks, including how growth funding will be

calculated and allocated, and therefore whether there will be a need to call on the central services block.

Equalities analysis

Q18 Is there any evidence relating to the 8 protected characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010 that is not included in the equalities impact assessment and that we should take into account?

No additional comments.

