

SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM

SUBJECT:	Removal of Reception Uplift Factor
-----------------	------------------------------------

AUTHOR:	Ian Hamilton – School Budget and PVI Manager
----------------	--

DATE:	20 November 2015
--------------	------------------

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

This paper firstly explains how the Reception Uplift factor is used to allocate funding to primary schools. It then seeks the views of SFF members as to the removal of this factor from the Kent's local funding formula from 1 April 2016.

FOR:	Decision
-------------	----------

1. Background

- 1.1 A Local Authority (LA) maintained school's financial year runs from April to March and an Academies financial year runs from September to August and in both instances the number of pupils funded is taken from the preceding October census. Prior to the 2013-14 School Funding reform changes the pupil count was the preceding January census.
- 1.2 It was acknowledged by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) that this change could have a detrimental impact of some primary schools where they had a staggered reception year intake, as this would take place after the October pupil census and therefore the school would not receive funding for those pupils until the following financial year.
- 1.3 In order to address this issue the EFA introduced a discretionary factor in the formula for Reception Uplift. This factor provides an uplift in funding based on the previous year's pupil numbers. To explain how this works it is best to illustrate by using an example:

Financial Year 2014-15

October 2013 census - 45 Year R pupils

January 2014 census - 60 Year R pupils

For the financial Year 2014-15 the school will be funded on 45 Year R pupils

Financial Year 2015-16

October 2014 census - 45 Year R pupils

January 2015 census - 60 Year R pupils

For the financial Year 2015-16 the school will be funded on 45 Year R pupils plus the number of Year R pupils recorded on the January 2014 census less the number of pupils recorded on the October 2013 ($60-45=15$), in total 60 pupils.

2. Analysis of current position

2.1 As part of the LAs Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for 2015-16, the LA received Reception Uplift funding for 248 pupils under this criteria, equating to just over £1m (248 X £4,363 (DSG per pupil)).

2.2 The table below summarises the number of schools and the number of pupils that make up the 248 pupils.

No of schools	82	19	13	5	3	1	2	1	1	127
No of pupils	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	26	

2.3 From September 2015 there will be no schools that apply a staggered admission system. Cecil Road Primary School was the last school in 2014 to do this and all of their reception pupils will in future be admitted in September each year.

2.4 The remaining schools that have an increase in reception year is due to casual admissions or where the parents have deferred admission (admission of summer born children) due to the pupil's age¹. The table below details the increase in pupil numbers by year group between October 2014 and January 2015.

Year R	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
169	163	185	179	166	170	109

It would indicate that as part of our DSG settlement for 2016-17 the LA should receive Reception Uplift funding of £737,347(169 X £4,363).

2.5 From the figures in the above table it would suggest that there is a similar level of casual admissions across all year groups (with the exception of Year 6 which is slightly lower) and that deferred admission for reception year pupils is not material in relation to the overall pupil numbers.

2.6 As we now have no school that operates staggered intake and schools are not funded for any other year group for the increase in pupil numbers between January and October, the LA believes it to be an appropriate time to remove the Reception Uplift factor.

¹ Advice on the admission of summer born children for local authorities school admission authorities and parents.

- 2.7 Ceasing to fund for school for reception uplift would generate estimated headroom of £700k and this could be used to help fund pressures on the DSG budget.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 Members of the SFF are asked to **DECIDE** whether the Reception Uplift factor should be removed from Kent's local funding formula.