



**Haringey** Council

**Appendix  
1**

**The Children and Young People's Service**

**Report to Haringey Schools Forum – Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2007**

**Report Title:**

**Response to the Fair Funding Consultation.**

**Authors:**

**Kevin Bartle, Head of Finance for the Children and Young People's Service**

**Telephone: 020 8489 3176      Email: [kevin.bartle@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.bartle@haringey.gov.uk)**

**Steve Worth, School Funding & Policy Manager**

**Telephone: 020 8489 3708      Email: [Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Stephen.worth@haringey.gov.uk)**

**Purpose**

**To report the outcome of the consultation on proposed changes to Haringey's Schools Funding Formula and Scheme for Financing Schools.**

**Recommendations**

- 3.1      That proposals 5.1, 5.2 a-d and 5.3 of the AEN/SEN Consultation Document are agreed.**
- 3.2      The Forum may wish to consider continuing to fund existing statements that fall between the current and proposed thresholds. Funding could continue for as long as the child remains at her/his present school and the statement is in force. Information on the cost of this proposal will be tabled at the Forum.**

- 3.3 That the proposed new Section 14 of the Scheme for Financing Schools is agreed.**
- 3.4 The Authority recommends that Option 1 of the consultation on Funding for Teachers on the Upper Pay Scale is agreed. The responses from schools favour Option 2.**
- 3.5 That Option 1 of the consultation on The Delegation of Primary School Resources for Children Taking School Meals is agreed.**

## 1. Background.

- 1.1 Local authorities are required to consult with their schools and Schools Forums on any proposed changes to their Scheme for Financing Schools or Schools Funding Formula.
- 1.2 Consultation has taken place this term on proposals to:
- Change the level of funding and the factors used for AEN/SEN allocations.
  - Change the methodology for allocating funding for teachers on the upper pay scale.
  - Inset a new section in Haringey's Scheme for Financing Schools on Community Facilities.
  - Increase the proportion of funding for pupils taking free school meals in the primary schools meal factor.
- 1.3 The full consultation document was sent to headteachers and to chairs of governing bodies. Additionally, letters were sent to all governors informing them of the consultation and giving details of the web site where the detailed consultation could be found. Three 'road shows' were also arranged to discuss the AEN/SEN proposals to which all headteachers and governors were invited and meetings with parents' groups to explain the proposals are continuing.
- 1.4 The consultation ended on the 7<sup>th</sup> November.

## 2. Responses.

### 2.1 The Delegation of Resources for Children with Additional and Special Educational Needs.

- 2.1.1 Table 1 sets out the proposals and the overall response. More detail on the responses is set out in Appendix 1.

**Table 1 Summary of Responses to AEN/SEN Consultation.**

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Other</b>
5.1 Do you agree that, in principle, the proportion of deprivation funding that schools receive in the Individual Schools Budget (ISB ) should reflect the proportion of additional deprivation funding that Haringey receives in the DSG (16%)?	33	5	8

5.2 Do you agree that the factors to be used in distributing AEN/SEN Funding should be:			
a) Eligibility for Free School Meals. As determined at the time of the January PLASC. Funding to be allocated pro rata to the number of eligible pupils.	35	4	7
b) a prior attainment factor to be calculated from end of Key Stage attainment data in Maths, English and Science. Key Stage 1 data would be used to calculate a prior attainment factor for Key Stage 2, Key Stage 2 for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 3 data for Key Stage 4. This factor will not apply to the infant and early years phases;	25	12	9
c) a factor for unplanned admissions calculated on the basis of any children who start at a school 3 months after the majority of their peers;	35	4	7
d) a factor to increase the rate of progress of underachieving groups, specifically pupils of African, African-Caribbean, Turkish and Kurdish background. Funding will be allocated pro-rata to the numbers of pupils in these groups.	32	8	6
Do you agree that the proposed percentages applied to these factors in the different phases should be as set out:	25	11	10
5.3 Do you agree that the threshold for receiving funding for specific statements should be set at 15 hours of special needs assistance support costed at Scale 4 (or a mixture of support of equivalent value)?	27	14	5

