



Education
Funding
Agency

Schools block funding formulae 2016 to 2017

**Analysis of local authorities' schools
block funding formulae**

July 2016

Contents

Introduction	3
Commentary	4
Basic per-pupil entitlement	4
Deprivation	6
Looked-after children	9
Prior attainment	10
English as an additional language (EAL)	11
Mobility	13
Total funding through the pupil-led factors	14
Lump sum	15
Sparsity	17
Other formula factors	19
Primary:secondary funding ratios	19
Notional SEN	21
Growth fund	22
Falling rolls fund	23
Information about the data file	24
“Proforma” sheet	24
“FINAL MI Data Jan” sheet	24

Introduction

In January 2016, local authorities in England submitted to the Education Funding Agency (EFA) their formulae for allocating their dedicated schools grant (DSG) schools block funding for 2016 to 2017 to schools in their area. For 2016 to 2017, schools are funded using a maximum of thirteen clearly defined factors.

This document provides an overview of the 2016 to 2017 formula factor values chosen by local authorities as at 8 March 2016. It provides charts and brief commentary on the ranges of unit funding amounts they have selected, and the proportions of schools block funding distributed under each of the permitted factors. This note is accompanied by a data file, more details about which can be found in the “Information about the data file” section at the end of this note. Small details of funding formulae may change subsequently compared to the figures presented here as a result of late amendments.

A similar summary about local authorities’ funding formulae for 2015 to 2016 was [published by the DfE last year](#).


Commentary

This chapter looks at each of the principal formula factors in turn.

Basic per-pupil entitlement

This is a mandatory factor which every local authority must use in their 2016-17 formula. Local authorities are permitted to choose different age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU) rates for primary pupils, for key stage 3 pupils and for key stage 4 pupils; but they must specify a primary AWPU of at least £2,000, and key stage 3 and key stage 4 AWPU values of at least £3,000.



The majority (80%) of primary AWPU values selected by local authorities are in the range of £2,500 to £3,250, although there are a few significant outliers of over £4,000. Nineteen of the 20 local authorities with the highest primary AWPU values are in London¹.



The secondary AWPU values show a similar pattern. For key stage 3 AWPU values, 80% of local authorities are allocating between £3,500 and £4,500 per pupil, and for key stage 4, the

¹ In the charts showing the ranges of unit funding amounts local authorities have used for the formula factors, only those authorities which have chosen to use that factor in their formula in each year are shown. However, in the charts showing the proportion of funding allocated using the factors, all local authorities are displayed, with those not choosing to use the factor (where its use is not mandatory) shown as allocating 0%.


majority (78%) are allocating between £4,000 and £5,000 per pupil . Again, the authorities with the largest secondary AWPUs are mostly in London².



The final chart in this section shows the proportions of schools block funding that local authorities are allocating through the basic entitlement factor. Overall, the proportion of funding being spent on the AWPUs ranges from 61% to 89%, with 51% of local

² City of London have a value of £3,000 for their key stage 3 and key stage 4 AWPU in 2015-16 and 2016-17, which is shown on the chart; however they do not have any key stage 3 or key stage 4 pupils at their sole school so allocate no funding through these indicators.

authorities allocating between 75% and 80%. Across all authorities, 76.8% of funding is being allocated through basic entitlement, a slight increase compared to 76.2% in 2015-16 formulae.



Deprivation


This is another mandatory factor which every local authority must use in their 2016-17 formula. Local authorities can distribute their deprivation funding using one or both of two indicators: children eligible for free school meals (FSM; which could be either straight FSM or Ever 6); or Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) data.

IDACI scores are taken from the English Indices of Deprivation (IMD) published by the Department for Communities and Local Government. IDACI is a measure of income deprivation and identifies the proportion of children in out-of-work households or on low incomes. The 2016-17 formula uses the updated IDACI scores published in September 2015. These scores are grouped into 6 bands as per the table below:


IDACI score	IDACI band value
$x < 0.20$	0
$0.20 \leq x < 0.25$	1
$0.25 \leq x < 0.30$	2
$0.30 \leq x < 0.40$	3
$0.40 \leq x < 0.50$	4
$0.50 \leq x < 0.60$	5
$x \geq 0.6$	6

These bands are unchanged from previous years.

The first chart in this section indicates that there is some variation between local authorities in the amount of funding allocated through this element of the factor. Of the 122 authorities using IDACI in their deprivation factor only 14% are using it to allocate more than 6% of their total funding (compared to 20% in 2015-16).



