

1. Do you feel a reasonable balance has been struck between the competing issues and needs in allocating the £3.5 million as per table 2 of this consultation? If not, how would you prefer to rebalance them?

Primary Head	No. more should be allocated to mobility, as detailed in the answer to question 2.
Primary Head	We believe that the whole premise of how to distribute this “windfall” money is flawed. It rests on looking at strategic pressures upon schools that should have already been considered in the existing SFF. The “windfall” cash is unlikely to be repeated in future years. It should therefore be used for short-term relief where most badly needed.
Primary Head	Yes
Primary Head	The balance is reasonable within the funding given. The mobility funding factor is a needed addition.
Primary Chair of Governors	On the whole yes. However, over the last few years the impact of the reduced budgets has had a particularly heavy impact on small ,one-form entry primary schools which are unable to benefit from economies of scale in the same way as larger schools. This has perhaps not been given due consideration.
Secondary Head	Yes, however could final allocations be based on the October 2019 census?
Secondary Head	We feel that the growth factors and rising roll funding will only exacerbate the inequality between schools with full rolls and others. The per pupil funding already provides additional funding for additional students.
Secondary Head	<p>No, a reasonable balance has not been struck. Only £0.8 million (22%) or a total of £1.355 million (38%, including the rewirement from secondary schools addressing increased costs allocation) has been allocated to rising rolls. In my opinion the priority must be to meet the demands created by the increase in pupil numbers. This need must be met first and then any remaining funding should be distributed using another funding factor.</p> <p>As discussed in Schools Forum a comparison of mobility against deprivation showed a weak correlation. For this reason I would propose using excess</p>

Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

	<p>funding from the 3.5M after rising rolls has been removed to simply increase the per head funding allocation across all schools.</p> <p>Having undergone a significant increase in pupil numbers in recent years, I am confident that we would not have been able to fund the increase in numbers had we not had received the rising rolls delegated funding. A 15% reduction in funding is untenable. A secondary school would not be able to budget for an increase in one or two form groups with a reduction of 15% to the rising rolls funding rates.</p> <p>In our case we have expanded on the basis of funding formula approved by Schools Forum in February 2018. Consequently, all of our financial projections are based on this formula. A significant change (e.g. reduction by 15%) would generate massive instability e.g. for (Name of School) the difference would be a budget reduction of £74,175.</p> <p>Furthermore the rising rolls funding already does not match lag funding and we receive nearly 16% less per student. For example we receive £4,945 for a KS3 rising rolls pupil, however, we typically receive £5,857 per KS3 pupil through lag funding. The difference (£912) is due to the prior attainment factor, the IDACI banding factor and the EAL factor. The difference amounted to £94,848 in just one year. This gap in funding will continue every year for five years, a total of £474,240 but will never be met.</p>
Secondary Head	<p>Yes – a reasonable balance based on the finite money available. However it is important to note that this will not be sufficient to resolve our funding crisis. From (Name of School)'s perspective and extra £24K is only one extra TA. This will not solve our financial issues.</p>

2. **Given the context of funding constraints and general cost pressures, do the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B, provide those schools most affected by pupil mobility with adequate amounts to have an impact?**

Primary Head	<p>No, the mobility allocations modelled in appendix B do not provide adequate amounts to have an impact.</p> <p>For a school with high mobility, we have identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - five factors which incur additional costs - four factors which lead to a lack (or loss) of funding <p>Five factors which incur additional costs</p> <p>1. Settling in of new pupils There is a high level of administration in admitting a new pupil: offering a place, supporting parents with little English to complete admissions forms, entering information onto a management system; and contacting previous settings to request safeguarding and educational records.</p> <p>Mobile pupils require additional support as they face a substantial cultural, educational and social adjustment. To mitigate this, at our school each new pupil has a home visit conducted jointly by two members of staff in order to ease their transition and provide the best opportunity for them to settle and achieve well. Teachers and leaders give time to offer a welcome and explain routines, match up pupils with a buddy, and ensure the child is settling well.</p> <p>2. Low levels of attainment and low levels or no English Most mobile pupils join the school with very low levels of attainment, and often with little or no English. In many cases they arrive from outside the United Kingdom, as refugees or economic migrants. Many have missed significant amounts of time in school. The school has to provide additional support to help the child to catch up to expected levels. Teaching these pupils requires specialist skills to support pupils who are significantly behind the age-expected levels, and who have little or no English. When there are significant levels of mobile pupils, this lowers the attainment levels for whole cohorts.</p> <p>3. Higher numbers of pupils with Special Educational Needs or Disability (SEND) Almost all mobile pupils with SEND needs, arrive at school with these needs undiagnosed and without additional funding. This means we have to give additional time and source expertise to establish the nature of the special needs, and how best to support them; apply for Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan funding; and pay for their support staff for up to a year until an EHC is given at approx. £20,000 per pupil, per annum.</p> <p>4. Higher numbers of Child Protection, Child In Need and Safeguarding cases</p>
--------------	---

