

Consultation on School Funding 2011-12: Introducing a Pupil Premium

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is: 18
October 2010

Your comments must reach us by that date.

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Education e-consultation website (<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>).

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.

Reason for confidentiality:

Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Address:

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either:

Juliet Yates on: telephone: 020 7340 8313 e-mail:

juliet.yates@education.gsi.gov.uk, or

Ian McVicar on: telephone: 020 7340 7980 e-mail:

ian.mcvicar@education.gsi.gov.uk

If you have a query relating to the consultation process you can contact the Consultation Unit on telephone: 0870 000 2288 or email:

consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Please select **ONE** category which best describes you as a respondent:

<input type="checkbox"/> School	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools Forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor Association
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Authority Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Trade Union/Professional Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Early Years Setting
<input type="checkbox"/> Campaign Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Carer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

1 Do you agree it is right to give a higher premium to areas that currently receive less per pupil funding? [Paras 24 - 27]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Yes, if the appropriate (Hybrid) Area Cost Adjustment element is retained to compensate those authorities that face higher staffing costs; this will ensure that the pupil premium recognised the relative additional costs associated with deprivation.

2 What is your preferred deprivation indicator for allocating the pupil premium? [Paras 29 - 50]

FSM - in year

FSM ever - 3 year

FSM ever - 6 year

Out of Work Tax Credit

ACORN/MOSAIC

Other (not listed)

Not Sure

Comments:

This is by far the simplest, most transparent and up-to-date of the measures proposed; it also targets specific pupils. The numbers of pupils eligible for FSM will be known to head teachers and will therefore be capable of verification. Bringing in those pupils who have moved in and out of being eligible has benefits but makes the system less transparent and simple.

The Working Tax Credit option is area based rather than child specific and is therefore not as targeted, and not as simple as the FSM options.

Insufficient information has been provided to draw any conclusions on the ACORN/MOSAIC options.

3 Do you agree the coverage of the pupil premium should include Looked After Children? [Paras 51 - 54]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments

Yes, this is a very disadvantaged group and we fully support any proposal that might help narrow the attainment gap for them.

4 What are your views on the operation of the Looked After Children element of the pupil premium? In particular, how might the funding arrangements work at local authority level for pupils educated outside of the local authority with caring responsibility? [Paras 55 - 60]

Comments:

The methodology adopted must be capable of identifying which child is funded and where they are at school. The proposal to provide funding to the home authority may impose an additional burden on LAC teams and schools in ensuring the funding is allocated correctly.

5 Do you think the coverage of the pupil premium should be extended to include additional support for Service children? [Paras 61 - 66]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

The additional costs linked with the higher mobility of service children and the other pressures they face should be recognised.

The DfE should also consider using the pupil premium to address the cost of the turbulence experienced by LAs that have substantial migratory populations.

6 Should the pupil count for three year olds, used to allocate DSG for 2011-12, reflect actual take up or continue to reflect a minimum of 90% participation where lower? [Paras 75 - 76]

Actual Take-Up

90% Minimum

Not Sure

Comments:

Actual take-up is the fairer option and is consistent with all other age-groups.

7 Should the pupil count used to allocate DSG for 2011-12 continue to reflect dual subsidiary registrations for pupils at pupil referral units? [Paras 77 - 78]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

No, the availability of adequate data should eliminate double funding. Local procedures should ensure that money follows pupils.

8 Do you support our proposals for additional support for schools catering for Service children? [Para 79]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Agreed.

9 Do you support our proposals for home educated pupils? [Para 80]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:
Agreed.

10 Do you think that there should be a cash floor at local authority level in 2011-12? [Para 85]

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

This is a very small allocation to very few LAs, but is probably significant to them in managing their falling rolls. This should be retained.

11 Have you any further comments?

Comments:

Thank you for the chance to comment on your proposals for the Pupil Premium. We welcome any initiative that will help narrow the attainment gap between those from more and less deprived backgrounds.

Whilst we welcome the introduction of the pupil premium, we are disappointed that the unfairness of the present Area Cost Adjustment will remain for at least another year. This will continue to discriminate against pupils from some of the most deprived areas in the country. Haringey Council, the Haringey Schools Forum local and national organisations and politicians from all parties joined our school governors, teachers and the parents of our pupils in campaigning for a fair deal for Haringey children. It is very disappointing to all concerned that after such effort from so many our case for a fair deal has been accepted but again our children will be deprived of the funding they so greatly need. However, we are encouraged by your comments in paragraph 71 that, 'The Government --- plans to resolve the (ACA) issue in the longer term as a new approach to school funding is developed.' We welcome the use of the 'hybrid' ACA option in the pupil premium.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Donna Harrison, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 794304 / email: donna.harrison@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 18 October 2010

Send by post to: School Funding Consultation 2011-12, Funding and Technology Unit, Department for Education, Level 3, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT.

Send by e-mail to: dsg.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk