

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
1	Bishop Ramsey	A	<p>The Governors of Bishop Ramsey School accept the genuine effort in the consultation document to achieve a fairer and more transparent funding formula. We have two concerns:</p> <p>Firstly the range between the funding allocated to the best and worst funded schools in the secondary sector is too great, with the best funded receiving 45% more than the worst funded even before the additional effect of the pupil premium is taken into account. We therefore feel that the formula should be re-examined for 2013-14 (assuming that a national formula has not by then been established) with the explicit aim of narrowing the gap between the best and worst funded schools. There will clearly need to be consultation on what constitutes a fair differential.</p> <p>Secondly, the damping mechanism is insufficient to properly shield schools which lose from very harsh budget cuts, which will inevitably require redundancies.</p>	D	For the reasons outlined above we prefer a slower transition taking place over 3 years	
2	Oak Farm Junior	A		K		
3	Laurel Lane Primary	D	<p>The Governors at Laurel Lane Primary School in West Drayton consider that the new funding formula does not adequately recognise the resource needed to support and educate children who, through no fault of their own, do not enter school at the same level as some of their peers in other parts of the borough.</p> <p>Although the grants are out of date they were originally there to support them and there has been no consideration that they are still needed for these vulnerable and deprived children.</p> <p>This is even more detrimental in the light of the new OfSTED regime which is insisting that all children reach a similar level and the Pupil Premium in no way makes up for the shortfall</p>			

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
4	Hillingdon Primary	A	<p>The Governing Body at Hillingdon Primary School is grateful for the work the local authority has done to draft a revised funding formula and for the extent to which this has addressed concerns expressed by the Governing body of Hillingdon Primary School (HPS) specifically with regard to fairness and transparency. We believe the proposed alterations to the formula have adopted the right approach and the move towards a simpler, more understandable method of delegating funds is to be welcomed.</p> <p>While we agree to the adoption of the proposals for 2012-13 we have a number issues which we believe the Local Authority needs to consider:</p> <p>1. The proposed formula changes are untried even to the extent that the formula amounts for 2012 13 are not modelled within the budget consultation. We are assuming that they will reflect those presented as part of the consultation process (based on 2011-12 data). We would be very concerned if the use of the 2012 data and the 2012-13 devolved funding level caused individual budgets or the overall profile to differ markedly from those presented in this consultation. It is likely however that the damping mechanism will prevent this.</p> <p>2. While we have agreed to the 'package', understanding that any change in one part of the formula may significantly skew funding over all and potentially to the detriment of some or many schools, we have concerns about the basis for Achievement funding, particularly at the use of KS 1 data for KS1 and the influence of one-off highs or lows in performance data. We would urge the Local Authority to revisit this aspect of the formula with a view to considering a) the suitability of other data that is nationally applied and externally monitored (such as the early years profile); and consider the use of a four year average of the most recent data collected at each key stage.</p> <p>3. The Governing body at HPS is also concerned that the achievement criteria is targeted too greatly on underperforming pupils. We feel that schools and pupils that are performing well should be recognised and financially supported. To this end we suggest that the Achievement funding (at present £3.7 Million) should be split into three categories to support all levels of learning. Those targeted for "Improvement" should be independently recognised; those who have reached national averages should be recognised as "Achieving" and those performing significantly above national averages should be recognised as "Achieved". Funding formulae should be devised to allocate funds to these areas. This will spread funding across all targeted teaching initiatives which is surely a fairer distribution. The funding allocation could be based upon schools' agreed targets and adjusted for any shortfall against targets the following year to avoid target inflation. This would deliver funding for initiatives in the year in which they are delivered rather than retrospectively.</p> <p>4. The Governing Body at HPS also feels that the ratio of AWPU should be reviewed in following years once the consequences of these changes have been absorbed. The current weighting which suggests that KS3 & 4 pupils require greater funding levels runs contrary to the recognised wisdom that "Early years" plays a key role in starting a pupil's lifelong learning journey.