

CONSIDERATION OF SCHOOL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1. Introduction

This report provides the School Forum with an analysis of all of the responses received as part of the consultation on Schools, Early Years & High Needs Special Educational Needs (SEN) Funding Arrangements for 2013/14, which took place between 1 October 2012 and 16 October 2012.

In all, stakeholders were asked 7 questions, 3 of which related to the Primary and Secondary Schools funding formula, 1 of which related to Special Schools and Special Resource Provision funding, with the remaining 3 relating to changes that are being proposed to the Early Years Single Funding Formula.

Schools Forum is being asked to consider these responses as part of its overall responsibility to propose a school funding formula for 2013/14 that needs to be submitted to the Department for Education by 31 October 2012.

2. Summary

As this was a wide ranging consultation paper, the responses received included a high proportion of stakeholders that made no comments where the particular question did not relate to their particular area. It has been assumed that these responses can be ignored in determining the final percentages.

The responses received relating to the proposed changes to the Primary and Secondary school funding formula, significantly support them (over 70% of respondents are in favour). However, one question Q1 (2% cluster threshold) has received a high proportion of stakeholders that disagree with the proposals (over 25%).

The responses received relating to the proposed changes to Special Schools and Special Resource Provision funding, support them, but there is a high proportion of stakeholders that do disagree with the proposals (over 29%).

The responses received relating to the proposed changes to the Early Years Single Funding Formula, significantly support them (over 70% of respondents are in favour). However, one question Q7 (4% of funding targeted at quality) has received a low proportion of stakeholders that agree with the proposals (over 52%), as a significant proportion did not know how to respond to this question.

3. Recommendation

It is recommended that Schools Forum:

- i) Accepts the proposed changes to the Primary and Secondary Schools funding formula.
- ii) Accepts the proposed changes to Special Schools and Special Resource Provision funding.
- iii) Accepts the proposed changes to the Early Years Single Funding Formula.
- iv) Agrees that Officers of the Council submit the draft funding pro-forma to the DfE by 31 October 2012.

4. Information

The Consultation paper on the Schools, Early Years & High Needs Special Educational Needs (SEN) Funding Arrangements for 2013/14, was sent out to all stakeholders on 1 October 2012, with a closing date of midnight on 16 October 2012. Additionally three meetings were held on 8, 9 and 10 October 2012, to explain in more detail the changes that are being proposed.

The consultation paper included 7 questions, three of which related to the Primary and Secondary Schools funding formula, 1 of which related to Special Schools and Special Resource Provision funding, with the remaining 3 relating to changes that are being proposed to the Early Years Single Funding Formula. The responses to each question are summarised below between Agreed, Disagreed, Do Not Know and No Response. A full analysis is included in Appendix A (an analysis of responses to the Formula Review, including any narrative in full where respondents have provided them).

Overall, the Council received 38 written responses to the consultation paper (including 22 from Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Nursery and Local Authority Nursery providers, 6 primary schools, 6 secondary schools, 3 special schools and 1 from the Hillingdon Association of Secondary Headteachers).

Questions - Primary and Secondary Schools Formula Review

Question 1: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether the rate of the cluster factor for SEN pupils should be set at 2.0% of the schools number on roll.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	13	34.2	72.2
Disagree	5	13.2	27.8
Do not Know	0	0.0	0.0
No Comment	20	52.6	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment). Those providing no comment are all PVI's.

Question 2: Stakeholders are asked to give views on the proposed changes to the school funding formula as set out in Section 5, which need to be considered as a package and include the proposal that AWPU ratios should be broadly in line with the national average, the Deprivation and Attainment ratios should be 1 : 1.5 between Primary and Secondary sectors and the Fixed Factor should be set at £140,000.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	14	36.8	77.8
Disagree	2	5.3	11.1
Do not Know	2	5.3	11.1
No Comment	20	52.6	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment). Those providing no comment are all PVI's.

Question 3: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether the Capping Factor for schools that gain from the proposed changes should be set at 0% (i.e. no cap).

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	13	34.2	72.2
Disagree	2	5.3	11.1
Do not Know	3	7.9	16.7
No Comment	20	52.6	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment). Those providing no comment are all PVI's.

Questions – Special Schools and Special Resource Provision Funding

Question 4: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether an occupancy rate of 95% should be introduced for each special school and special resource provision setting to provide a protection to funding levels in 2013/14.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	12	31.6	70.6
Disagree	5	13.2	29.4
Do not Know	0	0.0	0.0
No Comment	21	55.2	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes. However, it is also clear that there is a high proportion of stakeholders who do not agree with this proposal (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment). Those providing no comment include 20 PVI's and 1 secondary school.

Questions – Early Years Single Funding Formula Review

Question 5: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether 8% of the total EYSFF should be distributed using IDACI factors.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	29	76.3	82.8
Disagree	1	2.6	2.9
Do not Know	5	13.2	14.3
No Comment	3	7.9	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment).

Question 6: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether the distribution of Quality funding should be based on the ratings of each early years setting and that this should only be allocated where the rating is 3 or more based on a flat rate per hour.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	27	71.1	77.2
Disagree	4	10.5	11.4
Do not Know	4	10.5	11.4
No Comment	3	7.9	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that there are a significant number of respondents that are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment).

Question 7: Stakeholders are asked to give views on whether 4% of the total EYSFF is a reasonable rate to use to distribute resources based on a quality factor.

The following table summarises the responses received:

	Count	%	% Excluding No Comments
Agree	20	52.7	58.8
Disagree	4	10.5	11.8
Do not Know	10	26.3	29.4
No Comment	4	10.5	
Total	38	100.0	100.0

It can be concluded that a majority of the number of respondents are in agreement with the proposed changes (ignoring those stakeholders that made no comment).