

Item 3

TITLE OF REPORT: Education Consultation Outcome

Purpose of the Report

To present to Schools Forum the results of the 2016/17 Gateshead Education Funding Consultation, to note the responses and comments received and to approve the proposals made.

Consultation

The 2016/17 Gateshead Education Funding Consultation was sent to all schools and settings on the 18th September 2015, with all chairs of governors receiving a copy on 21st September 2015.

23 consultation responses were received, with an average “Yes” response of 76% an average “Don’t know” response of 21% and an average “No” response of 3%.

A synopsis of the responses is attached at appendix 1 and appendix 2 shows the comments made against each question.

Proposal

That Schools Forum notes the responses and comments made on the Education Consultation for 2016/17, and that the funding proposals are accepted.

The proposals will be reflected in the various different funding formula’s and used to prepare the Authority Proforma Tool which has to be uploaded to the DfE by 31st October.

Recommendations

That Schools Forum

- Notes the content of the report
- Accepts the proposals for
 - Mainstream School Formula
 - 2 year old funding
 - 3 & 4 year old Early Years Single Funding Formula

For the following reasons:

- To enable the draft Authority Proforma Tool to be uploaded to the DfE within the required timescale

CONTACT: Carole Smith

Appendix 1 - Responses

Question	Responses				% Responses				
	Yes	Don't Know	No	Total	Yes	Don't Know	No	Total	
Q1	Do you accept the proposed change to KS3 AWPU rate?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q2	Do you accept the proposed change to the deprivation factors and funding values?	14	4	5	23	60.87%	17.39%	21.74%	100.00%
Q3	Do you accept the proposal not to change the LAC factor value?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q4	Do you accept the proposed change to the EAL factor?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q5	Do you accept the proposal not to change the Mobility factor?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q6	Do you accept the proposal not to change the primary and secondary prior attainment funding rates?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q7	Do you accept the proposed no change to the lump sum values?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q8	Do you agree with the proposal not to include a sparsity factor in Gateshead's formula	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q9	Do you accept the proposal to cap the gains of those schools that benefit financially from the new formula?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q10	Do you accept the proposed update to the calculation of the PFI funding factor?	13	9	1	23	56.52%	39.13%	4.35%	100.00%
Q11	Do you agree the proposal to top slice the mainstream schools block to maintain the growth fund at £100K, which will be administered by procedures agreed by Schools Forum, and used to help support those schools that are required to provide extra places to support basic educational needs within the authority?	16	5	2	23	69.57%	21.74%	8.70%	100.00%
Q12	Do you accept the proposal not to amend the notional SEN calculation for the October submission of the APT and to carry out further work to review the notional SEN calculation in the Autumn term with a view to amending the notional SEN calculation for the final submission of the APT in January 2016?	17	6		23	73.91%	26.09%		100.00%
Q13	Do you accept the proposal to change the termly support cost funding allocations into an hourly rate?	18	5		23	78.26%	21.74%		100.00%
Q14	Do you accept that estimates for 2 year old payments should be based on the actual number of children in the previous term?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q15	Do you accept that estimates for 3 and 4 year old payments should be based on actual number of children in the same term of the previous year?	17	4	2	23	73.91%	17.39%	8.70%	100.00%
Q16	Do you accept the there should be an Amendment Procedure to override the estimate calculation?	19	4		23	82.61%	17.39%		100.00%
Q17	Do you accept that the Amendment Procedure should only apply if the actual number of children are at least 10% above or below the number of children used for the estimate?	18	4	1	23	78.26%	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
Q18	Do you agree with the proposal not to change the payment mechanism of the Early Years Pupil Premium?	17	5	1	23	73.91%	21.74%	4.35%	100.00%
Q19	Do you accept no changes to the hourly funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds?	18	4	1	23	78.26%	17.39%	4.35%	100.00%
Average		331	91	15	437	75.74%	20.82%	3.43%	100.00%

Appendix 2 – Comments

Q1 Do you accept the proposed changes to KS3 AWPU rate?

Reluctantly as this is taking money away from the Primary sector which may have an impact on outcomes. This will then have a greater impact on the Secondary sector.

Q2 Do you accept the proposed change to the deprivation factors and funding values?

There are definite concerns over this. We are in an area of high social deprivation.

This appears to affect our school greatly. We agree deprivation should be a priority but how it is proposed to be calculated doesn't reflect the need we see in our families. A quarter of our total pre-MFG funding for deprivation for this year was for children in IDACI bands 1 & 2. As our proportion of total pre-MFG funding for deprivation was only 6.71%, this would significantly reduce the proportion of total pre-MFG funding deprivation. This does not reflect the reality of the families in our school.

This change seems to affect schools, such as ours, adversely with regards to addressing need.