</p>	A	<p>We agree that a transition is needed but that it should not be over too long a period: this only delays the need for schools to make appropriate adjustments. We believe this two-year period is appropriate but are conscious that some schools will have significant losses and that this may have implications for staffing levels and the potential for redundancies.</p> <p>The Governing Body at HPS recognises the implications of these significant changes on some schools and has no desire to see any pupils disadvantaged by the process of making funding distribution fairer and more transparent. The Governing Body at HPS believes that any decisions taken to mitigate significant losses must also take into account each school's carry forward funding level. Remedial action must not be taken for any school which would still be in possession of carry forward funds. Only those schools which would otherwise run an absolute deficit</p>	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
5	Breakspear Federation	A	<p>We are in agreement with the objectives of the funding formula review and believe that the proposed model is both simpler and fairer than the current formula. Given that the 12/13 Guaranteed per pupil Unit of Funding is the same as that for 11/12, we assume that, except where pupil rolls change, the final 12/13 figures will be of the same order of magnitude as those shown in the spreadsheet provided. If this is not the case, we would certainly need sight of indicative 12/13 figures before final endorsement, or otherwise, of the proposals. Our only concern is that the reduction in the per pupil funding range in the primary sector is relatively small. Whilst we appreciate that some schools, particularly those with the most disadvantaged intakes, have a greater need for funding, the gap between best and worst funded is still £1,777 per pupil, which, for a full 3-form entry primary school, equates to £1.1 million. These figures are before the addition of the Pupil Premium, specifically designed to meet deprivation related issues.</p> <p>Finally, we would like to thank you for the very thorough and genuine consultation process to date (with a particular mention of the opportunities for governor involvement)</p>	A	We think the transitional arrangements are appropriate, given the need to balance the advantages of the proposed changes with the difficulties which will probably be caused for schools with significant potential losses. Given our comment above about the relatively modest reduction in the per pupil funding range, we would certainly not want to see a slower transition or a lower dampening percentage factor used	
6	Harefield Infant	D	Under the current proposals funding for KS1 is determined from KS1 results rather than Foundation Stage data. Retrospective funding of KS1 will disadvantage challenging cohorts particularly where these follow a more gifted cohort. Foundation Stage data for children transferring into KS1 is available and its usage would enable Achievement Funding to be more pertinent to that group	K	Accepting that a transitional factor is needed, the level needs to ensure that schools can take action towards achieving a different level of funding that is consistent with pupil needs and prevailing legislation (particularly relating to employment). For our schools, the current transitional factor amounts to half a teacher or a learning support worker. Bearing in mind phasing between academic and fiscal years this presents us with a significant but realistic challenge year on year. However, the transitional factor was originally conceived to temper the impact of funding changes brought about by changes in schools circumstances and not to address the outcome of a fundamental review of the underlying funding formula. So, whilst the continuity afforded by the transition factor remains appropriate the question arises as to whether this should be applied to the current exercise or whether some other mechanism is needed for this particular transition.	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
7	Ruislip High	D	<p>Whilst we agree in principle with the need to reduce the disparity in funding across the schools, we cannot at this stage support the proposed changes. This is because we are still an expanding school and will be until 2017; we therefore do not have a stable enough budget to allow us to appreciate fully the long term impact of the proposed reduction. For example, we would be loathe to make redundancies, and then need to reappoint staff into similar roles once we reach a better position to forecast on a long term basis.</p> <p>Secondly, whilst these changes are in relation to our KS 2 to 4 funding, we are currently relying on this budget to support our Sixth Form where we are receiving money for fewer students than our roll count and our funding formula is the same as that used in the FE sector. This formula will eventually be in place for all school Sixth Forms but transition relief has been created to ease this painful process for all other schools, we are in the unique position of running a school Sixth Form at this reduced funding level. There is no start up funding for new Sixth Forms at all and in addition, the YPLA is using national statistics in terms of all the other factors which are part of the formula and therefore we have very little internal control on this budget</p>	D	If the finding change is agreed, we would suggest that the transitional linear reduction is over a four year period. This would be most beneficial considering the situation the school is in as outlined in the commentary to question 1	
8	St Bernadette Catholic Primary	A	However we do think that the LA should revisit the formula arrangements for basis of achievement funding and consider a) using Early Years Foundation profile and b) using a 4 year average of most recent end of KS data	A		
9	Unknown	A		A		
10	Rainbow Pre School					I would like to bring to your attention the areas where pre-schools are losing out on funding to school nurseries. Where the school nurseries stagger their in-take sometimes until up to half-term pre-schools do not receive funding as the nurseries have already taken it for that term and the parents do not receive their free entitlement for that half-term. We are therefore faced with a dilemma of asking the parents to pay for what should be a free place or cancelling their child's place with us which is not good for our reputation. Also I have been asked by parents who would like to choose to share their five sessions between both pre-school and nursery how this affects funding. I would be obliged if you could explain how the funding will be allocated in such instances
11	Whiteheath Infant and Nursery	A	However we need to look at changing this for the next financial year. SEN should be based on EYFSP results and not end of KS1 which is retrospective . Otherwise we are being punished for improving children's attainment! I am pleased the fixed factor has been retained	A	However I would prefer a 1 year only transition period	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
12	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary	A	We appreciate the work that was done by the Schools Forum and LA Officers in the Autumn Term 2011. We agree that over time the formula had become complicated and perhaps unfair to certain schools. We would hope that the formula could be carefully monitored in its first year to ensure that actual figures received by schools for 2012/13 reflect the models shown in the consultation	A	It seems sensible to apply a damper of +/- 1.5% each year as a transition factor	
13	Hewens College			D	Hewens College is experiencing a falling roll and will continue to experience a falling roll for the next three years. With this in mind I would like consideration given to moving the transitional protection from 1.5% (Year 1) and 1.5% (Year 2) to 2% (Year 1) and 2% (Year 2). A transitional protection of 1.5% is not enough to sustain the falling roll at Hewens College and would seriously put the college at risk in terms viability. As a college we have spent the last year not only improving results but also a significant amount of time recruiting Year 6's and believe in Year 3 the roll at Hewens College would increase when the proposed transitional protection of 2% would run out. Whilst I am aware there will be a national review on the formula I would welcome some consideration given to my proposal	
14	Rosedale College	K	I agree with the principal of the proposed changes to the school funding formulae, particularly regarding payments made for a on off circumstance should sit outside of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. I believe that the reduction of the fixed payment from £143,000 to £100,000 for Secondary Schools and from £124,383 to £100,000 for primary schools is too big. I appreciate the desire to bring the fixed cost to the same value for Secondary and Primary Schools but this could be achieved by reducing the Secondary fixed costs to the same as Primary i.e. £124,383	D	It would seem to make better sense to protect the schools that are losing money for a longer period of time as those schools who are set to gain are already managing to operate at current funding levels. Those schools set to lose funding will probably need to restructure which could lead to redundancies. If schools restructure their staffing structure in light of potential funding reductions it would seem reasonable to expect the transition period to be over three years to coincide with possible safeguarding of salaries. I would strongly object to the transitional factor being any larger than +/- 1.5%	
15	Highfield Primary	A	We would like it revisited and refined next year as there are still items to address. We appreciate the work of the borough finance team and members of Resources SAG in preparing this (more transparent) budget formula	A	There needs to be an awareness of support for schools who need to make significant adjustments to their ongoing budgets. What about expanding schools?	