The change in IDACI data has resulted in a change in the distribution of pupils across the different IDACI bands. Only 14% of authorities have more than 25% of their pupils in IDACI bands 4 to 6 (compared to 29% in 2015-16) and no authorities have more than 50% of pupils in bands 4 to 6 in 2016-17 (in 2015-16 there were 14).




Because of the different permutations of deprivation indicator selections available for local authorities to use for this factor, it is not immediately straightforward to calculate per-pupil funding amounts on a comparable basis. For the purpose of this analysis, total


funding allocated through the deprivation factors is divided by the number of FSM pupils, to obtain an estimate of the deprivation funding per FSM pupil, as below.

$$\text{Total deprivation per FSM pupil for each LA} = \left(\frac{\text{Total Deprivation funding in FSM+IDACI}}{\text{Number of FSM pupils}} \right)$$

The chart below indicates that there is some variation between local authorities in the amount of funding allocated per FSM pupil. Two-thirds (64%) are allocating between £1,500 and £3,000 per FSM pupil.




There is also considerable variation in the proportion of schools block funding which local authorities are allocating to schools through the deprivation factor, ranging from 1% to 19%, as illustrated by the chart below. No local authorities are allocating 0% of funding through deprivation since its use is mandatory. Across all authorities, 7.6% of funding is being allocated through deprivation, a decrease from the 8.1% in 2015-16 formulae.




Looked-after children

Use of this factor in funding formulae is optional, and 91 local authorities have chosen to use it, compared to 88 in 2015-16. Like in 2015-16, the indicator authorities can use for this factor is children looked after for any period of time as at the end of March 2015 (as recorded on the March 2015 SSSDA903 collection). Three quarters of the authorities that are using the factor are allocating less than £1,250 per pupil.





Across all local authorities as a whole (including those not using the factor), 0.1% of schools block funding is being allocated through the looked-after children factor.



Prior attainment


Use of this factor is optional, with 143 local authorities using the indicator for primary pupils (compared to 142 in 2015-16 formulae) and 148 using the indicator for secondary pupils (148 last year). Four authorities are not using this factor at all. For primary pupils, the indicator is the number of children in years 1 to 3 assessed under the new early years foundation stage profile as not achieving a good level of development, and the number in years 4 to 6 not achieving 73 points or more or 78 points or more (authorities could pick between whether to use the 73 or 78 point indicator) under the old profile. In their formula local authorities can scale back the proportion of years 1 to 3 pupils not meeting the 'good development' criterion. For secondary pupils a single indicator was available: the number of pupils who fail to achieve level 4 or above in either English or mathematics at key stage 2.






Like last year, there is considerable variation in the per-pupil amounts selected. They range from £115 to £2,651 for the primary indicator and from £40 to £3,229 for the secondary indicator.

The following chart shows that 71% of local authorities are allocating between 2% and 6% of their schools block funding through this factor. Across all authorities, 4.3% of funding is allocated through this factor, a slight decrease from 4.4% last year.




English as an additional language (EAL)

Use of this factor is optional, and 136 local authorities have chosen to use it, compared with 132 in 2016-17.




Local authorities can choose one of three indicators for this factor: the number of pupils with EAL who entered the compulsory school system in either the last one, two or three years.

For the primary indicator, the distribution of per-pupil values is relatively narrow with 69% of local authorities allocating between £250 and £1,000 per pupil. Only 1 authority allocates over £1,500. By contrast there is rather greater variation in the per-pupil values selected for the secondary indicator; these range from £75 to £3,548.





With pupils attracting funding through the EAL factor being smaller in number than those attracting funding through many other factors, across all local authorities 0.9% of funding is allocated through this factor, compared to 0.8% in 2016-17.



Mobility


Use of this factor is optional, and only 68 of the 152 local authorities have chosen to use it (although this is two more than in 2015-16 formulae). The indicator for this factor is the number of 'mobile' pupils in excess of 10% of pupils, and is payable on the number of pupils exceeding this cut off (e.g. if a school has 12% mobile pupils, funding is applied to 2%).





Primary per-pupil amounts range from £10 to £3,000, and the secondary per-pupil amounts from £10 to £19,068.


All the local authorities which are incorporating the mobility factor into their 2016-17 funding formulae are using it to allocate less than 1% of their schools block funding, and only four are allocating more than 0.5%. Across all local authorities as a whole, some 0.1% of schools block funding is being allocated through this factor, the same as in the 2015-16 formulae.



Total funding through the pupil-led factors

The factors highlighted above (i.e. basic per-pupil entitlement, deprivation, looked-after children, prior attainment, English as an additional language, and mobility) are pupil-led. Although there is considerable variation across local authorities in the choices of factors used, the per-pupil amounts, and the proportions of funding allocated through each one,

overall there is strong consistency in the proportions of funding allocated through the pupil-led factors as a whole.




A requirement for the 2016-17 formulae is that across each local authority as a whole, a minimum of 80% of schools block funding must be allocated through these pupil-led factors. Note that the Isles of Scilly has only a single school, and does not formally receive DSG schools block funding in the same way as the other authorities, so the 80% requirement, which is set out in the DSG conditions of grant, does not apply to them; they are the block on the chart above shown below the 80% level.

All other authorities are indeed allocating more than 80% of their funding through a combination of the pupil-led factors, the lowest being 82.0%. In total 77% of authorities are allocating between 88% and 94% of their funding through these factors.

Across all authorities, a total of 89.84% of funding in 2016-17 formulae is being allocated through the pupil-led factors. This compares to 89.73% in 2015-16 formulae, 89.56% in 2014-15 and 89.46% in 2013-14.

Lump sum

In 2016-17 formulae, local authorities can use this factor to allocate a lump sum of the same amount to all schools, up to a maximum of £175,000. Separate lump sums can be specified for primary schools and secondary schools, up to a maximum of £175,000. All-through schools receive the lump sum specified for secondary schools. Middle schools receive a weighted combination of the two, based on the number of year groups of each phase present at the school. For a school which amalgamated during the 2015 to 2016 financial year, authorities must allocate it additional lump sum funding, so that it receives 85% of the combined lump sums that its predecessors would have received under the 2016-17 formula.




Although this is an optional factor, like last year all local authorities have chosen to include it in their 2016-17 funding formulae³. There is substantial variation in the value of the lump sums selected. For both primary and secondary lump sums, they range from £48,480, up to the maximum £175,000, which was chosen by 14 authorities for their primary lump sum amount and 36 for their secondary lump sum.


There are 86 authorities that have selected equal primary and secondary lump sum amounts. Fifty-four have selected a greater secondary lump sum than primary; and 12 authorities have selected a greater primary lump sum than secondary.

Note that in the lump sum - amounts chosen charts, lump sum choices of exactly a multiple of £10,000 are shown in the category for which that is the top of the band: so for example the two local authorities with a primary lump sum of £140,000 are included in the “£130k to £140k” category.

³ Isles of Scilly are the LA represented by the “Not chosen” bar for 2016-17 primary lump sum amounts; they did not select a primary lump sum but did specify a secondary lump sum. City of London and Haringey are the LAs represented by the “Not chosen” bar for 2016-17 secondary lump sum amounts; City of London LA has only a single primary school, and they selected a primary lump sum but not a secondary lump sum.



Overall, local authorities are allocating a slightly lower proportion of their schools block funding through the lump sum factor than last year: 8.2% in 2016-17 compared to 8.3% in 2015-16.




Sparsity

This factor was introduced into the funding formula arrangements in 2014-15. Whether a school is deemed to be sparse depends on two considerations: its “sparsity distance” and the average number of pupils per year group.


A school’s sparsity distance is derived from those pupils for whom it is their closest school (irrespective of whether they attend it). For all those pupils, the average distance

to their second nearest school for these pupils is calculated. Distances are calculated using the crow flies distance from a pupil’s postcode to a school’s postcode.

The sparsity factor may be applied to small schools where the average distance to pupils’ second nearest school is at least 2 miles (for primary schools, middle schools and all-through schools) or 3 miles (for secondary schools). Schools must also have an average number of pupils per year group no larger than 21.4 pupils for primary schools, 120 pupils for secondary schools, 69.2 pupils for middle schools or 62.5 pupils for all-through schools. Local authorities can narrow the eligibility criteria for the factor, by increasing the average distance to the second nearest school and / or reducing the average pupil number maximum thresholds, but they cannot widen the eligibility criteria. Local authorities can set different sparsity lump sum amounts for each of these four phases of school, up to a maximum of £100,000 per school. They can also choose in each case whether to apply a ‘taper’ so that the funding given to a sparse school depends on how many pupils they have (so that the smaller schools receive higher sparsity funding) or that all sparse schools receive the same specified sparsity lump sum. Additional sparsity funding of £50,000 can also be allocated to very small, sparse secondary schools.



Only 24 local authorities are using the sparsity factor in 2016-17 (the same as in 2015-16) with 128 not incorporating it into their formula. Many of those authorities not using the factor do not have any schools meeting the maximum permissible average year group size and minimum permissible distance thresholds for eligibility for funding through the factor, so do not have any sparse schools.




Of those that are using the factor, and excluding the Isles of Scilly (a notional 4%), the proportion of their schools block funding which they are allocating through this factor ranged from 0.03% to 0.94%. Across all authorities, 0.05% of funding has been allocated through this factor, the same as in 2015-16 formulae.

Other formula factors

Information for each local authority on the formula factors not discussed in this note (London fringe, split sites, rates, PFI funding, historic commitments of dedicated schools grant funding for sixth forms, and exceptional circumstances) can be found in the accompanying data file.

Primary:secondary funding ratios

Local authorities' 2016-17 schools block funding formulae have been used to calculate the relative differences in per-pupil funding allocated to secondary pupils compared to primary pupils. With the exception of the City of London, which has a single maintained primary school so does not have secondary pupils, the ratios of secondary to primary per-pupil funding under 2016-17 formulae are shown on the chart below. A ratio of 1 : 1.24, for instance, indicates that secondary-age pupils in a local authority receive, on average, 24% more funding per head than primary-age pupils.




The overall ratio nationally across all local authorities is 1 : 1.29, a very slight increase from the 2015-16 formulae when the figure was 1 : 1.28. The median local authority ratio is 1 : 1.30, as slight increase from 1 : 1.29 in the previous two years. For 7 authorities, their ratio in 2015-16 has decreased by more than 0.01 compared to last year, while for 12 authorities, their ratio has increased by more than 0.01. For the remaining 133 authorities, their ratio changed by less than 0.01 either way.

These ratios have been calculated for each local authority from the information they submitted to the EFA as follows. The first step is to split funding for primary pupils and funding for secondary pupils. For the factors with separate primary and secondary indicators (for example, basic entitlement and deprivation), this split is simply the amount of funding allocated through each type of indicator. For the other factors (with the exception of historic commitments for sixth form funding, which is excluded), the amount of funding allocated to each school in the local authority area is split between primary and secondary in proportion to the number of pupils in each phase at the school. These amounts are aggregated to estimate the total funding for primary pupils and the total funding for secondary pupils. These amounts are then divided, respectively, by the number of primary schools block-funded pupils on roll and the number of secondary schools block-funded pupils on roll in the authority. This gives per pupil funding amounts for primary and secondary phases, and the ratio of the two is taken.

This calculation excludes the effects on schools' funding of applying the minimum funding guarantee (MFG), and excludes any further capping or scaling factors applied by local authorities to ensure that the total funding allocated through their formulae is affordable within the total DSG schools block they have been allocated for financial year 2016 to 2017. For academies, the calculation is based on the amount of schools block funding they would receive in 2016-17 were they a maintained school.


Notional SEN

Funding for notional special educational needs (notional SEN) is not a separate formula factor. Rather, local authorities must specify how much of the schools block funding a school receives through the formula constitutes its notional SEN budget. In their funding formulae for 2016-17, local authorities specify what percentage of funding allocated through each factor contributes to the notional SEN budget.



The chart above shows how, at overall local authority level, the notional SEN budget in 2016-17 varies as a percentage of the total schools block formula allocation (before the application of MFG, capping and scaling). Some 128 (84%) of authorities are allocating between 5% and 15% of schools block funding as notional SEN.

The overall percentage of formula allocation which is designated as the notional SEN budget across all local authorities is 10.0%, the same as in 2014-15 and 2015-16. The median notional SEN allocation is 8.8%. However, as the chart shows, like last year there is a wide variation across local authorities.



The chart above shows the number of local authorities for which each factor is being used to determine schools' notional SEN budgets. In 2016-17 formulae, prior attainment is again the factor most commonly contributing to notional SEN; 147 of the 148 authorities featuring the factor in their formula are doing this. The majority of authorities are also assigning a percentage of their basic entitlement and deprivation funding into notional SEN. For the formula factors not displayed on the chart (such as sparsity, split sites, etc.) only at most a few authorities are using these for notional SEN in each case. Full details on the use of factors to calculate notional SEN in 2016-17 can be found in the accompanying data file. Overall, the pattern of factors used to calculate notional SEN is similar to 2015-16 formulae.

