

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

10th January 2012

**Report of the Strategic Director
for Children and Younger Adults**

LMS Formula – Responses to Consultation – (Education)

1. **Purpose of Report**

To inform Cabinet of the responses received from schools to the recent LMS consultation proposals and to seek approval to changes to the LMS formulae.

2. **Information and Analysis**

2.1 **Summary and context**

On 20th September 2011, Cabinet agreed a consultation document which set out a range of potential changes to Derbyshire's LMS formulae. Once the call in period had passed, the consultation document and pro forma response form were published on the main Derbyshire County Council website on 30th September 2011 and schools e-mailed to alert them to the consultation. Schools were initially given until 4th November 2011 to respond but this was extended by one week with the agreement of the Cabinet Member for Education.

The final results showed that 51 responses were received (Nursery 1, Primary 32, Secondary 17 and Special 1). A numerical summary of the numbers of votes for or against each consultation question is attached in Appendix 1. A précis of the responses was also presented to the Schools Forum meeting on 6th December 2011.

Despite the relatively low response rate, decisions have to be taken on the LMS formula for 2012-13. It should be noted that the impact of the formula changes in 2012-13 will be limited by the Government's Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) regulations. For 2011-12 the MFG was minus 1.5% which meant, in broad terms, that no school would experience a reduction in its budget of more than 1.5% assuming constant pupil numbers. On 13th December the DfE confirmed that the MFG would also be minus 1.5% for 2012-13.

Appendix 2 summarises the combined effect of the proposed formula changes based on 2011-12 data but using an assumed MFG of minus 2% for 2012-13, these figures have already been shared with individual schools. Now that the 2012-13 MFG has been confirmed at minus 1.5%, the gains of some schools will be slightly reduced as will the losses of those schools facing the biggest reductions.

The remainder of this report sets out the main issues covered by the consultation; recommendations for Cabinet to consider are clearly marked.

(i) **Inflation** - The DSG allocations for 2012-13 to 2014-15 are not expected to include any allowance for inflation. The consultation proposal was therefore not to fund inflation in the allocations to schools as to do otherwise would merely mean that funding had to be taken back out of schools' budgets in some other way. The majority (72%) of respondents agreed, sometimes reluctantly, with this approach.

Recommendation 1 - That the LMS formula multipliers should not be uprated for inflation for 2012-13.

(ii) **Deprivation** – The consultation proposal was to delegate the existing funding for deprivation on the basis of the number of pupils (known to be) eligible for free school meals. The 2011-12 funding to be allocated via free school meals would be as follows:

Table 1 – Deprivation Funding

Indicator	Pri £m	Sec £m	Total £m
Social Deprivation: Threshold	3.54	2.62	6.16
Social Deprivation: No Threshold	0.23	0.14	0.37
Former Standards Fund 201a	-	1.26	1.26
Formularised Grants (FSM Element)	3.11	1.72	4.83
Excellence in Cities (EiC)	1.03	0.93	1.96
Behaviour Improvement Programme (BIP)	0.77	0.70	1.47
Post-LIG Deprivation Funding	-	0.56	0.56
Total (£m)	8.68	7.93	16.61

The majority (68%) of respondents agreed with the proposal to use free school meals although concerns were expressed that some parents did not choose to apply for this benefit even though they were eligible. Another concern was that indicators such as the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) should be considered as they measure deprivation in a wider context. Concern was also expressed that the changes would reduce the allocations of those schools with the highest levels of deprivation.

Whilst eligibility for free school meals is not a perfect indicator, as it requires individuals to apply, it is simple to understand and easily measured. Furthermore, the Government has stated its intention that free school meals will become its preferred vehicle for funding deprivation so there is an attraction in mirroring this within the Authority's local formula to minimise future funding turbulence.

On 12th December 2011 the Government announced the Pupil Premium details for 2012/13 which included a change to the basis on which funding would be distributed. The new approach, known as "Ever 6", is to allocate funding to schools whose pupils have been known to be eligible for free meals at any point in the last 6 years. As stated above the Authority's own consultation with schools proposed the use of a single January free school meals count. Despite the Government's recent Pupil Premium announcement, it is proposed that the original single count methodology be used for 2012/13 but that this be reviewed for 2013/14 in conjunction with the Schools Forum.

The most significant turbulence from the proposed formula changes relates to those schools in receipt of historic allocations for Excellence in Cities, Behaviour Improvement Programme and Post Leadership Incentive Grant. The long term formula reductions of delegating the funding on free school meals is significant as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Sample of largest deprivation losses

Parish	School	Current	Formula*	Diff	Potential Pupil Prem incr	FSM %
		£	£	£	£	%
STAVELEY	SPRINGWELL COMMUNITY	735,909	333,172	-402,737	327,480	23.3%
BOLSOVER	THE BOLSOVER	571,851	205,783	-366,068	235,020	15.6%
C'FIELD	PARKSIDE COMMUNITY	640,408	223,748	-416,660	207,490	27.3%
SHIREBR'K	SHIREBROOK	612,493	295,609	-316,885	261,770	25.7%
TIBSHELF	TIBSHELF COMM. SPEC	431,008	256,412	-174,596	230,090	16.5%
ILKESTON	BENNERLEY SCHOOL	370,554	230,281	-140,273	188,970	36.0%
CLOWNE	HERITAGE MATHS/COMP'	510,935	329,906	-181,029	315,140	21.4%
ELMTON	CRESWELL CE INF & NURS	207,733	86,859	-120,874	60,850	38.9%
C'FIELD	SPIRE INF & NURSERY	186,164	81,536	-104,629	57,430	51.3%
SHIREBR'K	BROOKFIELD PRI	152,697	58,407	-94,290	79,030	33.7%
HEATH	HEATH PRI	151,471	65,675	-85,796	63,520	30.6%
HASLAND	GRASSMOOR PRI	138,986	62,277	-76,709	57,180	31.0%
BOLSOVER	NEW BOLSOVER PRI	153,826	78,779	-75,047	81,250	31.6%
C'FIELD	SPIRE JUNIOR	139,248	71,276	-67,971	77,040	55.8%
PILSLEY	PILSLEY PRI (C'FIELD)	86,574	18,809	-67,765	33,830	12.6%
SHIREBR'K	MODEL VILLAGE PRI	146,882	79,528	-67,354	67,960	40.0%
ELMTON	CRESWELL JUNIOR	121,635	61,377	-60,259	70,540	40.5%

* Before contribution to MFG

The column headed “potential pupil premium increase” is an extrapolation of the increase in funding from 2011/12 levels to 2014/15 based on the Government’s December 2011 Pupil Premium announcement. The values are indicative as the actual increases will depend upon the actual pupil data at that time. For many of the schools, the forecast increase in Pupil Premium will offset the formula losses. For others this will not be the case but the MFG protection arrangements will ensure year on year losses are manageable in the medium term.

Several of the affected schools serve some of the most deprived communities in Derbyshire, communities with deprivation levels running at above twice the county average (as measured by FSM). However, because of the historic grant rules, there are schools in other parts of the county supporting similarly deprived communities that have traditionally not received the same levels of support. Allocating the funding on a formulaic rather than an historic basis would remove these anomalies over a period of time.

The attainment gap between pupils on free school meals and their peers remains an issue both locally and nationally. The challenge facing the Authority therefore is to identify strategies to raise current performance levels and determine what changes, if any, to schools’ funding arrangements would help support this.

Recommendation 2(a) - That the funding streams in Table 1 be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils entitled to a free school meal as recorded on the January census for 2012/13;

Recommendation 2(b) - That the delegation of deprivation funding be reviewed for 2013/14 in the light of the Government's Pupil Premium announcement; and

Recommendation 2(c) – That the Authority considers how the attainment of pupils on free school meals can be improved together with any implications for its funding formulae.

(iii) Extended Services (Sustainability) – currently the funding is largely held by secondary schools which act as banker on behalf of other schools in each cluster. However, this is potentially problematic as now there is no requirement on the banker school to use the money for extended services either in their school or cluster primaries. Also the moves to Academy status mean that increasingly this funding could be held by institutions outside of Derbyshire's governance framework. The consultation proposal is to delegate the funding to schools on the basis of the number of pupils (mainstream) and places (special schools) and to allow schools that wish to re-pool the funding at cluster level to do so.

The majority (77%) of respondents agreed with the proposals. Concerns were expressed about the impact on individual secondary schools that use some of this funding for staffing and that some provision may be lost if funding is not re-pooled.

(iv) Extended Services (Subsidy) – as with Sustainability funding, currently this is largely held by secondary schools which act as bankers on behalf of other schools in the cluster. The proposal is to delegate this funding to schools on the basis of the number of pupils entitled to free school meals and to allow schools that wish to re-pool the funding at cluster level to do so.

A majority (53%) of respondents agreed with the proposal to delegate the funding in this way. As with Sustainability funding, concerns were expressed about the impact on individual secondary schools that use this funding for staffing and that some provision may be lost if funding is not re-pooled.

With both elements of Extended Services provision there is a further complication to consider. Since the host secondary school is only holding the monies on behalf of a group of schools, it would be inappropriate to allow an apparent reduction in funding for Extended Services to trigger MFG for the host school. This issue was discussed at the Schools Forum meeting on 6th December 2011 and support was given to exclude Extended Services funding from schools' MFG baselines for 2012-13 and 2013-14.

Given the above MFG change, it would be appropriate for an alternative measure of protection to apply. To this end, Cabinet is asked to agree to move from the current allocations to the full formula approach over two years to provide a measure of protection in 2012-13 outside of MFG. During this period the value of Extended Services funding incorporated within each school's delegated budget would be shown

separately to assist schools to re-pool the funding should they so wish. Schools Forum was supportive of this refinement.

Recommendation 3(a) - That Extended Services (Sustainability) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pre 16 pupils (mainstream) and places (special schools);

Recommendation 3(b) - That Extended Services (Subsidy) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils known to be eligible for free school meals;

Recommendation 3(c) - That Extended Services funding be excluded from schools' MFG baselines for 2012-13 and 2013-14; and

Recommendation 3(d) - That the change in the delegation of Extended Services funding be phased over two years 2012-13 and 2013-14.

(v) Secondary Schools' Catering FSM Funding – the consultation proposal is to change the delegation of the catering FSM budget to secondary schools from a daily count of free meals served during the year to the number of pupils eligible for free meals as recorded on the January school census. 64% of the secondary schools responding to this issue favoured the change, the main concern being the impact of variances in the number of pupils eligible for a free meal during the year.

Recommendation 4 - That secondary schools' catering FSM funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pre 16 pupils eligible for free school meals recorded on the January census.

(vi) SENTA Hours – schools were invited to give their views on potential future changes to the funding of SENTA hours in the LMS formula. Currently, statements requiring support of up to and including 8 hours in schools do not generally attract additional funding; schools are expected to meet these lower level needs from their existing resources. However, statements above this threshold attract the full number of hours rather than just those above the threshold e.g. a 12 hour statement attracts the full 12 hours not just the extra 4. Schools were invited to give their views on moving to a position whereby only the extra hours are funded, which would be more consistent with the Government's own thinking on schools and LAs' responsibilities for special educational needs expenditure.

43 schools responded with the majority expressing concerns over any changes to the current system pointing to the need to actively encourage the inclusion of SEN children, the impact on individual children and schools, particularly small schools, and what would happen to any funding released.

Although not explicitly detailed in the consultation, any savings in the SENTA hours methodology would be recycled within the LMS formula. Since the consultation was drafted it has become clear that the number of SENTA hours to be funded via the LMS formula for 2012-13 is set to rise by over £2m. If this trend continues, and unless additional funding can be identified, one or more LMS multipliers would have to be pared back to meet this pressure, possibly in 2012-13 but more likely in 2013-14.

Unless a change becomes necessary on financial grounds, no formula change is proposed pending clarification on the DSG changes for 2013-14 and beyond.

Recommendation 5 – That the views of schools on the funding of SENTA hours be noted.

(vii) Primary and Secondary School Action Allocation (SEN) – the methodology for delegating this funding to primary and secondary schools is currently based on historic counts which date back to the period 2000 to 2004. The proposal is to change to a more up to date count based on a 5 year average of the number of pupils recorded as being at School Action Plus on the January census with the following profiles:

- Autism (ASD)
- Hearing Impairment (HI)
- Visual Impairment (VI)
- Multi-sensory Impairment (MSI)
- Specific Learning Difficulty (SpLD)
- Physical Disability (PD)

74% of respondents supported this change. The main concern expressed was that schools felt the School Action Plus counts to be un-moderated. The other issue raised by primary schools was the disparity in the funding allocated for AEN across sectors, with secondary schools' funding being substantially higher. It should be noted that the secondary sector figure is higher as a consequence of the needs led review from some years ago when a majority of secondary schools supported transferring funding out of the pupil led budget (AWPN) into the additional educational needs indicator.

Whilst the long term future of School Action Plus as an indicator is likely to be affected by the Government's SEN changes, it would nevertheless provide a more up to date indicator of need in the short term.

Recommendation 6 – That the School Action Allocation (SEN) funding be delegated on the basis of a 5 year average of the number of pupils recorded as being at School Action Plus with one of the 6 specific profiles on the January census.

(viii) Primary School Action Allocation (Socio Economic) – this funding recognises the needs of pupils with social, learning and behavioural difficulties, but who are not statemented. Allocations are based on a socio-economic indicator (FSM) as historically there is a correlation between these particular needs and deprivation. Currently this funding is allocated on a three year average of free school meals entitlement. The consultation proposal is to delegate this funding on the basis of the January free school meals entitlement count which would allow it to be subsumed within the other deprivation indicators referred to earlier in this report.

60% of primary respondents supported the proposal.

Recommendation 7 – That the primary School Action Allocation (Socio Economic) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils entitled to a free school meal as recorded on the January census.

(ix) Secondary School Action Allocation (Cognitive Ability Tests (CATs)) - this indicator allocates additional resources to schools with children whose Cognitive Ability Tests (CATs) scores are in the bottom 20% of all scores in Derbyshire. A theoretical problem could arise if one or more school chose not to use the test. This would mean an incomplete data set, making measuring the 20% cut off impractical on a consistent basis with previous years.

The proposal is to use an absolute rather than a relative measure i.e. to provide support for children scoring 88 or below which has been broadly equivalent to the average 20% threshold for the last 7 years. 76% of secondary school respondents supported this change.

(x) Secondary School Action Allocation - Cognitive Ability Tests (CATs) - The consultation also asked whether funding should continue to be delegated using CATs tests given the government publishes nationally moderated Key Stage 2 results annually. 88% of secondary respondents felt that CATs should continue to be used with only 6% favouring Key Stage 2 results. Comments in support of CATs felt that they were a more accurate and objective measure of students' abilities.

Recommendation 8a – That funding for secondary School Action Allocation (CATs) continue to be delegated based on results of the Cognitive Ability Tests; and

Recommendation 8b – That the delegation in 8(a) be targeted at those pupils whose test scores are 88 or below.

(xi) Learner Support Units (LSU) – this indicator was introduced into the secondary formula in 2003-04 as a result of the deletion of a Standards Fund which provided additional support to 10 secondary schools with children struggling to cope in a mainstream school environment. Today, with an increased emphasis on personalised learning, all schools have to respond to pupils' individual needs, most without access to these additional resources. The proposal is to remove this indicator from future years' settlements. 70% of secondary respondents supported this change, the main concern being that this loss of funding would be compounded by other formula losses. The funding released by deleting this indicator would be recycled to secondary schools on the basis of the number of pre 16 pupils.

Recommendation 9 – That the Learner Support Unit indicator be deleted for 2012-13.

(xii) Advanced Skills Teachers (Salary Funding) – AST status was originally introduced in 1998, via the Standards Fund, and was designed to reward excellent teachers who chose to continue to teach in classrooms, rather than follow other routes to promotion through leadership. Several schools now employ ASTs outside of the supported scheme from their own budgets and continuing to support historic posts in other schools through targeted formula allocations is now difficult to justify.

Given the contractual commitments of the host schools, the proposal is to defer any changes until April 2015 to allow affected staff and the host schools time to consider their options. However, in the interim, if a "funded" AST leaves then the relevant school's funding would be reduced accordingly. The Authority would not provide

financial support should the school choose to replace the AST from their own resources. Schools Forum approval to reduce relevant schools' 2012-13 MFG baselines for AST salary reductions was sought and approved at the December meeting.

68% of respondents supported the change to AST salary funding although there was regret that the changes could lead to the loss of valuable staff.

Recommendation 10(a) – That the current historic AST salary allocations be retained until April 2015; and

Recommendation 10(b) – That the future years' allocations referred to in 10(a) be reduced where a funded AST has left the school and the school's relevant MFG baselines adjusted accordingly.

(xiii) Advanced Skills Teachers (Outreach Funding) – resources are also allocated to schools with funded ASTs to support teaching colleagues in their own and other schools to improve their practices. Payment of the outreach funding is triggered when the Authority has received a satisfactory body of evidence of the AST's outreach work.

The consultation proposed that this element be delegated to all schools from April 2012, based on pupil numbers. This would provide a resource for all schools to buy in specialist AST support as desired which, in turn, would potentially allow those schools which host AST posts to develop trading links in anticipation of the removal of the AST salary indicator in 2015-16.

66% of respondents supported the change although there was concern that, as the financial climate tightens, schools would be less likely to buy in AST outreach support.

Recommendation 11 – That AST outreach funding be delegated on the basis of pre 16 pupil numbers from April 2012.

(xiv) Specialist Schools Funding – This former specific grant was incorporated into the DSG from April 2011. Funding was delegated through the LMS formula to the 43 secondary and 4 special schools which had achieved Specialist School status on the basis of a block allocation (special schools) and a combination of block allocation and per pupil funding (secondary schools).

However, the national framework for assessing, monitoring and accrediting specialist schools and the associated funding regime have both now ceased. The funding allocations are therefore historic in the sense that no further schools can achieve the status, and thus attract the additional resources; equally no school can lose its status (and the associated funding.) The consultation suggested four options:

1. Absorb the block and per pupil allocations into the main AWPU and block indicators; or
2. Absorb the block and per pupil allocations into the main AWPU and block indicators but reduce the relevant multipliers to avoid an extra DSG cost; or

3. Remove the indicator and delegate the funding on pupil numbers/places allowing MFG to provide the relevant protection; or
4. Leave as historic allocations, if the DfE regulations permit this.

An overwhelming majority of secondary and special school respondents (94%) supported retention of the current allocation methodology. The main concerns were that the grant funding had had to be earned and that the funding supported significant staffing costs in schools.

(xv) Specialist Schools Funding – Further Issue – The consultation also sought the views of schools on the approach that should be adopted if the Government's new formula rules precluded the use of historic allocations. In this scenario 73% of secondary and special school respondents supported the delegation of funding through the formula on the basis of pupil numbers/places (Option 3).

It is clear from the responses that this funding stream is a sensitive matter for many secondary and special schools, the status quo option registered the highest level of support of any of the issues on which views were sought.

Equally though, there remains the concern that the current allocations relate to a framework which no longer exists with the inherent consequence that the current allocations will become the funding anomalies of the future.

Under the consultation proposals the existing funding would have been absorbed into the overall formulae. In 2011, relevant secondary schools received a block allowance of £16,212 plus £102.35 per pupil. By applying these values to the 3 secondary schools which did not attain Specialist School status (Newbold, Meadows and Hasland Hall) would have cost £315k. The consultation proposals assumed that the quantum to be distributed would remain as before and, as a result, the above block and per pupil values would have been pared back by around 5.5% to compensate. An existing Specialist School of 1,000 on roll would have seen its allocation of £118,563 reduce by around £6,521.

Similarly, the 4 Specialist special schools currently receive £60k each at a total cost of £240k. If the same approach was adopted, and the funding shared equally across all 10 special schools, the multiplier/allocation would become £24k, a reduction of 60% for the existing schools.

There are two points of contention. The first is that the Specialist Schools funding had to be earned; the inference being that other schools should not be rewarded for something they did not achieve. The second is that, under the consultation proposals, schools that earned the funding are losing some of this resource to pay (reward) those that didn't.

The issue of funding being earned is understandable but, if accepted, would require that the current distribution of funding becomes locked in, theoretically permanently. At some point this issue will have to be tackled either locally or nationally. Informal contact with neighbouring LAs indicates that some have either dealt with this issue previously or are looking to formalise the funding next year (Leicestershire,

Warwickshire, Derby City) with others (Stoke, Nottinghamshire, Nottingham City) retaining the historic allocations.

One compromise solution would be to level up the funding of the 3 secondary schools and 6 special schools over a period of time. The ultimate cost would be around £675k. If this were phased in over three years, the average cost would be £225k per annum and would avoid the need to reduce the allocations of other Specialist Schools. This additional cost could be funded from future years' savings in MFG payments.

Recommendation 12 – That the funding of non specialist secondary and special schools be brought in line with the additional funding received by Specialist Schools over a 3 year period as described above.

(xvi) High Performing Specialist Schools (HPSS) Funding – This former specific grant was also incorporated into the DSG from April 2011. Funding was delegated through the LMS formula to the 12 secondary schools which had achieved HPSS Status on the basis of 2010-11 grant levels i.e. the allocations were historic. Since only a minority of secondary schools received this funding, targeting the funding on an objective formula is impractical. Thus the choices were either to carry on allocating money on the current historic basis or to delegate the funding via pupil numbers, thus re-distributing the monies within the secondary sector.

A majority (53%) of secondary respondents supported the option to delegate the funding on pupil numbers. The numerical results are perhaps distorted by the fact that a majority of secondary schools do not currently receive this funding.

Recommendation 13 – That the HPSS funding within the formula be delegated on the basis of secondary pre 16 pupil numbers from April 2012 as set out in the consultation document.

(xvii) Alternative Formula Approach – the proposals discussed thus far were, in effect, suggesting relatively marginal changes to the funding formula. An alternative option was put forward which would delegate the overall quantum (the ISB or Individual Schools Budget) on a narrow range of factors. This alternative model would have deleted a range of formula factors, namely:

Small schools (KS3 & KS4 pupils)	Personalised Learning KS2 test results)
Condition Banding	Catering (free meals served)
Fmr Standards Fund 201a (FSM)	Learner Support Unit
EMBC (Block)	Practical Activities (Pupils)
Formularised Grants (Block)	Formularised Grants (Pupils)
Specialist School (Block & Pupil)	High Perf. Specialist Schools (status)
EiC (historic)	BIP (historic)
Post LIG Deprivation (historic)	

This alternative model was put forward to provide a comparator and to give a flavour of what a simplified formula might look like if the Government in the future were to be prescriptive about allowable factors within LAs' LMS formulae.

Schools were not asked to vote for or against this alternative model, merely to share their thoughts. The majority of the 26 comments received supported the incremental change rather than the more radical alternative model. A particular concern was that the turbulence was much greater, and thus more problematic, at a time of financial constraint.

Recommendation 14 – That the responses from schools on the alternative model be noted.

(xviii) Further Delegation – the consultation asked schools to indicate whether they wished to see additional services and budgets delegated via the LMS formula. The specific areas on which schools' views were sought are set out below:

Item	Nurs	Prim	Sec	Spec	Total
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Support for schools in financial difficulties	0	0	0	0	0
Allocation of contingencies	0	415	295	62	772
Free school meals eligibility	4	39	31	4	78
Insurance	0	1,515	628	75	2,218
Licences/subscriptions	3	144	19	4	170
Supply cover	43	1,392	959	136	2,530
Support for minority ethnic pupils or underachieving groups	13	157	79	13	262
Support for low cost high incidence SEN	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc	Tbc
Behaviour support services	6	2,313	34	7	2,360
Library and museum services	0	62	0	0	62
Total	69	6,037	2,045	301	8,452

The number of responses favouring delegation of each service was as follows:

Item	Nurs	Prim	Sec	Spec	Total
Support for schools in financial difficulties	0	1	2	0	3
Allocation of contingencies	0	4	5	0	9
Free school meals eligibility	0	9	2	0	11
Insurance	1	3	5	0	9
Licences/subscriptions	1	3	4	0	8
Supply cover	0	5	7	0	12
Support for minority ethnic pupils or underachieving groups	0	6	6	0	12
Support for low cost high incidence SEN	0	8	6	0	14
Behaviour support services	0	10	11	0	21
Library and museum services	0	14	8	0	22

There appears to be limited appetite for further delegation at this point and consequently it is not proposed to delegate any additional funding for April 2012. However, this position will need to be revisited once the Government's decisions on the future funding arrangements for schools and local authorities become clearer.

Recommendation 15 – That the responses from schools on the issue of further delegation be noted.

2.2 Further developments including the potential impact of changes on schools

The LMS consultation deliberately did not provide schools with the financial impact of the proposals on their individual budgets. This was designed to ensure that debate took place at a strategic level. However, since the consultation has closed, schools have been informed of the impact which the formula changes would have had had the original proposals been applied in 2011-12.