The table excludes a second response on behalf of a school that is similar to the first

### 2.1.2 Comments and Other Responses.

Many schools made comments or alternative suggestions which are summarised below:

- a) Concern was expressed that FSM will exclude certain groups, notably nursery pupils and children from refugee families; however, only one school commented positively on retaining IMD .
- b) Several schools expressed concern that the Targeted Ethnic Minority Groups were too limited and inflexible, and should either be widened to include other groups such as children from eastern European families or that the acquisition of English continue to be used as a factor. Another alternative suggested was a more general measure of ethnic diversity. The point was also made that white working class boys also underachieved.
- c) Several schools expressed concern that the transition period was too short suggesting that the change happen over 5 to 7 years rather than 3.
- d) Some schools strongly questioned the link between AEN and SEN and expressed the view that funding for high incidence SEN should be separate from funding for deprivation; in particular, that AEN funding should include a specific factor for pupils with below threshold special needs.
- e) Several schools commented that the combination of increasing the threshold and transferring funds from AWPU into AEN factors resulted in a 'double whammy'. Schools in the West of the borough were particularly susceptible, with many statemented pupils but low deprivation. One school commented that mainstream funds were already supporting statemented pupils and that now those funds were to be cut another school commented that this would have a significant impact on inclusion. A point was also made that the true cost of funding SEN provision was being masked.
- f) A school made the point that schools with low proportions of pupils from deprived backgrounds faced a higher per pupil cost for providing support and that this was not recognised in the proposals. To recognise this the school proposed that the 16% of deprivation funding should be allocated as 6% distributed across all schools and 10% by school population.
- g) A suggestion put forward by several schools to ameliorate the effect of e) was the protection of existing pupils with statements between the current and proposed thresholds. One school suggested that the funding for this transitional arrangement should be 'top sliced' from the budgets of those schools gaining from the re-distribution of funds.
- h) Several schools also made the observation that the prior attainment factor would penalise successful schools or reward primary schools for under-performance at KS1. One school commented that the factors gave no help for underperformance

in nursery and infant settings. Alternatively, another school wanted to see prior attainment given a higher weighting.

- i) Three schools commented on the likelihood that the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) will be below inflation. A proposal was made that the Schools Forum should set a local MFG at the level of cost pressures to protect school budgets in real terms.
- j) One school commented on the increased difficulty faced by small schools in coping with funding loss. The point was made that larger schools have the benefit of economies of scale in coping with budget reductions and that additional funding should be made available through the formula for small schools.
- k) One school commented that the proposals did not recognise gifted and talented pupils, nor pupils with dyslexia.
- l) Several schools objected to the increase in the threshold for statemented funding and suggested either retaining the status quo or reducing the threshold to 10 hours. One school advocated a banding system.
- m) Several schools commented that it was unacceptable not to fully passport deprivation funding.
- n) A school commented that, in looking at the level of funding for deprivation, other funding sources, such as Standards Fund should be taken into account.
- o) A request that Haringey Council should campaign for more money was made.

2.1.3 Several schools suggested alternative percentage distributions for AEN factors. Table 2 summaries those from primary schools and Table 3 those from secondary schools.

**Table 2 Alternative Proposals for Primary School Factors**

Key Stage	FSM	EAL	EMA	Mobility	Prior Attainment	TEMG
	%	%	%	%	%	%
KS1/2	30	30		40		
All	30	30	20	20		
KS1	40			30		20
KS2	30			30	20	20
KS1	50			20		30
KS2	60			20		20
KS1	50			10		40
KS2	50			20	10	20
KS1	50			20		30
KS2	50			20	10	20

**Table 3 Alternative Proposals for Secondary School Factors.**

Key Stage	FSM	Mobility	Prior	TEMG
-----------	-----	----------	-------	------

			Attainment	
	%	%	%	%
Secondary	80	10	10	
Secondary	30	50	20	
Secondary	20	40	20	20

2.1.4 In addition to schools, a Councillor commented welcoming the increase in funding for schools with the highest levels of deprivation but expressing concern for those pupils with statements that newly fall below the threshold will be disadvantaged if the school does not target funding at them. The Councillor suggested that there should be a stipulation that a specified percentage of the additional funding should be spent on pupils with statements.