It is essential that the weighting is towards the most deprived children/schools

This is going to significantly impact on us. Our % of pupil premium eligibility is relatively low but this does not reflect our families, many of which are low income families. The proposal to remove IDACI bands 1 and 2 will have significant impact for our school as this accounted for over £10,000 of our current year budget allocation. Looking specifically at the IDACI indicators (taking out FSM6), IDACI 1 and 2 account for 34% of our deprivation budget. The new proposals will be a great detriment to our school and does not reflect the reality of our catchment area and family backgrounds.

Q3 Do you accept the proposal not to change the LAC factor value?

We agree LAC should be a priority

It is agreed that this is a priority

Q4 Do you accept the proposed change to the EAL factor?

There is no change to EAL factor

It seems reasonable to increase the basis of funding considering the demands and the fact that more refugee children may arrive in the future.

It seems reasonable to increase the basis of funding from 1 to 3 years considering the demands placed upon these schools and we agree EAL is a priority.

It would be useful to know the range of EAL funding across the borough, the average for EAL funding across the borough or the proportion of total funding aimed at EAL.

Again agreed that this is a priority.

Q5 Do you accept the proposal not to change the Mobility factor?

It seems reasonable to fund a proportion of the budget based on mobility as these issues clearly place demand on schools so we agree this is a priority.

However as we don't have data about the range of mobility funding across the borough, the average for mobility funding across the borough or the proportion of total funding aimed at mobility, it is difficult for us to know whether £2,000 is a reasonable amount.

Q6 Do you accept the proposal not to change the primary and secondary prior attainment funding rates?

This needs to be considered.

We agree that prior attainment should be priority.

Prior attainment should be the priority.

Q7 Do you accept the proposed no change to the lump sum values?

We agree, this is a good mechanism to release funding to secondary schools.

Q8 Do you agree with the proposal not to include a sparsity factor in Gateshead's formula?

Makes sense if no schools meet the criteria.

We agree as no schools in Gateshead meet the criteria.

Does not seem to apply to Gateshead.

Q9 Do you accept the proposal to cap the gains of those schools that benefit financially from the new formula?

We agree. Protecting the MFG seems reasonable but capping % should be as high as possible balanced against the affordability of the funding envelope.

Q10 Do you accept the proposed update to the calculation of the PFI funding factor?

Very little knowledge of PFI funding and the difference to other schools.

It seems that this is an additional source of funding for PFI's – there seems no equivalent for non PFI schools such as ours.

This is an additional revenue stream for PFI schools to fund building services and grounds maintenance from the shared pot? Do non-PFIs (like ours) have a separate funding stream to fund grounds maintenance, building work and etc.

Q11 Do you agree the proposal to top slice the mainstream schools block to maintain the growth fund at £100K, which will be administered by procedures agreed by Schools Forum, and used to help support those schools that are required to provide extra places to support basic educational needs within the authority?

We agree, having a set of clear and transparent procedures to support those required to provide extra places seems reasonable.

Q12 Do you accept the proposal not to amend the notional SEN calculation for the October submission of the APT and to carry out further work to review the notional SEN calculation in the Autumn term with a view to amending the notional SEN calculation for the final submission of the APT in January 2016?

We agree. This makes sense.

This is a pragmatic decision, however if possible I would like this to be amended for this submission.

Agreed to review calculation in autumn term

Q13 Do you accept the proposal to change the termly support cost funding allocations into an hourly rate?

Is this just because there is a software change- the hourly rate is low enough so would be against any cuts.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q14 Do you accept that estimates for 2 year old payments should be based on the actual number of children in the previous term?

This could be problematic between the summer term and the following autumn term.

This does not affect us

No direct impact on our school

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q 15 Do you accept that estimates for 3 and 4 year old payments should be based on actual number of children in the same term of the previous year?

We think funding should be based on maximum capacity.

This could be problematic between the summer term and the following autumn term.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q16 Do you accept that there should be an Amendment Procedure to override the estimate calculation?

Yes – we find the amendment procedures used so far fair and clear

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q17 Do you accept that the Amendment Procedure should only apply if the actual number of children are at least 10% above or below the number of children used for the estimate?

Yes – we find the amendment procedure is fairly clear

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q18 Do you agree with the proposal not to change the payment mechanism of the Early Years Pupil Premium?

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Q19 Do you accept no changes to the hourly funding rate for disadvantaged 2 year olds?

Agreed but does not directly affect us

2 year olds regardless of background often need a lot of support especially around social development and communication and language. The rate does not reflect the amount of resources (including staffing) that is needed.

We agree although it does not directly affect us

Other comments

More comparative data across schools for each area of the budget would help schools to understand where we all are compared to similar schools.

Well done Carole!

Time given for consultation was not sufficient

Overall the increase in KS3 AWPU is welcomed

Having data about the range and average of total funding across the primary sector for each factor would have helped us get a sense of how our needs compare to those across the borough.