

## Consultation Questions

Respond by 17 April 2016

### Schools National Funding Formula

#### **Chapter 1: Reforming the funding system**

Question 1

Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

Question 2

Do you agree with our proposal to move to a school-level national funding formula in 2019-20, removing the requirement for local authorities to set a local formula?

#### **Chapter 2: The schools national funding formula**

Question 3

Do you agree that the basic amount of funding for each pupil should be different at primary, key stage 3 and key stage 4?

Question 4

- a) Do you agree that we should include a deprivation factor?
- b) Which measures for the deprivation factor do you support? Pupil-level only (current FSM and Ever6 FSM); Area-level only (IDACI); Pupil-level and area-level.

Question 5

Do you agree we should include a low prior attainment factor?

Question 6

a) Do you agree that we should include a factor for English as an additional language?

b) Do you agree that we should use the EAL3 indicator (pupils registered at any point during the previous 3 years as having English as an additional language)?

Question 7

Do you agree that we should include a lump sum factor?

Question 8

Do you agree that we should include a sparsity factor?

Question 9

Do you agree that we should include a business rates factor?

Question 10

Do you agree that we should include a split sites factor?

Question 11

Do you agree that we should include a private finance initiative factor?

Question 12

Do you agree that we should include an exceptional premises circumstances factor?

Question 13

Do you agree that we should allocate funding to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend for these factors? Business rates; Split sites; Private finance initiatives; Other exceptional factors.

Question 14

Do you agree that we should include a growth factor?

Question 15

Do you agree that we should allocate funding for growth to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend?

Question 16

- a) Do you agree that we should include an area cost adjustment?
- b) Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support? General labour market methodology; hybrid methodology.

Question 17

Do you agree that we should target support for looked-after children and those who have left care via adoption, special guardianship or a care arrangements order through the pupil premium plus, rather than include a looked-after children factor in the national funding formula?

Question 18

Do you agree that we should not include a factor for mobility?

Question 19

Do you agree that we should remove the post-16 factor from 2017-18?

### **Chapter 3: Transition to a reformed funding system**

Question 20

Do you agree with our proposal to require local authorities to distribute all of their schools block allocation to schools from 2017-18?

Question 21

Do you believe that it would be helpful for local areas to have flexibility to set a local minimum funding guarantee?

### **Chapter 4: Funding that will remain with the local authority**

Question 22

Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing responsibilities as set out in the consultation according to a per-pupil formula?

Question 23

Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing historic commitments based on case-specific information to be collected from local authorities?

## **Chapter 5: The future of the Education Services Grant**

### Question 24

Are there other duties funded from the education services grant that could be removed from the system?

### Question 25

Do you agree with our proposal to allow local authorities to retain some of their maintained schools' DSG centrally – in agreement with the maintained schools in the schools forum – to fund the duties they carry out for maintained schools?

## **High Needs Funding Formula and Other Reforms**

### **Chapter 2: Why changes are needed**

#### Question 1

Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

### **Chapter 3: Distribution of high needs funding to local authorities**

#### Question 2

Do you agree that the majority of high needs funding should be distributed to local authorities rather than directly to schools and other institutions?

#### Question 3

Do you agree that the high needs formula should be based on proxy measures of need, not the assessed needs of children and young people?

Question 4

Do you agree with the basic factors proposed for a new high needs formula to distribute funding to local authorities?

Question 5

We are not proposing to make any changes to the distribution of funding for hospital education, but welcome views as we continue working with representatives of this sector on the way forward.

Question 6

Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

Question 7

Do you agree that we should include a proportion of 2016-17 spending in the formula allocations of funding for high needs?

Question 8

Do you agree with our proposal to protect local authorities' high needs funding through an overall minimum funding guarantee?

**Chapter 4: Changes to the way high needs funding supports institutions**

Question 9

Given the importance of schools' decisions about what kind of support is most appropriate for their pupils with SEN, working in partnership with parents, we welcome views on what should be covered in any national guidelines on what schools offer for their pupils with SEN and disabilities.

Question 10

We are proposing that mainstream schools with special units receive per pupil amounts based on a pupil count that includes pupils in the units, plus funding of £6,000 for each of the places in the unit; rather than £10,000 per place. Do you agree with the proposed change to the funding of special units in mainstream schools?

Question 11

We therefore welcome, in response to this consultation, examples of local authorities that are using centrally retained funding in a strategic way to overcome barriers to integration and inclusion. We would be particularly interested in examples of where this funding has been allocated on an 'invest-to-save' basis, achieving reductions in high needs spending over the longer term. We would like to publish any good examples received.

Question 12

We welcome examples of where centrally retained funding is used to support schools that are particularly inclusive and have a high proportion of pupils with particular types of SEN, or a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs.

Question 13

Do you agree that independent special schools should be given the opportunity to receive place funding directly from the EFA with the balance in the form of top-up funding from local authorities?

Question 14

We welcome views on the outline and principles of the proposed changes to post-16 place funding (noting that the intended approach for post-16 mainstream institutions which have smaller proportions or numbers of students with high needs, differs from the approach for those with larger proportions or numbers), and on how specialist provision in FE colleges might be identified and designated.