Review of 2013-14 School Funding Arrangements

Response Form

The closing date for responding is 26 March 2013.

Your comments must reach us by that date.

Appendix C

The information you provide in your response will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations, which allow public access to information held by the Department. This does not necessarily mean that your response can be made available to the public as there are exemptions relating to information provided in confidence and information to which the Data Protection Act 1998 applies. You may request confidentiality by ticking the box provided, but you should note that neither this, nor an automatically-generated e-mail confidentiality statement, will necessarily exclude the public right of access.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential. ☐

Name:	Jane Porter (Director of Children's Services) on behalf of Dudley Schools Forum
Organisation (if applicable):	Dudley MBC
Address:	Westox House TrinityRoad Dudley DY1 1JQ

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the review document you can email Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.uk

Appendix C

Section 1: Are we moving towards national consistency?

Question 1: Should we set a minimum threshold for the pupil-led factors and, if so, at what level?

Example quoted 85% Dudley currently at 91.6% - this works well for Dudley and endorses the principle of funding being pupil - led

Suggested response: Yes

Dudley's 2013/14 funding for deprivation was based on the equivalent budgets allocated through the 2012/13 formula.

Dudley targets 3.9% of funding into deprivation

prior

Dudley's 2013/14 funding for prior attainment was based on the equivalent budgets allocated through the 2012/13 formula for underattainment together with the first £6000 of statement funding. This was then allocated to schools based on the number of pupils identified within the DfE data set.

(Dudley currently 4.1%)

Appendix C

Section 2: Areas of concern and possible changes for 2014-15

Prior Attainment

Question 4: Do you agree that local authorities should continue to use EYFSP data as an attainment-related proxy or should we consider use of a different indicator to identify low cost SEN in primary schools? If so, what indicator?

EYFSP data will not be available after 2013/14.
HTCF-BWG and Schools Forum to comments on different indicators available to use

Pupil mobility

Question 5: Would it help to allow an additional weighting to be given if a school experiences in-year changes to pupil numbers above a certain threshold? If so, where should this threshold be set?

Dudley decided to not use this factor for 2013/14. However, if used this formula factor could only use the DfE mobility data based on the previous 3 years.

HTCF – BWG & Schools Forum to comment.

The lump sum

Question 6: In areas with large numbers of small schools, could the problem of having a fixed lump sum be overcome by reducing the relevant AWPU?

Dudley schools don't match DfE criteria for "small schools" (less than100 pupils) but the principle of reducing AWPU to increase the lump sum for some schools is a possible solution but not always affordable.

HTCF – BWG & Schools Forum to comment.

Appendix C

Question 8: We said in June that we would review the level of the lump sum cap (currently £200,000) for 2014-15 in order to establish whether it is the minimum cap needed to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools. If we continued with one lump sum for both primary and secondary, what would be the minimum level of cap needed to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools? If we had separate lump sums for primary and secondary, what would be the minimum cap needed for each in order to ensure the sustainability of necessary small schools?

Dudley's lump sum is £130k. Minimum cap for small schools – HTCF – BWG & Schools Forum to comment Minimum cap for primary and secondary - HTCF – BWG & Schools Forum to comment

sed
schools becoming unviable?

Suggested response: Other L.A.s affected by this to comment – N/A for Dudley.

Suggested response: Other L.A.s affected by this to comment – N/A for Dudley.

n in
een

Suggested response : Yes – Dudley would wish to retain Lump Sum factor as "smaller" schools not necessarily covered by DfE definition do require lump sum funding to contribute to unavoidable fixed costs and overheads not covered by "per pupil" funding

Question 12: What alternative sparsity measures could we use to identify necessary small schools in rural areas?

Suggested response: Other L.A.s affected by this to comment – N/A for Dudley.

HTCF– BWG & Schools Forum to comment

indicators in order to prevent significant losses to schools with a high proportion of deprived pupils, why do you think that is the case?

Suggested response: The issue for Dudley was the mainstreaming of grants which previously targeted a significant amount of funding to a few schools. Whichever methodology used for targeting funding under the new framework would not replicate the historic values to these few schools.

deprivation, mobility and pastoral care through the Pupil Premium) require additional funding in order to achieve as well as non-service children?

Suggested response N/A

Appendix C

Other groups of pupils

Question 16: Have the 2013-14 reforms prevented local authorities from targeting funding to groups of pupils that need additional support? If so, which?

Issue for Dudley MBC

- Ex- statement funded pupils attract same value as LCHI pupils up to £6k threshold - is this fair ?

- Pupils arriving in the country with no EYSFP or KS2 results receive no additional funding as no prior attainment data exists but additional support is required
- Children with physical disabilities with no SEN do not attract additional funding under

Question 17: In cases where a population bulge is imminent, what is preventing good and necessary schools from staying open?

Suggested response: HTCF– BWG & Schools Forum to comment

the

Suggested response: HTCF– BWG & Schools Forum to comment

Section 3: Options for adjusting high needs funding in 2014-15 and beyond

Question 19: Would a formula factor that indicates those pupils who receive top-up funding be a useful addition to help deal with the funding of high needs?

The proposal is to include "High Needs" indicator in School Census from 2015-16 for pupils receiving top-up funding to help to identify those schools which have disproportionate population of pupils with High Needs. "could be used to target extra funding". UBUTU if a formula factor means extra funding is from Schools budget rather than HNB Suggested response: HTCF– BWG & Schools Forum to comment

cal
000

threshold? Should it be made a requirement from 2014-15?

Suggested response: Yes

tice

Suggested response: Yes helpful when new systems are changing.

tems

Suggested response: the planned place returns submitted by local authorities to the DfE should be one comprehensive list and not 2 separate documents.

Appendix C

Section 4: Schools Forums

Question 23: Do you think that Schools Forums are operating more democratically and transparently? If not, what further measures could the Department take in order to improve this?

Suggested response: No impact for Dudley Schools Forum – was previously operating democratically and transparently

Appendix C

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 26March 2013.

Send by e-mail to: Funding.REVIEW2013-14@education.gsi.gov.ukT

Send by post to:

Anita McLoughlin
Funding Policy Unit
4th Floor
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT