

Response ID ANON-TEB1-7CGV-3

Submitted to **Schools national funding formula**

Submitted on **2016-04-15 15:29:10**

Introduction

A Name

First name::

David

Last name::

Allen

B Email address

Email address:

david.allen@havering.gov.uk

C Response type

Please select your role from the list below::

Other

Please select your organisation type from the list below::

Representative body

Organisation name::

Havering Schools Forum

Local authority area::

Havering

D Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

Please give your reason for confidentiality::

Principles for a reformed funding system

1 Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

A funding system that supports opportunity

The funding system alone may not necessarily support opportunity; it is the funding that the system delivers that will make a difference. Havering has always been one of the lowest funded authorities in London and educational excellence will be difficult to achieve if funding is inadequate.

A funding system that is fair

Agreed. The current system permits different levels of funding based on defunct grants that are embedded into some schools' per pupil funding. An MFG of -1.5% does not rectify this quickly enough.

A funding system that is efficient

Agreed

A funding system that gets funding straight to schools

As mentioned above funding needs to be adequate to achieve educational excellence. Increasing funding to schools at the same time as increasing their responsibility for areas previously funded centrally will not help in maximising resources for teaching and learning.

The advantages of this arrangement may be undermined by MATs which will be permitted to allocate different levels of funding to the individual schools.

A funding system that is transparent

Agreed

The structure of the funding system

2 Do you agree with our proposal to move to a school-level national funding formula in 2019-20, removing the requirement for local authorities to set a local formula?

No

Please provide any further comments::

It is not possible to respond to this without knowing the rates of funding to be applied to the funding factors. Under current arrangements local authorities can set the balance between the amounts of funding that are allocated between pupil, deprivation, EAL factors etc to address the needs of their schools. If the national funding rates for (for example) deprivation factors are inadequate then schools with higher levels of deprivation may be worse off.

Building block A: per-pupil costs

3 Do you agree that the basic amount of funding for each pupil should be different at primary, key stage 3 and key stage 4?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Building block B: additional needs factors

4a Do you agree that we should include a deprivation factor?

Yes

4b Which measures for the deprivation factor do you support?

Pupil- and area-level

Please provide any further comments::

5 Do you agree we should include a low prior attainment factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

6a Do you agree that we should include a factor for English as an additional language?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

6b Do you agree that we should use the EAL3 indicator (pupils registered at any point during the previous 3 years as having English as an additional language)?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Building block C: school costs

7 Do you agree that we should include a lump sum factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments:

8 Do you agree that we should include a sparsity factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

It should be extended to apply to all schools not just those in rural areas. It should also be based on road distances not "as the crow flies".

Building block C: other school costs

9 Do you agree that we should include a business rates factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

It would be better to have a system that allows direct payments from central Government to Councils that by-pass schools altogether. Per pupil funding comparisons should always exclude business rates as some schools pay 100% and others only 20%.

10 Do you agree that we should include a split sites factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

11 Do you agree that we should include a private finance initiative factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

This will be necessary for schools in PFI/PPP contracts although a formula allocation should ensure that they do not benefit financially above other schools.

12 Do you agree that we should include an exceptional premises circumstances factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Yes, but the additional costs incurred need to be clearly evidenced.

13 Do you agree that we should allocate funding to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend for these factors?

Yes/No - Business rates:

No

Yes/No - Split sites:

No

Yes/No - Private finance initiative:

No

Yes/No - Other exceptional circumstances:

No

Please provide any further comments::

LAs use different amounts for split site funding, could this not be a standard amount?

Business rates can be allocated on the basis of current rateable values rather than historic. Otherwise funding allocations will not reflect revaluations for new buildings etc.

PFI/PPP funding should be based on current costs.

Exceptional circumstances should be on current costs

Building block C: growth

14 Do you agree that we should include a growth factor?

No

Please provide any further comments::

This would be appropriate for known growth, for example when an increased form of entry is moving through a school but the funding would need to be adequate to cover the costs, including the costs of pupils who will require additional support but have not yet been allocated pupil premium.

15 Do you agree that we should allocate funding for growth to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Decisions on expansions and budge classes are sometimes not resolved until after a financial year has started. LAs need flexibility to work with schools to take additional classes. The amount allocated to LAs should reflect projected expansion not historic. If this is not the case it will lead to overspends for local authorities with increasing pupil numbers. Historic budgets may also be inadequate when growth moved into the secondary sector which will be more costly.

Building block D: geographic costs

16a Do you agree that we should include an area cost adjustment?

Yes

16b Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

general labour market methodology

Please provide any further comments::

Factors not included in the formula

17 Do you agree that we should target support for looked-after children and those who have left care via adoption, special guardianship or a care arrangements order through the pupil premium plus, rather than include a looked-after children factor in the national funding formula?

No

Please provide any further comments::

The pupil premium plus provides funding that should be targeted to the looked after children. A small formula allocation will also support the additional administration and pastoral cost and recognises the importance of the role of the designated teacher. For authorities that currently use the factor there should be no reduction in their schools block DSG.

18 Do you agree that we should not include a factor for mobility?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Mobility causes turbulence in schools and this funding assists schools in managing those pupils. Although the amount of funding allocated by LAs is relatively small, it is targeted to the schools that need it.

19 Do you agree that we should remove the post-16 factor from 2017-18?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Transition to the reformed funding system

20 Do you agree with our proposal to require local authorities to distribute all of their schools block allocation to schools from 2017-18?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Only if other costs currently funded by the DSG are adequately funded e.g. pupil growth, high needs and early years

21 Do you believe that it would be helpful for local areas to have flexibility to set a local minimum funding guarantee?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Within national limits.

Funding remaining with local authorities

22 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing responsibilities as set out in the consultation according to a per-pupil formula?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Local authority statutory duties are not necessarily related to pupil numbers. There are fixed costs in running some services that will be common to all LAs. For example, it is not the case that a large county of 150,000 pupils will have School Admissions Team that is five times the size of a London Borough with 30,000 pupils. The requirement to coordinate admissions across London should also be recognised.

23 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing historic commitments based on case-specific information to be collected from local authorities?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Further information is required.

The education services grant

24 Are there other duties funded from the education services grant that could be removed from the system?

Please provide your comments::

No

25 Do you agree with our proposal to allow local authorities to retain some of their maintained schools' DSG centrally – in agreement with the maintained schools in the schools forum – to fund the duties they carry out for maintained schools?

No

Please provide any further comments::

These duties should be adequately funded outside of the DSG.

Equality analysis

26 Please provide any comments on the equality analysis.

Please provide any further comments::