A summary of the above changes for each secondary and special school together with a sample of primary schools is attached as Appendix 2. This modelling made a number of assumptions:

- (i) That **all** of the changes discussed in the Consultation are implemented using exactly the same method as described;
- (ii) That the original changes proposed in the LMS Consultation are approved by Cabinet i.e. the figures do not reflect any refinement to the Specialist Schools proposals discussed in section 2.1;
- (iii) The figures reflect the position had the formula changes applied in 2011-12 i.e. they do not reflect data changes for 2012-13 such as changes in pupil numbers, free school meals, SENTA hours etc; and
- (iv) They assumed the Government's Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2012-13 is set at minus 2% per pupil i.e. in very simple terms no school can lose more than 2% budget* per pupil between 2011-12 and 2012-13.

* N.B. the budget for MFG purposes is the overall LMS budget with certain exceptions e.g. Key Stage 1, rates, SEN etc.

In the normal course of events, the impact of the agreed changes at individual school level would only become apparent to Heads and Governors when the 2012-13 budgets are published in March 2012. In order to help schools plan, it is intended that once Cabinet has made its decisions regarding this report, to publish indicative multipliers based on the new formulae for 2012-13. These indicative multipliers would then provide a basis for schools to estimate their LMS allocations for 2012-13 and review/amend their expenditure plans around two months in advance of the publication of formal budgets. This additional time would be particularly helpful for those schools losing funding as a result of these formula changes, post 16 formula changes and/or reduced pupil numbers.

3. Other Considerations

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: - prevention of crime & disorder, equality of opportunity; environmental, financial, health, legal & human rights, human resources, property and transport considerations.

4. Background Papers

Supporting papers held in CAYA Finance Section.

5. Strategic Director's Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to note the responses of schools to the consultation and agree the following:

Recommendation 1 - That the LMS formula multipliers should not be uprated for inflation for 2012-13.

Recommendation 2(a) - That the funding streams in Table 1 be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils entitled to a free school meal as recorded on the January census for 2012/13;

Recommendation 2(b) - That the delegation of deprivation funding be reviewed for 2013/14 in the light of the Government's Pupil Premium announcement; and

Recommendation 2(c) – That the Authority considers how the attainment of pupils on free school meals can be improved together with any implications for its funding formulae.

Recommendation 3(a) - That Extended Services (Sustainability) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pre 16 pupils (mainstream) and places (special schools);

Recommendation 3(b) - That Extended Services (Subsidy) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils known to be eligible for free school meals;

Recommendation 3(c) - That Extended Services funding be excluded from schools' MFG baselines for 2012-13 and 2013-14; and

Recommendation 3(d) - That the change in the delegation of Extended Services funding be phased over two years 2012-13 and 2013-14.

Recommendation 4 - That secondary schools' catering FSM funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pre 16 pupils eligible for free school meals recorded on the January census.

Recommendation 5 – That the views of schools on the funding of SENTA hours be noted.

Recommendation 6 – That the School Action Allocation (SEN) funding be delegated on the basis of a 5 year average of the number of pupils recorded as being at School Action Plus with one of the 6 specific profiles on the January census.

Recommendation 7 – That the primary School Action Allocation (Socio Economic) funding be delegated on the basis of the number of pupils entitled to a free school meal as recorded on the January census.

Recommendation 8a – That funding for secondary school pupils at School Action Allocation continue to be delegated based on results of the Cognitive ability tests; and

Recommendation 8b – That the delegation in 8(a) be targeted at those pupils whose test scores are 88 or below.

Recommendation 9 – That the Learner Support Unit indicator be deleted for 2012-13.

Recommendation 10(a) – That the current historic AST salary allocations be retained until April 2015;

Recommendation 10(b) – That the future years' allocations referred to in 10(a) be reduced where a funded AST has left the school and the school's relevant MFG baselines adjusted accordingly.

Recommendation 11 – That AST outreach funding be delegated on the basis of pre 16 pupil numbers from April 2012.

Recommendation 12 – That the funding of non specialist secondary and special schools be brought in line with the additional funding received by Specialist Schools over a 3 year period as described in the report.

Recommendation 13 – That the HPSS funding within the formula be delegated on the basis of secondary pre 16 pupil numbers from April 2012 as set out in the consultation document.

Recommendation 14 – That the responses from schools on the alternative model be noted.

Recommendation 15 – That the responses from schools on the issue of further delegation be noted.

Numerical summary of Schools' responses

Appendix 1

	Total Responses			Nursery			Primary			Secondary			Special			No Response
	Yes	No	No Pref	Yes	No	No Pref	Yes	No	No Pref	Yes	No	No Pref	Yes	No	No Pref	
Q1- Inflation	36	9	4	0	1	0	20	6	4	15	2	0	1	0	0	365
Q2 - Deprivation	34	13	3	0	1	0	24	5	2	9	7	1	1	0	0	364
Q3 - ES Sustainability	37	7	4	0	1	0	23	3	4	13	3	0	1	0	0	366
Q4 - ES Subsidy	26	13	10	0	1	0	15	7	8	10	5	2	1	0	0	365
Q5 - FSM Count	28	4	15	0	1	0	10	3	15	17	0	0	1	0	0	367
Q7 - SA+ Count	34	8	4	0	0	1	21	5	2	13	2	1	0	1	0	368
Q8 - SEN FSM	25	17	7	0	1	0	18	11	1	6	5	6	1	0	0	365
Q9 - CATs Threshold	27	1	16	0	0	1	13	0	12	13	1	3	1	0	0	370
Q11 - Remove LSU	22	5	18	0	0	1	9	0	17	13	4	0	0	1	0	369
Q12 - AST Salary	34	6	9	0	0	1	19	4	7	15	1	1	0	1	0	365
Q13 - AST Outreach	32	8	7	0	0	1	18	5	5	14	2	1	0	1	0	367
	CATs	KS2	No Pref	CATs	KS2	No Pref	CATs	KS2	No Pref	CATs	KS2	No Pref	CATs	KS2	No Pref	
Q10 - CATs or KS2	16	13	15	0	0	1	2	11	13	13	2	1	1	0	0	370

Secondary & Special Schools only	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	No Pref	TOTAL
Q14 - Specialist School Allocation	0	0	1	16	0	17
Q15 - Specialist School Allocation (no Opt 4)	3	1	11	-	0	15
Q16 - HPSS	6	9	-	-	2	17