16	Harefield Junior	A		A		No Papers, just an email of agreement
17	McMillan Nursery	A		A	I agree to the suggested transition which seems fair and appropriate for the schools concerned	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
18	Warrenden Primary	A		A		No Papers, just an email of agreement with the Primary Forum response
19	Grangewood					
20	Moorcroft					
21	Primary Forum	A	<p>This response is the outcome of a meeting of a representative group of approximately a quarter of primary headteachers (17) and of the resulting draft response being circulated with an opportunity for all Primary Heads to comment, add or amend. We believe, therefore that it represents our collective views on the local authority's proposals.</p> <p>We wish to convey our sincere appreciation for the way that the local authority Schools Finance Team has engaged with the Resources Strategic Advisory Group, together with representatives from Schools Forum, over the past six months. The level of discussion, listening and remodelling has been high, with both the needs of schools and of the local authority being respected. We hope that this is an indicator of the way that the partnership between schools and the authority will continue to develop, since essentially it is in the medium and long term interests of the future citizens of the Borough that we all ensure monies are targeted fairly and effectively.</p> <p>We are grateful for the work the local authority has done to draft a revised funding formula and to the extent to which it has engaged and responded to the discussions with the Resource Strategic Advisory Group. It was for exactly this type of activity the group was established and it is good to see it again used for a creative dialogue with the Local Authority.</p> <p>We believe the proposed alterations to the formula have adopted the right approach and the move towards a simpler, more understandable method of delegating funds is to be welcomed.</p> <p>While we have collectively agreed to the adoption of the proposals for 2012-13 we have a number issues which we believe the Local Authority needs to consider:</p> <p>1. The proposed formula changes are untried even to the extent that the formula amounts for 2012-13 are not modelled within the budget consultation. We are assuming that they will reflect those presented as part of the consultation process (based on 2011-12 data). We would be very concerned if the use of the 2012 data and the 2012-13 devolved funding level caused individual budgets or the overall profile to differ markedly from those presented in this consultation.</p> <p>2. We are similarly concerned at the long term, year on year effects, which are again untested.</p> <p>3. While we have agreed to the 'package', understanding that any change in one part of the formula may significantly skew funding over all and potentially to the detriment of some or many schools, we have concerns about the basis for Achievement funding, particularly at the use of KS 1 data for KS1 and the influence of one-off highs or lows in performance data. We would urge the Local Authority to revisit this aspect of the formula with a view to considering a) the suitability of other data that is nationally applied and externally monitored (such as the early years profile); and consider the use of a four year average of the most recent data collected at each key stage.</p>	A	We agree that a transition is needed but that it should not be over too long a period: this only delays the need for schools to make appropriate adjustments. We believe this two-year period is appropriate but are conscious that some schools will have significant losses and that this may have implications for staffing levels and the potential for redundancies	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
21	Primary Forum (Continued)	A	<p>4. We believe that having established an active role for the Resource SAG, this valuable resource which can examine issues in detail in a way that the Schools Forum cannot, this should be retained. In particular we would urge the Local Authority to use it to continue monitoring and refining the operation of the formula, possibly from early in the autumn term so appropriate changes can be identified in time for the 2013-14 consultation</p> <p>5. With regard to the funding level to be delegated to schools for NQT recruitment, we note this appears to have been reduced from the historic funding of around £28k (to £20k) and have some concern that this cut in funding may have an adverse effect on the Authority's ability to recruit high quality NQTs in future years , and therefore the overall quality of education in Hillingdon schools</p>	A		
22	Meadow High					The response received relates very specifically to Special School funding and does not comment on the changes being proposed in the Primary and Secondary Funding Formula
23	St Swithun Wells Catholic Primary	A	<p>The principles being adopted are ones with which I agree – HOWEVER I am of the view that the process is being rushed, the claimed consultation is more an affirmation of decisions already taken. There has been precious little engagement with Governors – whose opinions were not sought until very late in the process.</p> <p>Further, what is being proposed is untried and there is little evidence to suggest that the outcomes will be as envisaged. This, in my view is a result of the speed with which this is being launched</p>	A	<p>The issue seems to me to be one of the degree to which the impact of the changes on individual school budgets has been tested / thought through. Once more I would suggest that the cause of this is the indecent haste with which this is being "consulted" and introduced.</p> <p>How much different might things have been if a real policy / process development over six to eight months engaging in detail with all schools might have been with the changes being brought in at the start of the 2013/13 year?</p>	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
