

RESPONSES TO SEPTEMBER 2004 CONSULTATION PAPER

APPENDIX 2

RESP	NNDR IN FOUNDATION SCHOOLS	NON-STATEMENTED SEN	SEN FUNDING (DECOUPLING)	DISECONOMIES OF SCALE IN SMALLER SCHOOLS	FREE SCHOOL MEALS FUNDING	OTHER
1Sp			Clarification required as to the funding for Special Schools and units			
2P				Simplification of formula has eroded the effect of the lump sum. Additional funding for small schools is necessary.		
3P			Disagree with the decoupling proposals. Should continue to fund all statements and keep non-statemented funding separate. Encourage annual audit of Action and Action Plus. Funding using Action and Action Plus with a cap of 25% of roll, increased if low Key Stage results.	Benefit to small schools of lump sum is substantially more than they previously received from small school factor. No change.	Increased funding is required, possibly based on a value of £1.60 multiplied by the number of pupils entitled to FSM.	
4TP	Must be a simpler way. Pay 15% NNDR and allocate the saving by adjusting pupil age weighting	Adopt Schools Forum proposal until protection ceases.	Decoupling is wrong.	No further action until size of any problem can be quantified.	Definitely needs addressing, but information from every school regarding costs is required.	

RESP	NDR IN FOUNDATION SCHOOLS	NON-STATEMENTED SEN	SEN FUNDING (DECOUPLING)	DISECONOMIES OF SCALE IN SMALLER SCHOOLS	FREE SCHOOL MEALS FUNDING	OTHER
5P				Increase the lump sum for group sizes 2 and 3 to the same as group size 4 (paid for as specific growth)		The true cost of workforce reform should be included in the formula for primary schools. Primary funding for teachers salaries should be increased by 10%
6P	Either all foundation primary and secondary schools lose or none of them. Not equitable for secondary schools to be protected and primary to lose out.	Opposed to allocating on Key Stage 1 results and Free School Meals. FSM is not an indicator of SEN. Propose – keep two separate factors. Schools audit Action & Action Plus children with support from LEA to produce more accurate figures. Reduce 30% cap to 25% based on 3 year average.	Strongly opposed to this suggestion. Statement is a form of protection for a child.. The money should be spent on the child. Do not agree that there will be reduce bureaucracy.	Do not agree that the funding formula does not reflect the resource requirements of smaller schools. Lump sum as currently used is sufficient.	Not sure why this element should be increased, but if so it should be across the board. There are issues re funding for production kitchens.	Revise the primary curriculum funding model to an average class size of 24 (from 26) in order to meet the needs of workforce reform. This should be by way of extra funds so as not to disadvantage secondary schools Why is needs-led factor based on CATs results for year 7 – should it not be SATs results at Year 6? Schools that consistently under spend without good reason should have their following year budgets reduced.
7S*	Very strong case for adjustment. Preference is for paragraph 3.10. Possible phasing in of losses and gains. Not support the “even higher” solution (column L)	Do not support use of action and action plus. Prefer numbers on roll, FSM or CAT assessments.	Extra 25% uplift to primary for early intervention is contentious. Use KS2 instead of CATs? A strong case for paragraph 5.10, with a protection factor.	Not clear how large a problem this is. Not appropriate to increase the number of factors.	Not clear who this affects and why the failure of the tendering process should increase costs.	Funding should be based on a needs-led approach. A move to the Inner London average for funding is supported provided it is through extra funding for all. The needs-led approach should include technical support, exam costs for years 7 – 10 and lower secondary class sizes

RESP	NDR IN FOUNDATION SCHOOLS	NON-STATEMENTED SEN	SEN FUNDING (DECOUPLING)	DISECONOMIES OF SCALE IN SMALLER SCHOOLS	FREE SCHOOL MEALS FUNDING	OTHER
8P	Disagree with 3.10. Formula should reflect actual NNDR costs with no adjustment to pupil weighting. Phase in change to limit hardship to individual schools.	Link to assessed needs of pupils in individual schools. Differential funding for action and action plus. Reinstate SEN audit.		Diseconomies do exist. Lump sum should be adjusted to compensate smaller schools, extra cost added in as growth so an not to disadvantage larger schools.	Enormous additional cost in order to implement satisfactory arrangements. Additional funding should reflect the real cost of the service.	
9S						Add further premises factors (age of buildings) Increase funding for needs-led, pupil retention factors and lower social deprivation threshold to £100. Add further factors
10P **	Formula should be fair and transparent. Apply actual NNDR funding and rely on maximum loss protection to support schools most affected.	Schools are competent to judge which pupils require action and action plus support. Reduce cap to 25% unless low key stage 2 results support higher figure	Arguments for decoupling are not accepted. Undermines possibility of pupils receiving their statement entitlement.	Agrees small schools are not well served by the formula. Lump sum should be adjusted to increase the non-teaching deputy allocation for small schools. This should be paid for out of growth.	Funding level should take account of the real costs now being charged by contractors to schools. School meals factor should be updates during the financial year to take account of pupil mobility.	Inadequate funding overall. Needs real terms increase of 6%. Impact of 10% PPA in primary schools will be significant.
11P		Support 30% cap.	Reject de-coupling. Compromises a child's right to statement funding	Accept lump sum is beneficial to small schools, but should be increased for small schools re non teaching deputy time	LEA should increase funding.	Increase overall level of school funding by 6% Needs-led funding reflect classroom assistant for every class

RESP	NNDR IN FOUNDATION SCHOOLS	NON-STATEMENTED SEN	SEN FUNDING (DECOUPLING)	DISECONOMIES OF SCALE IN SMALLER SCHOOLS	FREE SCHOOL MEALS FUNDING	OTHER
12P	Support proposal for NNDR funding to equal actual NNDR costs	Re-establish differential between school action and action plus. Double the value of action plus.	Do not support the principles of decoupling. Support faster and more cost effective intervention. If proposals are implemented, £6,500 cut-off would need to be reduced below cost of a specialist teacher.	Strongly support a factor to compensate for diseconomies of scale re curriculum/pupil driven costs in smaller schools. Should set this at £25,000 or amend lump sum to include cost of a full-time teacher.	Support factor increasing by more than inflation.	
13S	Support adding 2.01% to secondary weighted pupil factor to compensate for the use of actual NNDR. Use actual NNDR for primary schools	Re-establish school action and action plus differential. PLASC data should be verified. 30% capping seems arbitrary.	Deeply concerned about the decoupling proposal. If this is introduced, threshold should be set at £4,000 and phased in over 2/3 years. Apply methodology to needs-led funding instead.	Diseconomies of scale acknowledged. Enhance the current lump sum to include an element to reflect this.	Not directly affected. Only support more funding if it improved meal quality, not just boosted contractors' profit margins.	

CODE: Letter after respondent number refers to category (P = Primary; S = Secondary; Sp = Special; TP = Teachers' Panel)

* Secondary Heads Group Response

** Primary Head Teachers Group response