Delegated Options	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total
Support for schools in financial difficulties	0	1	2	0	3
Allocation of contingencies	0	4	5	0	9
Free school meals eligibility	0	9	2	0	11
Insurance	1	3	5	0	9
Licences/subscriptions	1	3	4	0	8
Supply cover	0	5	7	0	12
Support for minority ethnic pupils or underachieving groups	0	6	6	0	12
Support for low cost high incidence SEN	0	8	6	0	14
Behaviour support services	0	10	11	0	21
Library and museum services	0	14	8	0	22

Summary of gains/losses – secondary

Appendix 2

	Current 2011-12 S2S1 Budget							Consultation Proposals										MFG Net Change		Pupil Premium
	Deprivation £	Catering £	AEN £	LSU £	Specialist £	HPSS £	Current Total £	Deprivation £	Catering £	AEN £	LSU £	Specialist £	HPSS £	Revised Total £	Gross Change £	Net Change £	(FSM) £			
ALDERCAR COMM. LANGUAGE COLLEGE	140,745	39,797	79,785	0	107,406	176,630	544,363	178,260	28,587	63,399	3,844	92,096	21,339	387,525	-156,838	86,807	-70,032 ∴	57,584		
ALFRETON GRANGE ARTS COLLEGE	288,195	28,690	56,715	24,448	91,951	0	490,000	232,508	36,824	26,587	3,229	78,820	17,716	395,684	-94,316	32,274	-62,042 ∴	74,176		
ANTHONY GELL	28,958	12,568	76,901	24,448	85,401	0	228,276	65,245	10,659	68,512	2,970	73,193	16,180	236,760	8,484	-45,537	-37,053 ∴	21,472		
BELPER AND SIXTH FORM CENTRE	89,841	24,044	67,289	0	166,463	0	347,637	181,385	28,829	88,963	6,395	142,826	35,147	483,545	135,909	0	135,909 ∴	58,072		
BENNERLEY	370,553	30,448	48,544	0	56,231	0	505,777	209,082	34,159	33,744	2,070	48,136	9,294	336,485	-169,292	119,932	-49,359 ∴	68,930		
BROOKFIELD COMM. SPEC SPORTS COLLEGE	32,672	14,595	99,972	0	147,630	98,312	393,181	69,853	11,144	145,204	5,135	126,649	30,826	388,811	-4,370	0	-4,370 ∴	22,448		
BUXTON COMM.	78,881	21,656	101,894	24,448	146,402	94,231	467,512	163,820	26,406	88,963	5,607	125,594	30,442	440,832	-26,680	0	-26,680 ∴	53,192		
CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH HIGH	59,154	18,992	84,111	0	107,509	0	269,765	118,628	19,381	54,196	4,722	92,184	21,202	310,313	40,548	0	40,548 ∴	39,040		
DRONFIELD HENRY FANSHAWE	52,111	18,670	80,266	24,448	203,309	0	378,804	116,916	18,654	106,346	8,005	174,478	43,759	468,157	89,353	0	89,353 ∴	37,576		
ECKINGTON	138,985	23,686	114,391	0	166,565	0	443,627	143,801	23,136	112,482	6,501	142,914	35,152	463,987	20,360	-21,613	-1,253 ∴	46,604		
FREDERICK GENT	212,652	28,056	69,211	0	106,997	43,672	460,587	146,802	23,984	69,534	4,696	91,745	21,083	357,844	-102,744	23,488	-79,256 ∴	48,312		
FRIESLAND	133,552	44,004	55,753	0	154,488	0	387,797	213,460	34,159	76,692	5,839	132,540	32,354	495,044	107,247	0	107,247 ∴	68,808		
GLOSSOPDALE COMM. COLLEGE	129,434	33,803	89,398	0	171,785	0	424,419	232,737	37,308	36,812	6,348	147,398	36,443	497,046	72,627	0	72,627 ∴	75,152		
GRANVILLE COMM.	120,962	24,850	77,863	0	88,778	0	312,454	143,837	23,499	53,173	3,754	76,095	16,852	317,210	4,756	0	4,756 ∴	47,336		
HASLAND HALL COMM.	120,217	44,479	82,669	0	0	0	247,365	172,011	28,102	31,699	4,558	89,459	20,465	346,294	98,929	0	98,929 ∴	56,608		
HEANOR GATE SCIENCE COLLEGE	106,507	43,230	78,824	0	155,716	0	384,277	220,716	35,612	28,632	6,088	133,595	32,605	457,248	72,971	0	72,971 ∴	71,736		
HERITAGE MATHS & COMPUTING SPEC COLLEGE	510,935	54,059	80,746	0	113,036	0	758,776	299,536	48,937	91,008	5,008	96,932	22,486	563,906	-194,870	102,906	-91,964 ∴	98,576		
HIGHFIELDS	66,570	27,736	152,841	0	162,062	0	409,209	138,064	22,288	79,760	6,205	139,046	34,118	419,480	10,271	0	10,271 ∴	44,896		
HOPE VALLEY COLLEGE	18,826	6,694	45,660	0	79,055	154,289	304,525	40,037	6,541	88,963	3,251	67,742	14,594	221,128	-83,397	27,987	-55,410 ∴	13,176		
ILKESTON	95,822	25,634	56,234	0	116,720	0	294,410	165,303	26,649	61,354	4,564	100,097	23,458	381,424	87,014	0	87,014 ∴	53,680		
