

RESPONSES TO SEPTEMBER 2003 CONSULTATION PAPER

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
1C	Agree – Model 3	No change	Support proposals	3.5% floor; 6% ceiling	Support proposal	Support proposal	Support proposal	Opposed to reduction	Funding for Workforce reform
2P	Agree – Model 4			Agree proposal. Ceiling should be set, but not so that it negates impact of other factors		Support proposal		Not supported	
3 LLL	Agree – Model 3	No change, but if extra funding is required, look at combining with Social Deprivation Factor. Is there a statistical link between CAT and FSM?	Support proposals	No view taken	Support proposal	Support proposal	Support proposal	Not supported	
4S	Merge Social Deprivation and Needs-Led factors. Allocate based on base line test scores for primary, CAT results for secondary and % on roll from most deprived wards.	See Social Deprivation comments		If there is a ceiling, adjust all schools across the board.	Fully support funding through the formula		Not necessarily support – need more information	Simplification of the formula is welcome.	

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
5S	Use the factors that determine Additional Educational Need			6.4 reflects fair practice. Fund DfES floor by capped ceiling, then move to 6.4 over 3 years				Support proposal. Simpler, fairer and more transparent.	
6P									Channel more resources into the primary sector to pre-empt the need for remedial programmes in secondary later.
7P	Need to boost the funding going to schools through this factor.	Need to boost the funding going to schools through this factor.							Increase support for single form entry primary schools (e.g. via lump sum)
8S	Increase the funding (to £500k) even if no new money. Allocate per pupil, not % on roll.	Use Free School Meals for Secondary allocation as well as primary.	Agree to place factor is no other factors can achieve result.	Floor should be funded by reduction across all schools.	Agree need to fund JK project, but not through formula. Make funding available to any schools with such pupils	Not supported as a new factor but agree suggested mechanism if proposal goes forward	Agree, but elements of split site factor need to be reviewed	Support some consolidation but proposal is too drastic and will shift resources too greatly.	

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
9P	Needs are more extreme in deprived areas. Schools picked up extra costs when uniform grant was stopped. In favour of option 4 (£5,000 cut off) to help the most impoverished communities.	Valuable catch-up element. Free School Meals is an accurate assessment. Many schools provide out of school tuition. Also need to cover cost of school trips.							
10P	Agree 200 most deprived wards in London. Do not support s cut off. Value of factor should be greatly increased.	FSM best for primary. Mixing statistics does not seem sensible. Use FSM for secondary as well?	Support the principle of neither better nor worse off.	Any limit (ceiling) should be applied across all schools. Do not support a ceiling cap.	Not support funding of a specific project like this through the formula	Allocation method seems sound. However, do not agree with having this factor.	Agree, subject to cost implication.	Do not support very small number of factors but agree formula should be less complex. Merge factors. Current proposals would make formula more complex.	
11N*	Agree. Model 3 (£2,000 minimum). Increase value only if no impact on small schools	Agree no change unless better proxy is found. Do not support tests for early years.	Agree proposal for place factor	No want ceiling if impacts on small schools. If only a few schools affected, OK	Support – ideally as an SEN unit.	No view	Support	Do not support	

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
12Sp									Special School lump sum should relate to group size
13P	Use of most deprived Wards does not seem to provide a link between schools in the same cluster group								Mobility funding should be improved. Use more up to data PLASC data for Capital allocations
14P	Increase the value significantly and use Free School Meals								Increase ISB for workforce reform. Direct growth to primary sector for this and extra-curricular activities.
15P	Extend to 200 most deprived wards in London. New money should only be added if growth.	Remain separate factor. Create declaration form for FSM to cover non take-up	Agree to place factor	Agree floor. If there is a ceiling, still allow real terms increase in funding.	Support. Look at supporting a similar provision for primary pupils	Proposals are fair.	Mixed views, but generally supported	Not acceptable.	

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
16P									Need to consider cost of workforce reform. Need to increase funding to primary schools through the curriculum factor
17P **	Retain separate factor. Increase the size of the factor (with real growth). FSM only, not use most deprived wards at all. Devise declaration form for parents who do not take up their FSM entitlement	This and social deprivation factor should lead to increase in the numbers of teaching assistants in primary schools.	Agree place led factor	Agree to floor. Do not agree to cap at ceiling.	Can only support this proposal if there is real growth to cover it.	Puzzled by rationale behind the request for this factor	Opposed to this factor as there are savings in the Federation.	Should only consider this as part of a more thorough review of the curriculum model. In view of the implications, not possible for 2004/05	Context: low funding levels for some schools in the current year. Workforce reform issues. Revise limp sum
18S									Do not support proposed changes to the SEN audit factor.
19P									Do not support proposed changes to the SEN audit factor.

RESP	SOCIAL DEPRIVATION FACTOR	NEEDS-LED FACTOR	NURSERY SCHOOL FUNDING	FLOORS AND CEILINGS WITHIN MAIN FORMULA	JOHN KELLY LANGUAGE PROJECT	FUNDING REDUCING NUMBERS	SPLIT SITE FACTOR	FEWER FACTORS	OTHER
20P	Model 2 preferred	Propose no change		Should cap schools with highest increases	Should not be funded by primary schools with less than 5% carry forward	Agree proposals	Agree proposal	Disagree	LEA should consider: Paternity leave, in year rising rolls, increased SEN, funding long-term sickness after 5 days, performance management workforce reform, additional costs of Ofsted, SATs

CODE: Letter after respondent number refers to category (N = Nursery Heads; P = Primary; S = Secondary; Sp = Special; C = Governing Body Clerk; LLL = Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Panel)

- Combined response from all nursery heads.
- Primary Head Teachers Group response

RESP	OTHER
21P (Received after closing date)	Funding for workforce reform, primary weightings, FSM, equalise group 2 and 3 lump sum, base SEN funding on special needs