

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Note: the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee was supportive of the LA's proposals, as set out in the consultation with schools, and looked forward to receiving feedback from the consultation at its meeting in October 2013.

Consultation question	School responses	Schools' comments	Working group response	The LA's latest proposal
Q1 Do you agree that the secondary school lump sum should be increased to £0.175m?	<p>Primary: Yes – 82% No – 18%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 80% No – 20%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the secondary sector.</p>	<p>There were few comments. Clearly, primary schools were generally supportive and the only concern centred on the impact upon primary school budgets (note: there will be no impact). Mixed views were express by secondary schools. One supported the protection of small schools whilst another questioned the educational opportunities for pupils in small secondary schools.</p>	<p>A detailed discussion took place. The challenges faced by some secondary schools and the LA's strategic approach to this were discussed.</p> <p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to increase the secondary school block allocation to £0.175m, with that being funded from the secondary sector's age weighted pupil unit value.</p> <p>This marks a partial reversal of the change made for 2013/14. One again, the minimum funding guarantee will continue to offer protection to schools.</p>
Q2 Do you agree that the sparsity factor should not be introduced in the primary sector?	<p>Primary: Yes – 75% No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%</p>	<p>There were few comments. No common concerns were cited.</p>	<p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school budgets.</p>

	<p>This question is relevant to the primary sector.</p> <p>Primary: Yes – 75% No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 60% No – 40%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the secondary sector.</p>	<p>There were very few comments.</p>	<p>One member suggested that a more strategic approach to small secondary schools was necessary.</p> <p>The working group supported the LA's proposal. One member of the Schools Forum voted against.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to introduce a sparsity factor for secondary schools. This will be set at a rate of £0.1m per school and operate without tapering.</p> <p>This will be funded from the age weighted pupil unit value in the secondary sector.</p> <p>Like the proposed increase in the lump sum factor (see above), this will partially offset the loss in funding suffered by some small secondary schools in 2013/14. Unfortunately, not all small secondary schools will benefit due to the DfE's qualifying criteria (i.e. a school must have < 600 pupils on roll and an average sparsity distance of > 3 miles).</p>
<p>Q3 Do you agree that the sparsity factor should be introduced for secondary schools at a rate of £0.1m per school, and without tapering?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 75% No – 25%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 100% No – 0%</p> <p>This question is more relevant to the secondary sector at present.</p>	<p>There were few comments that dissented from the LA's proposal. One primary school suggested that the difficulties outlined in the consultation regarding subjectivity of funding allocations could be overcome. Two secondary schools objected to the DfE's exclusion from this funding of schools that are not assessed by OFSTED to be good or outstanding.</p>	<p>The working group recognised the significant impact falling rolls were having on some small secondary schools, but concluded that the introduction of this factor could not solve these complex situations. The LA's approach to these issues was outlined.</p> <p>The working group unanimously</p>	<p>The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school funding.</p>
<p>Q4 Do you agree that the LA should not introduce a factor to support schools with falling rolls?</p>				

<p>Q5 Do you agree that the LA should seek to maintain the same overall level of funding for low cost, high incidence SEN to ensure stability in funding, rather than re-direct more funding into this factor from other pupil-led factors?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 100% No – 0%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 80% No – 20%</p> <p>This question is relevant to the secondary sector.</p>	<p>There were very few comments. No common concerns were cited.</p>	<p>supported the LA's proposal.</p> <p>The working group acknowledged that the LA's funding of SEN is a little above the national average and that there is no justification at this time for increasing the funding distributed through this factor.</p> <p>The working group unanimously supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to maintain the current level of low cost, high incidence SEN funding in the secondary sector. Although more pupils will qualify for funding due to the DfE's amendment to the qualifying criteria (i.e. those that do not attain the expected level at Key Stage 2 in English or Maths) the impact upon individual secondary schools should be very modest indeed.</p>
<p>Q6 Do you agree that the LA should not introduce a factor for pupil mobility?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 82% No – 18%</p> <p>Secondary: Yes – 100% No – 0%</p>	<p>There were a few comments from primary schools, but mixed views were expressed. Some schools felt that the impact of pupil mobility was not recognised by the LA. By contrast, one school stated that these children attract the pupil premium and another recognised that the DfE's proposed use of October census information would severely undermine the effectiveness of this factor.</p>	<p>The working group acknowledged that the sums that would be allocated to schools would not be material and so the introduction of this factor would run counter to the government's vision for a simplified funding formula.</p> <p>The working group unanimously</p>	<p>The LA does not propose to introduce this factor and therefore there will be no impact upon school budgets.</p>

<p>Q7 Do you agree that a factor for Looked After Children should be introduced in primary and secondary schools in 2014/15?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 79% No – 21% Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%</p>	<p>There were few comments. Those against the proposal suggested that the pupil premium should provide sufficient funding.</p>	<p>supported the LA's proposal.</p>	<p>The working group concluded that the impact of this funding should be monitored; good practice guidance should be issued to schools; a protocol should be agreed between schools to allow the funding to follow pupils mid year, and; the funding should be used to enable LAC to access education, as some don't attend school.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to introduce this factor. Funding released from the unwinding of transitional protection arrangements this year can be used to finance this additional cost, so there should be no negative impact upon schools' existing budgets.</p>
<p>Q8 Do you agree that the funding for the Looked After Children factor should be set at £1,200 per pupil?</p>	<p>Primary: Yes – 79% No – 21% Secondary: Yes – 90% No – 10%</p>	<p>There were a few comments. These were mixed and there was no common theme.</p>	<p>The working group considered the sum proposed was reasonable and acknowledged that it would be for each school to determine how best to deploy the additional resource.</p>	<p>The LA proposes to set the rate at £1,200. As indicated above, the funding released from the unwinding of transitional protection arrangements this year can be used to finance this additional cost, so there should be no negative impact upon schools' existing budgets.</p>	