

## Appendix 3

### ANALYSIS OF SCHOOLS' RESPONSES TO FORMULA REVIEW CONSULTATION

#### Introduction

1. At the closing date 19 November 2007 there were 21 responses with 15 of those using the Response Form issued with the consultation papers:
  - 10 Primary Schools (19%) plus 1 Primary Headteachers' Group
  - 5 Secondary Schools (38 %)
  - 3 Nursery Schools (75%) plus one Nursery Headteachers' Group
  - 1 Teachers Panel
2. The overall level of responses is disappointing given the significance of the funding implications for schools, but not out of line, it is understood, with the level of responses to previous consultations.

#### Details of the Consultation Responses

3. An analysis of the completed response forms is enclosed at Annex 1. Details of the comments made by each respondent were reported in full to the Schools Forum 12 December 2007.
4. The answers to the questions in the Response Form have been weighted as follows:
  - Strongly Agree 3
  - Agree 2
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree 1
  - Disagree 0
  - Strongly Disagree 0
5. The table below shows the summary of the weighted responses:

Question	Average Score			
	Primary	Secondary	Nursery	Total
Q1	2.8	2.4	1	2.14
Q2	2.4	2.8	0.25	1.93
Q3	0.8	1.6	2	1.43
Q4	2.5	2.8	1.25	2.23
Q6	1.6	1.2	3	1.86

6. It will be seen that there is a high level of support from both Primary and Secondary schools for Question 1 - Do you agree that additional funding for deprivation /AEN should be the first call on growth funding rather than a reallocation of existing resources?
7. A similar high level of support from primary and secondary schools is recorded for Question 2 - Do you agree that the main basis for the allocation of funding for AEN factors should be actual pupil numbers?
8. The responses to Question 3 – Do you agree that there is a case for part of the AEN formula allocations to be made on the basis of percentage of roll? are less clear cut. The average score for primary is less than 1 and so is marginally towards disagree whilst secondary and nursery are in agreement.
9. There is strong support from primary and secondary schools for replacing the existing 5 formula factors with three new formula factors for Attainment, Social Deprivation and Underachieving Groups – Q4. Nursery schools neither agree nor disagree.
10. There is less strong agreement that the Minimum Funding Guarantee should continue to apply to provide protection for the few schools that will lose funding as a consequence of the formula review proposals.
11. The responses to Question 5, requesting schools to rank the four models, produce no clear overall preference. Schools not surprisingly have in the main ranked the models in relation to their own interests.

#### Issues raised by the Consultation Responses

12. A number of responses raise the issue of the underfunding of Primary Schools relative to secondary and in comparison with London averages. In particular the Primary Headteachers Group response raises this as a significant issue. Whilst the consultation paper did make reference to this matter it was in the context that it would be possible to target funding to Primary through deprivation factors should the Council so decide and that the existence of relative underfunding was not in itself reason not to review the basis of the funding of AEN. The proposed formula model does in fact move funding to the Primary sector relative to Secondary.
13. The Primary Headteachers' Group response raises the issue of small schools in the most deprived wards receiving only marginal increases in allocation as a result of the AEN formula proposals. It is the case that the review has concluded that an allocation based on pupil numbers rather than percentage of roll is a more equitable basis for the future. However the models presented for consultation allocated only £3.5m in growth. The recommendation to allocate £8.5m over the three years 2008/09 to 2010/11 to deprivation factors does make a considerable improvement.
14. A number of comments questioned the proposal to remove the factor for mobility.

15. A suggestion was made that there should be an improved Lump Sum for small primary schools. This could be looked at as part of an ongoing review for years 2 and 3.