2.1.5 Responses were also received from the Markfield Project, Haringey Autism and Downs Inclusion Group and the Muswell Hill SEN Parents Group. All three restricted their comments to the proposed increase in the threshold for statemented funding. The groups expressed their concern that an increase in the threshold may leave vulnerable children without support because of budget pressures. There would also be a pressure not to admit, or to exclude, children with special needs. Schools may also be wary about being seen to provide good SEN support so as not to encourage applications from pupils with special need. A move to legally challenge local authority schemes over the delegation of special needs responsibilities was mentioned.

## **2.2 Section 14 – Community Facilities.**

2.2.1 This consultation is in response to DCSF recommendations to include a section on Community Facilities.

2.2.2 Responses and observations.

The majority of schools that responded were either in favour or had no comments. Three schools expressed concern about the impact of the provisions on their activities. These will be discussed individually with the schools concerned. The schools responding are shown in Appendix 2.

## **2.3 Funding for Teachers on the Upper Pay Scale.**

2.3.1 The consultation proposed a simplified methodology for allocating funding but one that still targeted funding at schools facing the greatest costs. Table 4 summarises the response set out in detail in Appendix 3.

**Table 4. Summary of Responses to Funding for Teachers on the Upper Pay Scale.**

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>For</b>
Option 1. Use the information provided by schools each January in the 618G return to identify the numbers of teachers on the upper pay scale. Funding would be provided for each teacher based on agreed levels of support averaged over numbers of teachers on the UPS. The Schools Forum will be consulted annually on the sum to be distributed through this factor	13
Option 2. Retain the status quo.	19
Other Options.	1

The table excludes a second response on behalf of a school that is similar to the first.

### 2.3.2 Comments and Other Responses.

The response was in favour of the status quo, the one school making a return under the Other Option suggested a combination of the two. The Local Authority remains of the view that using the 618G form gives substantial benefits in the early, transparent and known determination of funding and will recommend Option 1 to the Forum.

## 2.4 The Delegation of Primary School Resources for Children Taking School Meals.

2.4.1 The consultation proposed changes to the proportion of funding allocated via free school meal numbers. The proposed change will bring estimated income more in line with estimated expenditure. Table 5 summarises the responses shown in Appendix 4.

**Table 5. Summary of Responses to Consultation on Funding for Primary School Meals.**

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>For</b>
-----------------	------------



Option 1. That from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2008, 90% of primary school resources for school meals will be allocated pro-rata to the numbers taking free school meals and 10% pro-rata to the school roll.	4
Option 2. That we continue with the existing methodology of distributing 75% of primary school resources for school meals pro-rata to the numbers taking free school meals and 25% pro-rata to the school roll.	4

The table excludes a second response on behalf of a school that is similar to the first.

#### 2.4.2 Comments and Other Responses.

One school made detailed comments that would refine the targeting of meals funding. The proposal has merit and further details will be tabled at the meeting of the Forum but it may be necessary to include this proposal in the next round of consultations.

### 3. Recommendations.

- 3.1 That proposals 5.1, 5.2 a-d and 5.3 of the AEN/SEN Consultation Document are agreed.
- 3.2 The Forum may wish to consider continuing to fund existing statements that fall between the current and proposed thresholds. Funding could continue for as long as the child remains at her/his present school and the statement is in force. Information on the cost of this proposal will be tabled at the Forum.
- 3.3 That the proposed new Section 14 of the Scheme for Financing Schools is agreed.
- 3.4 The Authority recommends that Option 1 of the consultation on Funding for Teachers on the Upper Pay Scale is agreed. The responses from schools favour Option 2.
- 3.5 That Option 1 of the consultation on The Delegation of Primary School Resources for Children Taking School Meals is agreed.