	<p>Many families relocate for serious safeguarding reasons. Some of these are disclosed on joining and others become apparent after a few weeks. This requires a considerable level of communication with other agencies – Social Care, Health and Police. Additional checks are put in place to more carefully monitor these children. More staff need higher levels of safeguarding training in order to increase capacity and manage the additional meetings.</p> <p>5. Higher numbers of pupils with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulties</p> <p>The circumstances leading to children relocating often cause SEMH difficulties. Safeguarding cases contribute to these, as do children relocating as refugees, or those who have been evicted, and those living in poor quality housing with a lack of outdoor space and a lack of opportunities for play. High levels of deprivation are linked with higher incidences of SEMH difficulties. Schools provide additional support to counteract this. Support includes more trained counsellors and psychotherapists, nurture groups and specialist interventions. Higher levels of pupils with SEMH difficulties also affects the other children – and staff. Additional support needs to be provided to counteract this affect.</p> <p>Four factors which lead to a lack (or loss) of funding</p> <p>1. Lack of per-pupil funding.</p> <p>There is an obvious lack of funding if children join the school after the October census date; the full funding for these children is only given after they appear on the following year's census. In the meantime, despite not being funded, the school meets the child's needs. In many cases, the mobile child may leave the school before the next October census date. The fluctuations in pupil numbers also lead to uncertainty in planning and setting budgets.</p> <p>2. Lack of Pupil Premium funding</p> <p>Many mobile pupils face high levels of deprivation yet are ineligible for free school meals (FSM) or the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG). The main reasons for this lack of ineligibility include recent arrivals to the UK, lack of parental British Citizenship or otherwise having No Recourse to public funds.</p> <p>3. Lower allocation of High Needs funding</p> <p>In addition to the inaccuracies of Pupil Premium eligibility described above, the crude measure of IDACI is also inaccurate. We know from conducting home visits for all our new arrivals that many live in multiple occupancy housing which is not reflected within the IDACI measure.</p> <p>4. Missing funding for pupils with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs)</p> <p>Many mobile pupils have undiagnosed Special Educational Needs which require intense support for the child in the form of 1-2-1, as well as specialist provision and significant work in applying for additional funds through an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP). The school is not funded for this and there is a significant time lag before any funding is awarded. To compound this, in our experience, the majority of pupils with successful EHCP</p>
--	--

Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

	applications then transfer out of our school – either to a special school which more fully meets their needs, or to relocate again due to family circumstances.
Primary Head	No comment.
Primary Head	No, unfortunately the cost of enrolment administration, additional educational needs, the destabilisation of class and year group cohorts, additional staff input to meet with the pupils' transition needs amount to more than the cost of an additional TA.
Primary Head	The amounts added to the primary schools is not adequate as the unfunded mobile pupils in many schools should attract higher funding. The added costs to induct such pupils and support them is more than what is being suggested. This is an additional pressure on schools and their limited budgets. The schools identified in AppD to receive funding are mainly in areas with high levels of deprivation and underfunded.
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes , although once again the impact of mobility has a proportionately greater financial impact in one form entry schools. However ,we do believe that the mobility allocations modelled would be enough to make a difference
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes we think so although it will not affect Capital
Secondary Head	No
Secondary Head	Yes

3. Considering the funding lag for growing school populations that is inherent in the national system of funding, are you in favour of continuing to move a portion of the Schools Block into a growth fund that supports expanding schools?

Primary Head	Yes.
Primary Head	No. This will have the effect of further depleting the income of small schools, which has already been severely squeezed in recent years, by funnelling away a proportion of the general schools block into a fund to which they may have no possibility of access.
Primary Head	It seems that the only expanding schools are currently the High Schools, who have had 7 years to prepare for the influx. A greater need lies with the primary schools that have expanded and have insufficient pupils to furnish full classes ending up with less than 30 (say 20 – 25) in a class and needing teachers for each class. This added to the on costs that have increased considerably this year, we are on a fast track to being in deficit. Additional, schools are finding it hard to recruit quality teachers, so letting go of effective staff, will add further difficulties.
Primary Head	The school does not support this proposal to support expanding schools. More should be done to support and fund those school which have already expanded to attract full numbers and meet their needs.
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	NO - We feel that the growth factors and rising roll funding will only exacerbate the inequality between schools with full rolls and others. The per pupil funding already provides additional funding for additional students.

Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

Secondary Head	<p>Yes, and would add that the Schools Forum could forward fund the growth fund and build capacity into the model so that the funding need could be spread over a number of years (e.g. 6/8/10/12 years). When the current demand on the growth funding settles down over the next 2/3/4/5 years as schools catch up with the lag funding, the top slicing of the Schools Block can continue for a few more years to recoup the deficit and also build a reasonable reserve for any future growth funding needs.</p> <p>I hope the revised National Funding Formula on growth funding will help us manage this more effectively and ensure that schools willing to increase their capacity are not underfunded.</p>
Secondary Head	<p>Expansion shouldn't be funded through Schools Block. Expanding schools receive extra funding from government.</p>

4. Are the proportional increases to pupil led funding factors a fair method of distributing the increased funding that is available?

Primary Head	No. For the reasons expressed in question 2, more should be allocated to mobility.
Primary Head	No.
Primary Head	This is a challenge as some schools are in greater need, but by the same token you would wish to have an equitable system.
Primary Head	Yes
Primary Chair of Governors	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes
Secondary Head	Yes although we would be able to increase the secondary factor by removing the growth and rising roll funding
Secondary Head	Yes. Also, as there is a DfE expectation that the Central Funding Block is significantly reduced over time, the Schools Forum could attempt to urgently drive down costs and commitments in this block, for example, why is £800,000 set aside for CAFAI provision? Furthermore, underspends in the Central Block were also reported at the 6 November Schools Forum meeting.
Secondary Head	Yes