JOHN FLAMSTEED COMM.	40,481	20,551	36,528	0	78,236	59,901	235,698	91,937	15,020	58,286	3,208	67,039	14,404	249,894	14,196	0	14,196 ∴	30,256		
JOHN PORT	46,174	28,542	61,521	0	224,803	90,847	451,888	91,160	14,536	96,121	8,915	192,941	48,787	452,460	572	0	572 ∴	29,280		
KIRK HALLAM	124,397	29,166	60,560	24,448	134,427	152,773	525,771	169,592	27,618	44,993	5,532	115,307	27,561	390,603	-135,168	44,272	-90,896 ∴	55,632		
LADY MANNERS	31,147	7,208	116,794	0	171,581	0	326,730	50,576	7,995	63,399	6,152	147,222	36,429	311,773	-14,957	0	-14,957 ∴	16,104		
LONG EATON	96,925	31,002	86,995	0	147,835	94,894	457,651	183,256	29,314	46,015	5,781	126,825	30,757	421,947	-35,704	0	-35,704 ∴	59,048		
MILL HILL	64,400	19,603	68,730	24,448	125,113	0	302,295	104,894	16,958	17,384	4,823	107,306	25,440	276,805	-25,490	0	-25,490 ∴	34,160		
NETHERTHORPE	154,612	27,976	55,753	0	126,034	0	364,375	190,988	30,040	57,263	4,447	108,098	25,732	416,569	52,194	0	52,194 ∴	60,512		
NEW MILLS BUSINESS & ENTERPRISE COLLEGE	56,093	16,926	51,908	0	80,283	0	205,212	92,802	14,536	41,925	2,727	68,797	14,988	235,774	30,563	0	30,563 ∴	29,280		
NEWBOLD COMM.	225,599	23,287	73,056	24,448	0	0	346,390	206,434	33,190	65,444	5,337	115,483	27,646	453,534	107,144	0	107,144 ∴	66,856		
PARKSIDE COMM.	640,408	44,006	67,289	0	67,592	0	819,294	203,151	33,190	112,482	2,658	57,895	11,932	421,307	-397,987	336,743	-61,244 ∴	66,856		
QUEEN ELIZABETH'S GRAMMAR	44,562	22,597	90,359	0	160,015	0	317,532	100,057	15,989	130,888	6,295	137,287	33,607	424,123	106,591	0	106,591 ∴	32,208		
SHIREBROOK	612,493	46,850	78,343	0	88,369	0	826,055	268,396	43,849	152,106	3,732	75,743	16,757	560,584	-265,471	191,397	-74,074 ∴	88,328		
SPRINGWELL COMM. COLLEGE	735,909	53,598	103,817	24,448	105,871	0	1,023,643	302,502	49,421	44,993	4,638	90,777	20,822	513,152	-510,491	417,651	-92,839 ∴	99,552		
ST JOHN HOUGHTON CATHOLIC	21,785	11,334	35,086	0	79,567	0	147,771	50,417	8,237	55,218	3,277	68,182	14,713	200,044	52,273	0	52,273 ∴	16,592		
ST MARY'S CATHOLIC HIGH	45,754	11,421	48,063	0	147,733	95,270	348,241	80,551	12,355	83,850	5,310	126,737	30,819	339,622	-8,619	0	-8,619 ∴	24,888		
ST PHILIP HOWARD CATHOLIC	70,881	33,503	32,683	0	67,080	0	204,147	78,591	12,840	30,677	2,631	57,456	11,813	194,008	-10,139	-3,825	-13,964 ∴	25,864		
ST THOMAS MORE CATHOLIC SCIENCE COLLEGE	19,260	9,514	58,157	0	57,561	0	144,493	43,003	7,026	24,541	2,139	49,279	9,603	135,590	-8,902	0	-8,902 ∴	14,152		
SWANWICK HALL	156,159	36,817	85,553	0	143,229	0	421,758	236,091	38,035	71,579	5,405	122,868	29,712	503,692	81,934	0	81,934 ∴	76,616		
THE BOLSOVER	571,851	46,872	109,584	0	98,911	0	827,219	186,839	30,525	61,354	4,278	84,799	19,205	387,000	-440,219	357,013	-83,206 ∴	61,488		
THE ECCLESBOURNE	14,578	4,523	52,870	0	164,007	149,026	385,003	35,588	5,814	62,376	5,802	140,716	34,663	284,960	-100,043	10,557	-89,487 ∴	11,712		
THE MEADOWS COMM.	161,209	23,668	87,956	24,448	0	0	297,281	139,388	22,772	33,744	3,102	65,281	13,929	278,217	-19,064	0	-19,064 ∴	45,872		
THE PINGLE	109,879	27,417	48,544	0	136,986	0	322,826	171,393	27,375	54,196	5,220	117,505	28,237	403,927	81,101	0	81,101 ∴	55,144		
THE WILLIAM ALLITT	178,371	34,159	27,396	0	115,287	61,785	416,999	189,805	31,009	74,647	5,125	98,866	23,008	422,461	5,461	0	5,461 ∴	62,464		
TIBSHELF COMM. - SPEC SPORTS COLLEGE	431,008	34,466	116,794	0	113,752	0	696,020	232,808	38,035	84,872	5,045	97,547	22,652	480,960	-215,060	119,237	-95,823 ∴	76,616		
TUPTON HALL	347,239	41,511	105,259	24,448	213,033	0	731,489	284,637	45,787	117,594	8,031	182,830	46,105	684,985	-46,505	0	-46,505 ∴	92,232		
WILSTHORPE COMM.	136,239	28,674	81,708	0	100,549	0	347,169	165,850	26,649	31,699	3,574	86,206	19,731	333,708	-13,461	0	-13,461 ∴	53,680		
	7,932,984	1,280,884	3,440,370	244,481	5,375,361	1,271,630	19,545,709	7,202,709	1,162,971	3,123,665	221,975	4,880,529	1,154,569	17,746,419	-1,799,290	1,799,290	0	2,342,766		