Growth fund

Subject to the approval of their schools forum, local authorities are able to retain some of their schools block funding centrally (i.e. rather than allocate it to their individual schools) for a growth fund. This can be used only for the purposes of supporting growth in pre-16 pupil numbers to meet basic need pressures, to support additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation, and to meet the costs of new schools. Authorities must use the fund on the same basis for the benefit of both maintained schools and academies in their area.

Some 131 of the 152 authorities are retaining a growth fund in 2016-17, a decrease compared to 132 doing this in their 2015-16 formulae. The total value of these growth funds is £164.4m. Growth fund amounts for individual authorities range from £50,000 to £6.7m.

Falling rolls fund

Local authorities were also able to retain funding centrally for falling rolls to prepare for a future population bulge, again subject to the approval of their schools forum. The falling rolls fund should be restricted to population increases expected in two to three years in necessary schools which are classed by Ofsted as good or outstanding. The fund cannot be used by authorities to prop up unpopular or failing schools.

Only 30 authorities are retaining a falling rolls fund in their 2016-17 formulae (compared with 29 in 2015-16), with a total value of £9.2m. Falling rolls fund amounts for individual authorities range from £7,000 to £1.4m.

Information about the data file

Alongside this document, the DfE has published a detailed data file in Microsoft Excel format showing the 2016-17 funding formula used by each local authority, as they stood at 8 March 2016.

“Proforma” sheet

The sheet entitled “Proforma” allows the full data for a single authority to be displayed on the screen. Click on the purple cell near the top of the page next to the LA Name label, then click on the drop-down arrow that appears alongside, to select a new local authority.

“FINAL MI Data” sheet

The sheet entitled “FINAL MI Data” gives the proforma data values for each authority in a large table. This section provides a description of all the columns displayed here.

Reception Uplift

The “Reception Uplift” column indicates which local authorities have opted to increase the count of primary pupils to which the basic entitlement primary indicator applies, to include pupils with deferred entry into reception later in the year. The other column in this section indicates the number of pupils this applies to.

Basic entitlement

This section shows the per-pupil funding amounts local authorities have chosen for the primary and secondary indicators in their 2016-17 formulae; the number of pupils in mainstream maintained schools and academies in the authority as a whole to which each indicator applies; the total amount of schools block funding allocated to maintained schools and academies through each factor; the proportion of schools block funding allocated through each factor; and the proportion of the factor’s funding which contributes towards notional SEN budgets.

Deprivation, looked-after children, prior attainment, English as an additional language, mobility

These sections also show the per-pupil amounts chosen, the number of pupils, the total/proportion of funding allocated to schools through each factor, and contribution to notional SEN budgets. For the indicators where local authorities had a choice as to which specific measure to use for their formulae, columns indicate the selection. Explanations for the entries in these columns are given below. For each, the entry “N/A” means that a local authority has chosen not to use a particular factor or indicator.

Deprivation – Primary FSM Factor, Secondary FSM Factor:

- FSM % Primary / FSM % Secondary: Indicator used is the number of pupils who are eligible for FSM.
- FSM6 % Primary / FSM6 % Secondary: Indicator used is the number of pupils who are FSM Ever 6.

English as an additional language – Primary (1/2/3/NA), Secondary (1/2/3/NA):

- EAL 1 Primary / EAL 1 Secondary: Indicator used is the number of pupils with EAL who entered the compulsory school system in the last year.
- EAL 2 Primary / EAL 2 Secondary: Indicator used is the number of pupils with EAL who entered the compulsory school system in either of the last 2 years.
- EAL 3 Primary / EAL 3 Secondary: Indicator used is the number of pupils with EAL who entered the compulsory school system in any of the last 3 years.

Prior attainment – Primary Low Attainment (73/78/NA):

- Low Attainment % old FSP 73: Indicator used is the number pupils in years 4 to 6 who did not achieve 73 points or more in the old early years foundation stage profile.
- Low Attainment % old FSP 78: Indicator used is the number pupils in years 4 to 6 who did not achieve 78 points or more in the old early years foundation stage profile.

Lump sum

Lump sum funding is shown in two places in the data file. Most funding through the lump sum factor is shown in the group of columns entitled “Lump sum”. However there is also a small amount of lump sum funding displayed in the “Exceptional circumstances” section, in the first four columns of this group (all of which have a column title “Additional lump sum...”). The data here relates specifically to additional lump sum funding which authorities are allocating to schools which amalgamated during the 2015 to 2016 financial year. As explained previously, authorities must allocate such schools additional lump sum funding, so that they receive 85% of the combined lump sums of its predecessors. Authorities could also apply to continue protection for schools which amalgamated during the 2014 to 2015 financial year. The data are presented in this way because authorities recorded any additional lump sum funding for previous year amalgamations in a different section of their formula submission.