24	Harlington Community	A	<p>1) This new formula is welcomed in broad terms, as it goes some way to addressing historical anomalies that have disadvantaged our school.</p> <p>2) Achievement (formerly SEN) funding: How is funding going to be allocated for students that do not have prior data e.g. in - year admissions who join from abroad? Since many of these students require similar levels of support for students who make less than expected levels of progress in primary school, it would be helpful if students with no KS2 data gain the same Achievement Funding points as those who do not make expected levels of progress in the previous Key Stage.</p> <p>3) Ideally the former EMAG grant needs to be devolved on a needs basis.</p> <p>4) Schools that have high mobility such as ours are disadvantaged financially if they take in large numbers of students after the January PLASC, particularly if additional classes have to be created for the following September due to the increase in numbers. Is there any mechanism for a possible funding allocation if mid year admissions increase in this way?</p>	D	<p>Although we recognise that schools who are likely to lose funding under the new agreement need to be able to plan effectively, in effect the damping mechanism disadvantages our students for a further two years. In real terms this is more than £270,000 not allocated in the first year based on the model given. This is on top of the relative lack of funding we have had due to the anomalies in the previous funding formula.</p> <p>The use of a 2 year transition damping arrangement against a 1 year funding agreement – we don't know how the new National Funding Formula will affect future funding arrangements, so there is no guarantee that this funding will be secure in the future.</p> <p>The damping mechanism has an extremely negative affect on our personal funding – we lose approximately 75% of the proposed funding as a result. There is a great variation of the effect of the damping mechanism between schools in order to ensure a +/- 1.5%. Ideally we would prefer a one year damping mechanism</p>	
25	Cherry Lane Primary	A	<p>Agreed on the assumption that the review by Resources SAG is an ongoing process, and will continue in 2012-13.</p> <p>Would like to see some consideration for success and possibly include a Value Added Factor</p>	A	<p>How will this work if the Funding Formula continues to be reviewed?</p> <p>Needs further discussion at School's Forum</p>	
26	Swakeleys	A		A		
27	Field End Junior	A	<p>We appreciate the work by both the Resources SAG and London Borough of Hillingdon on the schools revised funding formula.</p> <p>The revised formula certainly appears simpler to work with and more transparent. We would hope that when the live 2012/3 figures are worked under this new model; the effects on our school are not too dramatic. As the review has been tested on last years figures it would be comforting to know that the new model will continue to be developed for 2013/14 should any concerns come to light in its first year</p>	A	<p>With the budget for schools decreasing this year we feel that the proposed 2 year transition being set at +/- 1.5% will enable us to plan for the coming years in a managed way</p>	

SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY ANALYSIS - FORMULA REVIEW

	Respondent	Q1 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Q2 A/D/K	Q1 Comments	Other Comments
28	The Douay Martyrs	A	The Governing Body are pleased to note that the formula for funding schools has been reviewed and out dated calculations and data which created significant discrepancies in funding are now being replaced. The governors would wish to ensure that funding follows the students so would want funding allocated by AWPU's .As requested last year a further review should be carried out of the split site factor which governors argue each year is not sufficient to cover the duplication of services required and should not be limited by a campus distance factor but should take account of the health and safety issues of the number of pupils having to cross a main highway	D	The Governing Body note that there will be some major funding shifts in income allocation based on the revision of the formula however whilst there has been a recognition within the transition arrangements for those schools who will be losing funding there has been no consideration for those schools who have been significantly underfunded on the old formula and have already had to make significant budgetary changes in order to balance their books. It is unfair that the students in these schools will have to wait two years to receive the funding the updated formula has calculated especially when a number of these schools are still not reaching the 'Hillingdon' average funding per student	
29	Barnhill Community High	A	Barnhill supports the changes to the formula as a package. Our view is that it is an appropriate development and a significant improvement on the previous situation	D	Barnhill believes that the rate is correct but that it should be instituted over a shorter period. Therefore, we would want a +/- 1.5% transitional factor, but only over a one year period	
30	HASH	A	HASH supports the changes to the formula as a package. It sees it as an important step in the right direction, and appreciates the work that has been put into developing the new formula. HASH would like clarification of how mid-year admissions are counted in the deprivation and achievement factors, should they be relevant? For example, will a school receive additional funding for a mid-year admission who arrives with English and Maths below Level 3	K	There was no consensus from HASH on this question	

Key		Count		Count		
A	Agree	21		15		
D	Disagree	3		7		
K	Do not Know	1		3		
Blank	No comment	5		5		
Total		30		30		
		%		%		
A	Agree	70.0		50.0		
D	Disagree	10.0		23.3		
K	Do not Know	3.3		10.0		
Blank	No comment	16.7		16.7		
Total		100.0		100.0		