Summary of gains/losses – primary

Appendix 2

	Current 2011-12 S251 Budget			Consultation Proposals			Gross Change	Assumed MFG Net Change		Pupil Premium (FSM)
	Deprivation	AEN	Total	Deprivation	AEN	Total				
INKERSALL PRIMARY	97,423	1,320	98,743	40,341	3,033	43,374	-55,369	31,762	-23,607	23,912
SHARLEY PARK COMM. PRIMARY	130,107	4,620	134,727	97,149	3,033	100,182	-34,545	11,186	-23,359	57,584
COTMANHAY INFANT	134,882	2,640	137,521	81,506	1,451	82,957	-54,565	35,597	-18,968	48,312
NORTH WINGFIELD PRIMARY	106,712	5,610	112,322	68,333	3,429	71,762	-40,560	21,730	-18,829	40,504
CRESWELL CE INFANT AND NURSERY	185,221	2,640	187,861	53,514	1,187	54,701	-133,160	114,653	-18,506	31,720
CLOWNE INFANT AND NURSERY	53,531	1,320	54,851	35,402	1,319	36,720	-18,131	0	-18,131	20,984
BOLSOVER INFANT AND NURSERY	111,012	2,310	113,321	42,811	2,506	45,317	-68,005	50,484	-17,520	25,376
CLOWNE JUNIOR	103,197	6,599	109,796	40,341	2,242	42,583	-67,213	49,766	-17,447	23,912
BRIMINGTON JUNIOR	53,456	9,239	62,695	40,341	1,582	41,924	-20,771	3,698	-17,073	23,912
NEW BOLSOVER PRIMARY	139,394	2,310	141,704	53,514	7,649	61,163	-80,541	63,531	-17,010	31,720
HOLLINGWOOD PRIMARY	77,867	1,320	79,187	27,169	5,143	32,312	-46,875	30,229	-16,647	16,104
HEATH PRIMARY	141,233	5,280	146,512	46,104	2,110	48,214	-98,298	81,818	-16,480	27,328
COTMANHAY JUNIOR	143,423	3,300	146,722	94,679	4,220	98,899	-47,824	31,486	-16,338	56,120
GAMESLEY COMM. PRIMARY	115,060	1,320	116,380	79,036	4,352	83,388	-32,992	17,251	-15,741	46,848
PARK INFANT AND NURSERY	62,444	1,320	63,764	30,462	1,846	32,308	-31,456	15,760	-15,696	18,056
PARKLANDS INFANT AND NURSERY	55,405	1,320	56,725	37,048	659	37,708	-19,018	3,639	-15,379	21,960
BOLSOVER C OF E JUNIOR	72,907	3,630	76,537	39,518	5,802	45,320	-31,217	15,979	-15,238	23,424
WHITWELL PRIMARY	86,897	3,960	90,856	40,341	2,506	42,847	-48,010	32,851	-15,158	23,912
GRASSMOOR PRIMARY	130,166	5,610	135,776	44,458	2,637	47,095	-88,681	73,643	-15,037	26,352
MODEL VILLAGE PRIMARY	134,670	3,630	138,300	55,984	2,242	58,226	-80,074	65,087	-14,987	33,184
STENSON FIELDS PRIMARY COMM.	13,587	1,320	14,907	27,169	1,714	28,883	13,976	-2,081	11,896	16,104
CHARLOTTE NURSERY AND INFANT	35,116	1,980	37,095	46,928	2,242	49,170	12,074	0	12,074	27,816
TOWN END JUNIOR	10,938	1,320	12,258	22,229	2,242	24,471	12,213	0	12,213	13,176
HASLAND JUNIOR	23,797	1,980	25,777	37,871	791	38,663	12,886	0	12,886	22,448
SCARGILL CE VA PRIMARY	5,408	1,320	6,728	15,643	7,121	22,764	16,036	-3,102	12,934	9,272
LONGMOOR PRIMARY	53,299	2,310	55,609	67,510	1,055	68,565	12,956	0	12,956	40,016
ALDERCAR INFANT AND NURSERY	6,701	2,640	9,341	21,406	1,187	22,592	13,251	0	13,251	12,688
ST GEORGES C OF E PRIMARY	10,021	1,320	11,341	23,052	1,846	24,898	13,558	0	13,558	13,664
PARKSIDE COMMUNITY JUNIOR	18,012	2,970	20,982	31,285	3,297	34,582	13,600	0	13,600	18,544
HOWITT PRIMARY COMMUNITY	58,371	4,950	63,320	74,920	2,110	77,030	13,709	0	13,709	44,408
ST JAMES' CE PRIMARY	16,663	2,640	19,303	32,108	1,714	33,823	14,520	0	14,520	19,032
HARRINGTON JUNIOR	25,034	1,650	26,684	36,225	5,934	42,159	15,475	0	15,475	21,472
HALLAM FIELDS JUNIOR	11,698	1,980	13,678	27,169	2,374	29,542	15,865	0	15,865	16,104
ABERCROMBIE COMM. PRIMARY	13,945	1,650	15,594	32,108	923	33,032	17,437	0	17,437	19,032
NEW WHITTINGTON COMM. PRIMARY	16,791	3,630	20,420	36,225	1,978	38,203	17,783	0	17,783	21,472
GLEBE JUNIOR	30,048	5,610	35,657	48,574	6,725	55,300	19,643	0	19,643	28,792
BELMONT PRIMARY	20,217	1,320	21,537	38,695	2,769	41,464	19,927	0	19,927	22,936
PENNINE WAY JUNIOR	18,426	2,310	20,736	36,225	4,484	40,709	19,973	0	19,973	21,472
GRANGE PRIMARY	27,298	2,310	29,608	48,574	1,319	49,893	20,285	0	20,285	28,792
SAWLEY INFANT AND NURSERY	12,220	1,320	13,540	32,932	1,055	33,987	20,447	0	20,447	19,520
ALL SCHOOLS	8,185,864	782,363	8,968,227	6,807,812	650,656	7,458,467	-1,509,760	1,509,760	0	4,035,272

Summary of gains/losses – special

Appendix 2

	Current 2011-12 S251 Budget				Proposals						
	Specialist School Block £	Base Block Allocation £	Formula'sd Grants Block £	Total £	Specialist School Block £	Base Block Allocation £	Formula'sd Grants Block £	Total £	Gross Change £	Assumed MFG £	Net Change £
Holly House School	60,000	248,282	94,163	402,445	23,325	241,300	91,515	356,140	(46,305)	21,191	(25,114)
Holbrook Centre For Autism	-	248,282	94,163	342,445	23,325	241,300	91,515	356,140	13,695	0	13,695
Brackenfield Special School	60,000	84,981	94,163	239,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	(41,713)	18,963	(22,749)
Ashgate Croft School	-	84,981	94,163	179,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	18,287	0	18,287
Swanwick School & Sports College	60,000	84,981	94,163	239,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	(41,713)	16,918	(24,794)
Stubbin Wood School	-	84,981	94,163	179,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	18,287	0	18,287
Bennerley Fields School	60,000	84,981	94,163	239,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	(41,713)	14,594	(27,118)
Peak School	-	207,457	94,163	301,620	23,325	201,623	91,515	316,463	14,843	0	14,843
Alfreton Park Community Special School	-	84,981	94,163	179,144	23,325	82,591	91,515	197,432	18,287	0	18,287
Stanton Vale Special School	-	153,023	94,163	247,186	23,325	148,720	91,515	263,560	16,374	0	16,374
All Special Schools	240,000	1,366,929	941,630	2,548,559	233,251	1,328,490	915,151	2,476,892	(71,667)	71,667	0