Therefore the total amount of funding that each authority is allocating through the lump sum factor is obtained by summing the values in the “Lump Sum total” and “Additional lump sum total” columns. Similarly, the proportion allocated through the lump sum factor is obtained by summing the values in the “Lump Sum proportion” and “Additional lump sum proportion” columns.

Sparsity

Sparsity funding is also shown in two places in the data file. Most funding through the sparsity factor is shown in the group of columns entitled “Sparsity”. However there is also a small amount of sparsity funding displayed in the “Exceptional circumstances” section, in the group of three columns following the additional lump sum data. The data here relates specifically to additional sparsity funding which authorities are allocating to very small, sparse secondary schools.

(London) fringe payments, split sites, rates, PFI funding, sixth form, exceptional circumstances

These sections of the data file show the total funding and proportions of funding allocated to schools through each factor.

Schools block

The “Total Funding Schools Block Formula Excl MFG Funding Total (£)” column gives the total amount of money allocated to mainstream maintained schools and academies in 2016-17 under local authorities’ basic funding formulae.

Minimum funding guarantee

The MFG protects the per-pupil funding of schools from one year to the next and for 2016-17 has been set at -1.5%. The column “Minimum Funding Guarantee (£)” is the total funding authorities are allocating to their schools, over and above the amounts derived through their basic formula, to ensure this condition is met.

In addition, local authorities are allowed to set capping and scaling factors to ensure that the amount of funding allocated through their formula (and including any additional funding to ensure the MFG is met) fits within the total DSG schools block available to them. Any change in the per-pupil funding amount in 2016-17 compared to 2015-16 for an individual school can be capped at a level specified by the local authority: these caps are given in the column “Capping Factor”. Any school which sees its per-pupil funding increase by more than the level of the cap will see any additional increase scaled back, to some extent (see next paragraph). For example, in this column a 0% cap means that the local authority will start scaling back any increase in per-pupil funding. A capping factor of 2% means that any rise in per-pupil funding of more than 2% will be scaled back.

The column “Scaling Factor” indicates the amounts by which schools’ increases in per-pupil funding over the level of the cap will be reduced. So, for example, a 100% scaling factor means that ALL increases in per-pupil funding above the level of the cap will be removed – in other words the cap is a strict limit on the increase in per-pupil funding in 2016-17 compared to 2015-16. Similarly, a 50% scaling factor means that schools will

lose half of any per-pupil funding increase above the level of the cap. Authorities showing 0% values in both the “Capping Factor” column and the “Scaling Factor” column are not restricting per-pupil increases compared to 2015-16 in order to stay within their available funding.

The “Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied (£)” column shows the total amounts that have been taken off school budgets due to the application of the capping and scaling factors. Clearly, any school requiring additional funding in addition to that specified by a local authority’s basic formula in order to meet the MFG will not also be subject to capping and scaling reductions. Any entry of zero in this column means that capping and scaling has not led to any deductions in funding compared to the basic formula for any schools in the local authority area.

Totals

The “Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (£)” column shows the total schools block funding allocated to mainstream maintained schools and academies in each local authority under their 2016-17 formulae, after additions for MFG funding and deductions from capping and scaling. Note that these figures will not exactly match the total DSG schools block funding for 2016-17 that has been allocated to each local authority. This is for a number of reasons. The funding formulae specify the funding allocated to individual schools, and so exclude central schools block budgets (such as the growth fund and falling rolls fund, which are shown in the correspondingly named columns). The DSG funding blocks are notional and local authorities can move funding between blocks. Also the funding formulae will reflect any brought forward over- and under-spends, and authorities supplementing DSG from other funding sources.

For the other columns in this section:

- % Distributed through Basic Entitlement – the proportion of schools block funding being allocated through the basic entitlement factor in each local authority, prior to MFG and capping and scaling.
- % Pupil Led Funding – the proportion of schools block funding being allocated through the pupil-led factors (i.e. basic entitlement, deprivation, looked-after children, prior attainment, English as an additional language, and mobility), prior to MFG and capping and scaling.
- Primary/Secondary Ratio – the local authority’s primary:secondary funding ratio; a figure of 1.24, for example, denotes a ratio of 1 : 1.24, meaning that secondary-age pupils in a local authority receive, on average, 24% more funding per head than primary-age pupils.



Education
Funding
Agency

© Crown copyright 2016

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications

Reference: EFA-00166-2016



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk