

CONSULTATION ON FAIRER FUNDING 2015-16 - ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

48 Responses

Primary 34 proforma in favour of Option 1
 1 proforma in favour of Option 2
 1 Letter in favour of neither
 1 letter from Chair of Primary and Special HT Forum

Secondary 10 proforma in favour of Option 2
 2 letters from Secondary HTs

1 proforma from a Secondary and Primary school MAT in favour of option 2

Supporting Comments

Primary:

Comment 1

It is within the spirit of the fair funding consultation to ensure that funding is equitably distributed in this fashion.

At present primary children receive £3574 each through the formula and secondary school pupils receive £4873. Primary pupils receive 73% of the per pupil funding that secondary schools receive. The DfE minimum funding per child was set at £4543 in the consultation. Primary school students receive £889 less than this minimum and secondary school receive £330 more.

This is obviously an inequitable situation which clearly needs to be addressed. It is clear in the tone and content of the DfE consultation that the additional funding for underfunded boroughs should also address inequities across borough funding.

In example 1 primary schools receive £4129 per child and secondary schools £5194. This would mean the primary pupils receive 79% of the funding per child that secondary schools receive. Primary schools are still underfunded in comparison to

secondary schools and there is still inequity but it has been addressed to a certain extent. Primary schools will also receive a per pupil amount below the DfE minimum, by £322. Secondary school pupils receive £651 above the minimum.

There is no argument, therefore for distributing more of the money to secondary schools.

There is an argument to distribute more of the money to primary schools to raise the per pupil average to the DfE minimum, or at least closer to this. This option has not been consulted on.

It also needs to be acknowledged that underfunding primary schools has a profound effect on attainment for all children. In a report published recently on the so called “London Effect”, that children in London attain higher than similar children elsewhere and that disadvantaged children in London attain higher than all children elsewhere, showed that this was mainly an effect of higher quality outcomes in primary schools. This is due to high levels of funding in inner city primary schools. If we continue to underfund primary schools in Bromley children in Bromley will continue not to benefit from the “London Effect” and we will continue to have underperforming children in Bromley.

In example 2 primary pupils receive £ 4121 per pupil and secondary pupils £5328, primary pupils receive 77% of the funding of secondary pupils; around the same as currently. Primary pupils will receive £422 less than the DfE minimum and secondary pupils £785 more than the DfE minimum per pupil. This has compounded the inequity in funding.

The name of the consultation is Fair Funding, this suggestion does not enable fair funding across Bromley schools and cannot and should not be accepted in the spirit of the DfE consultation.

Comment 2

If ‘fair funding’ is the basis for this redistribution, then this benefits our school – for now. The phrase ‘fair funding’ indicates an opportunity to rectify the historic inequity of funding for Beomley borough primary schools, in comparison with Bromley secondary schools and other borough’s primaries. The historic low level of funding for Bromley primaries has always made planning and delivery of day-to-day and one-off big projects incredibly difficult. The additional funding would help us tackle the tail of underachievement in outer London schools, when compared with more successful and higher funded inner London schools. Option 1 appears fairer than option 2, which is not equitable, as Primary schools would be further disadvantaged by the weighting of funds towards secondary schools.

Comment 3

As option 1 is the only remaining option from the original proposals, and that it is in the spirit of the original consultation which is to reduce the underfunding of primary schools.

Option 2 would only be logical if Bromley scrapped their funding formula and split the whole pot using only pupil numbers. In this option Secondary schools appear to keep any over funding eg FSM while primaries have theirs reduced.

Comment 4

It is time to address the chronic underfunding of Primary Schools in Bromley. If this option (1) is adopted it will go some way to redress the historic funding imbalance between primary and secondary schools in Bromley. If this opportunity is missed the LA will not have honoured the spirit of the new legislation in terms of providing a reasonable minimum level of funding for all its schools,

Comment 5

This funding was provided to enable the inequality of funding in Bromley Schools to be addressed. Bromley Primary Schools have been significantly underfunded for many years. The ability to provide additional resources to pupils even when schools are working collaboratively is minimal at this funding level. An increasing number of schools are in category and need additional funding to support the raising of attainment. Better funding of primary schools will impact on pupils attainment and therefore make them better prepared for secondary education.

The funding profiles in both options will only bring Bromley Primaries to the minimum expected by DfE it will not be sufficient to address the years of underfunding of Bromley Primary schools. A further option is required to redistribute the overfunding in KS 3 in both Option 1 and 2. The £159 above the minimum could be reallocated to address the loss of schools in Option 1.

This option would be an unfair distribution of funding, with secondary schools receiving AWPU significantly above the DfE minimum funding level and primaries at the bare minimum. This would be an unfair distribution of funding and would be a continuation of the inequality of funding at secondary and primary level. In neither option do any secondaries lose funding. However in both options there are primaries who will.

Comment 6

Will enhance our budget in areas most needed – deprivation and FSM6

Comment 7

With either option it seems the minimum funding guarantee will disappear?

Comment 8

As a school we are opting for option 1 because under this formula we will receive extra funding which will benefit our pupils who primarily come from deprived backgrounds and require a significant amount of additional intervention in order to achieve national and LA outcomes. Option 2 implies from the spreadsheet that our school will receive no additional funding so this will not be an option for us.

Historically funding of primary and secondary schools has been weighted heavily in favour of KS 3 and KS 4 pupils. However this doesn't mean that this should continue in the future as the correct funding model should enable all pupils to be funded equally through the AWPU.

Comment 9

The only option is stated in the title of the consultation. There is now the opportunity to make funding more equitable. Primary schools have been underfunded for too long. 60% of Bromley schools are in the Primary phase but only attract 54% of the funding. A huge number of primary schools are in category and need additional funding to support the raising of attainment. Better funding of primary schools will impact on pupils attainment and therefore make them better prepared for secondary education. One form of entry schools are often in the middle of estates in areas of high deprivation. We need to raise the attainment of working class pupils and continuing to underfund these children will not break the current cycle and under performance will be allowed to continue.

Option 2 would be an unfair distribution of funding. Under this option 78% or 58 out of 74 primary schools would be worse off. 100% of secondary schools would be better off. All but two of the primary schools in category would be worse off. 10 of the 14 Primary schools that gain under this option are small or faith schools. The majority of primary schools in areas of high deprivation would be worse off.

Comment 10

I believe that this option gives more to the Primary phase. This is fairer because the underfunding has historically had a greater effect on the Primary phase due to the difference in the banding per pupil being so much lower than in the secondary phase. How can it be that a child suddenly becomes worth over £1000 more when moving from year 6 to year 7? To go for option 2 would actually compound the iniquity. It should also be noted that even with this money, Bromley is still funding below the government's recommended baseline figure per pupil which is, I believe, about £4400.

I understand the desire of the secondary representatives of the forum to get an appropriate "cut" of this funding. I would do the same, but to make the split 60:40 of this "extra" money would only further imbalance the current situation, as there are more children in primary than secondary education.

Comment 11

Primary schools in Bromley are underfunded and here is an opportunity to address this issue. The achievement of white working class pupils has become a concern in government. At a recent conference organised by Lambeth LA it was highlighted that white working class pupils in London are clearly becoming the children left behind in a fast moving education system. Pupils from ethnic minority groups are dominating tables of achievement because they are funded well and supported in their

education. When Lambeth described itself as an area of disadvantage I felt that was an out of date label and one which sat better upon the borough of Bromley where schools try to make inadequate budgets from the 20th century fit a 21st century education system. Schools in Bromley are falling behind and it is a disgrace that we cannot offer children the same advantages that other groups of pupils enjoy. This is an opportunity to begin to redress the balance between primary and secondary school underfunding. Do not squander the educational achievement of primary school children who deserve the best education in Bromley rather than one that is merely good enough because funding allows nothing better.

Comment 12

Option 1 is our preferred option. We know the benefits of early intervention and this additional income would enable all schools to target children and families earlier.

Comment 13

Although in this instance option 2 favours our school, it disadvantages the primary sector compared to the secondary. The primary sector has been underfunded for many years and this needs to be redressed.

Comment 14

Agree with the LA that this looks the fairer option.

Comment 15

The objective of the fair funding consultation is to ensure that funding is equitably distributed. We strongly believe that option 1 is a more fair formula of allocation of funding. Under option 2 primary schools will be underfunded in comparison to secondary schools. Primary schools will receive a per pupil amount under the DfE minimum and secondary schools will receive a per pupil amount above the DfE minimum. This is an inequitable situation that clearly needs to be addressed. Underfunding in primary schools has a profound effect on attainment for all children and research suggests that higher funding in primary schools leads to higher pupil achievement at secondary level. There is an argument for distributing more money to primary schools to raise pupil average to the DfE minimum and to raise pupil attainment prior to transitioning to secondary school.

