

**NATIONAL SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA 2014/15 HEREFORDSHIRE CONSULTATION
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OCTOBER 2013**

Q1: PRIMARY SECONDARY FUNDING RATIO	Yes	No
Do you agree that Herefordshire should move to address the primary secondary funding ratio in 2014/15 given that the DfE have advised authorities to be aware of their position in the benchmarking data but not introduced any constraint for 2014/15?	24	2

Q2: PRIMARY SECONDARY FUNDING RATIO	Yes	No
If Herefordshire does agree to address the funding ratio in 2014/15, do you agree with the proposed strategy of moving from a primary secondary funding ratio of 1:1.18 to 1:1.23 over a five year period and the associated funding transfer of an annual £200,000 from primary schools to secondary schools so that Herefordshire's funding ratio moves to be consistent with our "family" authority average?	24	2

Q3: SCHOOL LUMP SUM VALUES	Yes	No
Do you agree that Herefordshire should adopt the lump sum values (proposed by the f40 group) of £75,000 for primary schools and £150,000 for secondary schools?	22	4

Q4: PRIMARY LUMP SUM	Yes	No
Do you agree that the lump sum allocation for primary schools should be reduced by £6,000 to £99,000 in 2014/15 as part of a planned move over 5 years so that the primary lump sum is eventually funded at £75,000?	23	3

Q5: SECONDARY LUMP SUM	Yes	No
Do you agree that the lump sum allocation for secondary schools should be increased by £13,750 to £118,750 as part of a planned move over 5 years to eventually be funded at £150,000?	23	2

Q6: SPARSITY FUNDING	Yes	No
Do you agree that Herefordshire, as one of the most rural counties in England, should include the DfE's sparsity factor in the school funding formula for 2014/15?	23	3

Q7: SPARSITY FUNDING	Yes	No
Do you agree that sparsity funding should be phased in over the same five year period as the lump sums are revised?	22	4

Q8: PRIMARY SPARSITY FUNDING	Yes	No
Do you agree that the subsidy required for small rural primary schools should be based on an additional £20,000 for expensive teacher costs and a “missing pupil” subsidy based on 50% of the basic pupil entitlement funding so that small qualifying schools are funded for the full cost of teachers in small classes?	19	7

Q9: PRIMARY SPARSITY FUNDING	Yes	No
Do you agree that the baseline sparsity subsidy for a qualifying small 28 pupil primary school should be set at £51,000 and that sparsity funding should decrease on a tapered basis?	16	6

Q10(a): PRIMARY SPARSITY MODEL A	Yes	No
Do you agree that the primary sparsity model (A) of a tapered lump sum of £70,000 and a maximum threshold of 105 pupils should be implemented over a five year period from 2014/15 at a total cost of £515k as it supports more small schools and is consistent with our approach in 2012/13?	14	11

Q10(b): PRIMARY SPARSITY MODEL C	Yes	No
Or do you agree that the alternative primary sparsity model (C) of a tapered lump sum of £70,000 and a maximum threshold of 70 pupils should be implemented over a five year period from 2014/15 at a total cost of £200k, which is reduced expenditure from arrangements in 2012/13?	8	14

Q11: SECONDARY SPARSITY FUNDING	Yes	No
(a) Do you agree that the preferred secondary sparsity model (model E) of a tapered lump sum of £70,000 and maximum threshold of 450 pupils should be implemented over a five year period from 2014/15 on the basis of consistency with primary schools at a total cost of £39k?	12	4
(b) Or do you prefer the alternative model (model D) of a tapered lump sum of £70,000 and a maximum threshold of 600 pupils, implemented over 5 years, at a total cost of £132k?	1	9

Q12: FUNDING THE COST OF SPARSITY	Yes	No
Do you agree that the cost of sparsity payments should be phase specific so that the cost of primary sparsity is funded by the primary schools budget and the cost of secondary sparsity is funded by the secondary schools budget?	22	3

Q13: SECONDARY PRIOR ATTAINMENT FUNDING	Yes	No
That the funding allocation for secondary prior attainment be amended from £355 per pupil not achieving level 4 in Maths AND English to £148 per pupil not attaining Maths OR English so that expenditure is maintained at the same level as 2013/14?	23	0

Q14: NOTIONAL SEN BUDGET	Yes	No
Do you agree that the Notional SEN budget is fairly calculated and no further changes are required?	21	4

Q15: CAPPING GAINERS TO FUND LOSERS	Yes	No
Do you agree that schools gaining funding through the national funding formula should be capped in order to fund the statutory Minimum Funding Guarantee protection provided to schools losing funding? Note: the alternative is to reduce the basic entitlement funding per pupil all schools (including those losing funding) – which will further increase the costs of the MFG?	25	1

Q16: DE-DELEGATION	Yes	No
Do you agree that the current de-delegation of funding should continue for		
(a) trade union facilities	20	7
(b) ethnic minority support	23	2
(c) free school meals administration	23	2
for local authority maintained schools?		

Q17: HIGH NEEDS ASSESSMENT MATRIX	Yes	No
Do you agree that the High Needs Assessment Matrix (as based on the new draft Code of Practice on Special Educational Needs) as set out in the Appendix provides a sound basis for the implementation of a new tariff funding model from April 2014?	23	2

Q18: HIGH NEEDS ASSESSMENT CATEGORY WEIGHTINGS	Yes	No								
(a) Do you agree with the principle of weightings?	20	0								
(b) If yes, do you agree that the High Needs Assessment Matrix should be weighted as follows;	12	4								
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sensory and/or Physical</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication and Interaction</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emotional, Social & Behavioural Development</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cognition and Learning</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Sensory and/or Physical	4	Communication and Interaction	2	Emotional, Social & Behavioural Development	3	Cognition and Learning	4
Sensory and/or Physical	4									
Communication and Interaction	2									
Emotional, Social & Behavioural Development	3									
Cognition and Learning	4									

Q19: HIGH NEEDS FUNDING TARIFF	Yes	No																								
Do you agree that the High Needs Funding Tariff for April 2014 should be grouped as follows?	22	1																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Tariff Group</th> <th>Assessment Points</th> <th>Tariff Value (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Local Offer</td> <td>0-9</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>10-19</td> <td>1,350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>20-29</td> <td>3,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>30-49</td> <td>5,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>50-69</td> <td>8,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>70-89</td> <td>12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F</td> <td>90+</td> <td>16,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Tariff Group	Assessment Points	Tariff Value (£)	Local Offer	0-9	0	A	10-19	1,350	B	20-29	3,500	C	30-49	5,500	D	50-69	8,500	E	70-89	12,000	F	90+	16,000
Tariff Group	Assessment Points	Tariff Value (£)																								
Local Offer	0-9	0																								
A	10-19	1,350																								
B	20-29	3,500																								
C	30-49	5,500																								
D	50-69	8,500																								
E	70-89	12,000																								
F	90+	16,000																								

Q20: TARIFF FUNDING IMPLEMENTATION	Yes	No
Do you agree that the timescale for High Needs Tariff Funding should be implemented in stages as set out above in paragraph 6.14?	21	2

Malcolm Green

7th October 2013

12.15pm