

## B&NES Consultation on the School Funding Reform for 2014-15

### Summary of Responses Including Comments

**No. of Primary Schools responded out of 62 – 26**

**No. of Secondary Schools responded out of 13 – 8**

**No. of Other responses – Governors, officers, councillors, Finance Officers - 0**

#### Lump Sum

**Question 1** - Do you agree that the lump sum should remain the same as 2013-14 at £115,642 for both primary and secondary schools, providing further changes are not suggested dealing with alterations in other factors?

Question 1	Yes	No	Left Blank
Primary Response	25		1
Secondary Response	6	2	
Others			

#### **Question 1 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
St Johns Bath	I am sure that other factors have been considered before this sum was produced. I would suggest that it seems high and that a number of the factors below should be addressed before a final lump sum figure is produced. In short, maybe somewhat high but should be the same for all schools.
Oldfield Park Infants	We are happy to take the recommendation of the formula review group
Wellsway	We don't feel there is any benefit to secondary school to increase the amount as this would simply take funding away from larger schools
Welton	We agree to keep it as is
St Marks	Governors feel that the sum given to all schools, or at least all Secondary Schools is increased to the maximum of £175,000 for 2014-15 as for small schools this is crucial to cover costs that pertain to all schools.
Farnborough	I agree with a lump sum. Although I think it should be of the order of £125K to £140K which would help better support the smaller and rural schools in the BANES area
Pensford	If the DFE have restricted the amount primary school receive to £175,000 and primary schools are only receiving £115,642 where's the extra £59,358 going?
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	If the DFE have restricted the amount primary schools receive to £175,000 and primary schools are only receiving £115,642 where's the extra £59,358 going?
Paulton Juniors	Seems fair given that secondary schools are able to generate more additional income than primaries.

#### Sparsity Factor

**Question 2** - Do you agree that a sparsity factor should **not be** introduced?

Question 2	Yes	No	Left Blank
Primary Response	22	4	
Secondary Response	7		1
Other			

#### **Question 2 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
WASPS	It seems premature to introduce such a factor without an overall review of primary school place provision within BANES and the potential role of small rural schools. If such a factor were to be introduced there would need to be a clear cost benefit analysis in terms of demand, potential educational impact and transport costs.

Oldfield Park Infants	Provided that this does not disadvantage any one group of pupils
Chew Valley	It has been pointed out to me that the question is a double negative! My belief is there should not be a sparsity factor!
Wellsway	Doesn't affect secondary schools therefore there is no point
Welton	We agree
Farmborough	I agree with the Forum on this. I think for BANES a sparsity factor adds to the complication of the formula computation without adding any real benefits to any schools. Easier to disregard it.
St Stephens	There seems little local need
Pensford	Yes as only 3 schools will currently benefit from this allowances
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	Yes as only 3 schools will currently benefit from this allocation
Paulton Juniors	Affects hardly any schools as BANES is quite compact.

### **Mobility Factor**

**Question 3** - Do you agree that a pupil mobility factor should be introduced?

<b>Question 3</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Left Blank</b>
Primary Response	16	10	
Secondary Response	6	2	
Others			

**Question 3 - Additional Comments:**

<b>School</b>	<b>Comment</b>
WASPS	There is considerable evidence of the impact of mobility on individual pupils and it is entirely fair that individual schools should be funded to meet the additional demands which are created
Wellsway	This does not affect secondary schools so there is no point
Welton	We feel that there is little benefit. Only a handful of schools gain
Farmborough	This makes sense for short term mobility 2 to 3 months etc. What about schools who see a sudden increase in numbers through normal admissions? You can plan for leavers not the number of starters via BANES own admissions!
St Stephens	This seems to positively benefit only one school and the detrimental effect is difficult to understand in terms of the relativities
Pensford	This only benefits a limited number of schools, yet all schools would have their funding reduced.
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	This only benefits a limited number of schools, yet all schools would have their funding reduced.
St Andrews	Mobility does not necessarily mean EAL. As a school which experience high mobility, we do find that pupils starting mid-year require additional funding, or who leave without being 'counted'. Clearly those without high mobility will not agree.
Paulton Juniors	Only significantly affects a few schools in BANES as a positive change however, more schools are adversely affected.
Westfield	As a large school we would require over 34 children to move in/out during the academic year.

**Question 4** - Do you agree that the sum of £500 per qualifying mobile pupil is allocated to schools?

<b>Question 4</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Left Blank</b>
Primary Response	19	7	
Secondary Response	6	2	
Others			

**Question 4 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
WASPS	This appears to be a reasonable level and we support the underlying rationale
Welton	Not really needed. We would question whether pupils actually need this
Farmborough	I would have thought they would be entitled to the Pro-rata element of the Basic pupil element from DFE for the duration of their stay at any particular school. BANES should reclaim from DFE?
St Stephens	This seems to positively benefit only one school and the detrimental effect is difficult to understand in terms of the relativities
Pensford	This sum would contribute towards resources and supporting integration
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	This sum would contribute towards resources and supporting integration
St Andrews	For a school like ours which is heavily affected by MFG it seems unreasonable that the CAP prevents us from benefitting from this much needed resource.
Paulton Juniors	Would prefer not to use a mobility factor however can see that this factor will provide additional funding for smaller schools facing increased "in year" pupils.

**Question 5** - Do you agree that a pupil led factor is reduced to support the new factor?

Question 5	Yes	No	Left Blank
Primary Response	14	12	
Secondary Response	6	2	
Others			

**Question 5 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
Oldfield Park Infants	This does not seem to have a significantly adverse effect on any single school's budget
Welton	We do not want to reduce the pupil led factor. Would prefer more pupil led funding for majority rather than minority. We are not convinced that this factor is required.
Farmborough	If only one or 2 schools are impacted can't this be modelled into the budgets? Then adjusted via a forecast once actual pupil numbers known? Then money claimed by the schools from BANES as required?
St Stephens	This seems to positively benefit only one school and the detrimental effect is difficult to understand in terms of the relativities
Pensford	The pupil led factor should remain untouched
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	The pupil led factor should remain untouched
Paulton Juniors	No, but can't suggest an alternative funding method. Per pupil entitlement fairest factor to use.

### **Targeted Support for High Needs pupils**

**Question 6** - Do you agree that this methodology is the best for ensuring that resources are targeted to the schools that take in more than the average number of pupils with statements of SEN?

Question 6	Yes	No	Left Blank
Primary Response	25	1	
Secondary Response	7	1	
Others			

**Question 6 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
WASPS	This methodology has worked well for our school in 2013/14
Oldfield Park Infants	Re: EYTF we are concerned that children with high levels of EYTF are not included in the count of statements. Last year 12/13 there were a large number of applications for Statutory Assessment across the LA for children who had received high levels of EYTF. These applications had to be made by Jan 13, however, many assessments were not completed by May and therefore the children did not count. For example at

	this school 3 children on receipt of EYTF were statemented later in the summer term. This brought our total of statements to 6 however we have not qualified for the additional support.
St Keyna	I don't agree that schools should only receive funding for a greater than average number of pupils with SEN. Plus, for schools who do have a greater than average number, it still leaves a number of pupils with statements of SEN without funding.
Welton	Yes agree but preferred old Matrix funding method of allocating SEN funding. Easier for schools to calculate support and funds available. Current method more complicated. Some schools have difficulty funding first £6,000 for each new statemented pupil.
St Marks	Schools with a higher proportion of statemented children need educational funding to assist with associated problems of disruption in year groups and to aid inclusion for the pupils concerned.
Farmborough	Makes sense to monitor SEN over the course of a school year. Pro-rata any additional support to the school that requires it.
St Stephens	The methodology is very appropriate, but the amounts seem wrong. Particularly the average allocation of 1 to 60. The very small sums reallocated (representing about 5 children only) beg questions about where the average mark is placed. Neither method appears to redress the balance
Pensford	It supports inclusion in smaller schools
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	It supports inclusion in smaller schools
Batheaston	Within the restrictions imposed by the DFE, this is a helpful methodology
Oldfield Secondary	Each school should be funded for actual numbers
Cameley	However, just to clarify, does this mean in our case for example; we have two pupils with statements and 107 NOR and currently only receive the SEN budget allocation of 10k. Would we the receive the first £6,000 for each statemented pupil?
St Andrews	Mobility of pupils with statements?
Paulton Juniors	Seems the fairest way to allocate the funding
Ralph Allen	Please note that the overall MFG methodology quotes figures that are not the final EFA provision for 13/14 - understand the principle of impact is the issue here but accurate data would be helpful. Thanks

**Question 7** - Do you agree that the targeted support fund should change from the current methodology?

Question 7	Yes	No	Left Blank
Primary Response	19	5	2
Secondary Response	8		
Others			