Option 1 follows most closely the funding levels which are suggested by the DfE and would therefore, on implementation of the national funding formula, be most likely to cause the least “turbulence” in overall funding levels. Furthermore, it appears to be especially beneficial for the most disadvantaged pupils and for those with low qualified parents.

Further to the points raised regarding Option 1 above, we feel that Option 2 is not a viable option. The name of the consultation is “Fair Funding” and in our opinion Option 2 does not enable fair funding across Bromley schools and cannot and should not be accepted.

Comment 16

The imbalance in funding that has existed for years between Bromley Primary Schools and their Secondary School partners has led to significant differences in staffing levels and quality of resources and this has to be reversed. What Bromley Primaries have achieved with low funding levels is hugely impressive but it is time that they were better supported to achieve even more. The gap in funding, when clearly so much more could be achieved if pupils at a younger age were to benefit from better facilities and resources, as well as lower staff:pupil ratios, must be reduced over the coming few years. Secondary schools might actually find they also benefit from such a move, as pupils come to them having already benefitted from better financial support.

Comment 17

Option 1 is the fairer option as no particular schools or groups of pupils appear to be disadvantaged. It is important that primaries maintain their current levels of FSM6 and EAL funding to ensure that their most vulnerable pupils are 'secondary ready'. Additionally this option goes some way to addressing the historical level of underfunding to primary schools in Bromley and therefore upholds the spirit of the purpose of the additional funding.

Option 2 provides very large increases for all secondary schools above Option 1, but substantially lessened amounts for all but a handful of primaries. Historically it is the primary schools that have been chronically underfunded so this option seems neither fair nor proportional. Reducing the deprivation and EAL funding to primary schools seems contrary to all we know about the huge gains that can be made through early intervention to support particular groups of pupils.

Comment 18

I am not voting for either option 1 or 2 Why? Because I believe it would be morally wrong for me to vote when neither option is fair for all pupils/students in Bromley.

This is highlighted by the fact that voting has polarized primaries and secondaries.

Finding a funding option that is fair and inclusive for all is immensely complex and I appreciate the hard work that the School's Forum have put into developing these 2 models. However it is clear that neither works equitably for all pupils/students and the upshot of the voting has been that each phase has become divided and entrenched.

Let's forget about the politics and the divisive language and move on. I propose that we ask the School's Forum to go back to the drawing board and work out a new option with support from an intermediary if needed and drawing on the experience of other boroughs where successful solutions have been developed.

The bottom line is that we all want to provide the very best education for our

pupils/students and I firmly believe that by working together with our immense shared experience and professionalism we can find a solution that will be fair to all.

Secondary:

Comment 1

Option 2 represents a more realistic and appropriate distribution of £19.1m. It addresses the intention of the additional money ie individual students, as a priority over and above formula distribution. It is not about primary versus secondary but about a fair distribution for all children and schools.

Comment 2

Option 2 is a far more appropriate method to take the schools funding formula forward.

Comment 3

The larger AWPU figure for KS4 reflects the vast number of changes that schools have to make and that it will be necessary to increase the number of teaching staff. We accept that taking the opportunity to provide more for primary schools by adjusting the funding ratio (currently 1:1.36) is desirable but believe model 1 goes too far, particularly as the models propose an equal base sum for primary and secondary whereas the existing favours secondary by 10%.

Option 1 gives an increase of 15 % in primary and 6% in secondary but option 2 gives 13% to primary and 9% to secondary which is a more reasonable balance. The school accepts the use of FSM at the current stage but strongly advocates a move to the alternative IDACI which gives a more accurate guide to deprivation within each school community. FSM is accurate over the whole of an authority or PAN London but is not accurate on an individual school basis.

Comment 4

Option 2 takes a wholistic view of the funding schools receive. It is a fairer distribution of the funding that takes account of factors other than AWPU. Given also the cut in Sixth Form funding Secondary Schools need to be treated fairly if they are to meet the needs of their large school populations.

Comment 5

Option 2 is clearly favourable for secondary schools and would expect all other secondary schools to vote in favour of this option. However, as there are only 14 primary schools who are better off with this option and only 17 secondary schools , making a total of 31 who would benefit from Option 2, as opposed to 61 schools who would prefer Option 1, we would assume that unless there is some sort of proportional representation (as secondary schools represent a far greater number of students than primary schools) there is little point in voting this way.

Comment 6

We feel this is a rather awkward exercise. As a secondary school with little funding we could not opt for Option 1 which obviously benefits primary schools.

Comment 7

Will ensure that Funding is received in areas most needed KS3 and KS4.