**Question 7 - Additional Comments:**

School	Comment
WASPS	See comments above and below. We feel that in principle the methodology has worked well. However we are happy to consider refining the basic model
Oldfield Park Infants	It seems fairer that the full amount of £6000 should be received
Welton	Prefer monthly allocation as new statements occur ad hoc during the year. Given a choice we would have preferred the old matrix/SEN funding methodology as this was easier to calculate and budget for
St Stephens	It should make the situation more equitable. Neither method convincingly does so.
Pensford	The current method is complex and hard to explain and forecast
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	The current method is complex and hard to explain and forecast
Paulton Juniors	Not a significant change to schools

**Question 8** - Do you prefer Option 1 or Option 2?

<b>Question 8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Left Blank</b>
Primary Response	19	5	2
Secondary Response	4	3	1
Others			

**Question 8 - Additional Comments:**

<b>School</b>	<b>Comment</b>
WASPS	It makes sense to adopt a tapered approach
Oldfield Park Infants	£6,000 per pupil balances what the school is expected to contribute.
Chew Valley	Option 1 is clear and treats pupils with high needs as individuals and with equality
St Keyna	If forced to choose between them then option 1
Welton	We prefer option 1. Simpler to calculate. More beneficial to us
St Marks	Option 2 preferred, as a larger number of High Needs pupils brings with it increased and more expensive support needs
St Stephens	Neither. Option 2 appears fairer in that the tapered approach ought to make redistribution more robust – but on looking at the actual financial effect, it does not.
Pensford	Option 1 as more schools benefit
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	Option 1 as more schools benefit
Oldfield Secondary	Neither
St Andrews	Option 2 – more inclusive.
Paulton Juniors	Option 1 appears to hardly increase the primary allocation whereas Option 2 reduces the total allocation. Option 2 has more impact on primaries' modelled budgets. Prefer Option 1.
Ralph Allen	Although we would benefit from the sliding scale model – we believe the whole system is better supported by option 1. We seek – as the historical level access school that attracts a higher proportion of targeted need than average – is more visible support in adapting buildings and services, through letters of support and bid/scope development. This we feel would be a more appropriate way to support leverage & additional funding for our school who adapt to a higher level due to the percentage of higher needs students welcomed on behalf of the Bath education system.

**Question 9** - Are there other alternatives you think should be considered?

<b>Question 9</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Left Blank</b>
Primary Response	5	11	10
Secondary Response	2	5	1
Others			

**Question 9 - Additional Comments:**

<b>School</b>	<b>Comment</b>
WASPS	Given the very significant changes last year, and the short timescale of this consultation, we believe that the new funding formula as a whole should have time to bed in. The changes proposed in the consultation document are modest and sensible, but we would not support making any further changes unless these are required to meet statutory obligations.
Oldfield Juniors	Statement are fully funded as in previous years
St Keyna	Statements are awarded to individual children, and they need to have extensive needs to be awarded one. This extra support should be funded for each child confirmed as needing it. The proposed scheme will discourage smaller schools from accepting pupils with special needs, as there is less slack in their budgets to support the unfunded children.

Welton	Alternative: revert back to old system where each pupil's statement is fully funded and allocated as soon as they receive statement. School doesn't have to find £6,000 for each statement but is given an allocation as a percentage of SEN to use for SEN resources etc. This was far easier to calculate and budget for and easier for staff and governors to understand.
St Stephens	We would be interested to explore any method that targeted money to schools where relatively high numbers of statements occur. Perhaps a reduction in lump sum to free money for targeted allocation might help.
Pensford	Allocated resources on a monthly basis rather than the proposed termly basis. Investigate another method of obtaining payment from other Local Authorities e.g. Bristol
Camerton, St Julians & Shoscombe	Allocated resources on a monthly basis rather than the proposed termly basis. Investigate another method of obtaining payment from other Local Authorities e.g. Bristol
Batheaston	We know LA officers acknowledge that there is still a financial penalty for schools that have a greater number of high needs children. In order to support the core value of Inclusion, we would ask that the LA continues to look for ways to support all schools in this position, e.g. find funding from sources unaffected by the restrictions imposed by DFE regulations. The Governors are grateful that so much time and commitment has been given to ameliorating the effects of the DFE formula.
Oldfield Secondary	Fund for actual numbers
St Andrews	Because of the MFG schools like St Andrew's is not receiving the level of funding that central government considers appropriate. We recognise the need to manage this introduction of new systems so that schools that lose have a chance to adjust, but 3 years should be the maximum in which to do this from the date of the introduction of the new formula.
Paulton Juniors	The LA will have a good understanding of the strategic implications of any changes made & have already considered many scenarios. Little significant change to overall individual funding & difficult to estimate pupil changes in future.
Ralph Allen	As above : working together to leverage funding from other sources rather than trying to divide existing funds in a different way.