

A consultation on school funding reform: Proposals for a fairer system

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is:

11 October 2011

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>).

The information you provide in your response will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations, which allow public access to information held by the Department. This does not necessarily mean that your response can be made available to the public as there are exemptions relating to information provided in confidence and information to which the Data Protection Act 1998 applies. You may request confidentiality by ticking the box provided, but you should note that neither this, nor an automatically-generated e-mail confidentiality statement, will necessarily exclude the public right of access.

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

Name **Malcolm Green**

Organisation (if applicable) **Herefordshire Schools Forum**

Address: **Plough Lane**
PO BOX 4
Hereford HR4 0LE

If you have an enquiry related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact either

Ian McVicar on: Telephone: 020 7340 7980 e-mail: ian.mcvicar@education.gsi.gov.uk
or

Juliet Yates on: Telephone: 020 7340 8313 e-mail: juliet.yates@education.gsi.gov.uk,

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Consultation Unit by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk, by Fax: 01928 794 311, or by telephone: 0870 000 2288.

Please tick the box that best describes you as a respondent.

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

If 'Other' Please Specify:

Chapter 1 - The National Funding System

In paragraphs 1.8 to 1.14 we discuss two ways we are considering using to calculate the schools block:

- a) A formula based on the schools within the area and the pupils within those schools (“School-level”);
- b) A formula based solely on the pupils within the area (“local authority-level”).

Question 1: Would you prefer the formula to be based on

a) a notional budget for every school; or

b) the pupils in each local authority area?

School level

LA level

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: A notional budget for each school will make very clear to all the cost of local formula variations on a school by school basis. Changes can then be made locally to aid convergence to the national formula. Schools will have confidence in the fairness of the allocations and can determine the pace of change locally. A notional budget on a school by school basis will ensure fairness between local authority and academy schools.

Chapter 2 - The Schools Block - system

Local flexibility

In paragraphs 2.6 to 2.9 we discuss local funding formulae and propose reducing the number of formula factors which local authorities can apply. We suggest that the local formula factors could cover:

- a. Basic entitlement per pupil (currently Age-Weighted Pupil Units)
- b. Funding for additional educational needs (e.g. deprivation, SEN)
- c. Rates
- d. Exceptional site factors (e.g. split site, PFI and rent)
- e. Lump sums for schools

Question 2: Do you agree that these are the right formula factors to retain at a local level?

All

Some

None

Not Sure

Comments: The only significant sums paid to schools outside these factors are the former Teachers Pay Grant (3.5% of funding) which is paid on teacher numbers above the threshold and the former standards fund grants which are paid on a varying historic amount per pupil (16% of funding). Other factors such as small schools protection, key stage 1 class size funding, grounds maintenance, free school meals all account for less than 1% of overall funding. The AWPU is over 60% of available funding.

Question 3: What other factors, if any, should be able to be used at local level or could any of these factors be removed?

Comments:

Paragraphs. 2.12 to 2.14 discuss primary/secondary ratios:

Question 4: Do you think that setting a range of allowable primary / secondary ratios around the national average is the right approach to ensure that there is consistency across the country?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: The consultation paper suggests a single ratio of 1:27 for primary/secondary funding, however, the national averages for KS1 is 1:03, KS2 is 1:0, KS3 is 1:28 and KS4 is 1:55. The proposed average ratio of 1:27 will significantly cut KS4 school budgets and reduce KS1. Are you sure this is right? This seems not to recognise the additional costs of KS4 and the additional costs of reception.

Arrangements for Academies

Paragraphs. 2.17 to 2.22 discuss options for the future of calculating Academies' budgets. Option (i) suggests that local authorities could calculate budgets for all schools in the area and then tell the EFA how much Academies should be paid; and Option (ii) that the EFA could calculate Academies' budgets using a pro-forma provided by local authorities setting out their formula factors.

Question 5: Do you think we should implement option (i) or (ii) when calculating budgets for Academies?

(i)

(ii)

Other

Not Sure

Comments: Anything other than option (i) duplicates local authority schools finance teams in the EFA at extra cost, delay and increased risk of errors, as all school budgets have to be calculated by the local authority to reconcile to DSG.

Ensuring accountability and fairness

Paragraphs 2.23 to 2.26 discuss options to improve the working of Schools Forums - whether the main groups on the Forum should all separately have to approve a proposed formula and whether the Forum should have more decision making powers.

Question 6: Do you think these options would help to achieve greater representation and stronger accountability at a local level?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Anything that helps to ensure an independent and truly representative Schools Forum will be helpful. However, it is possible to see instances arising nationally where the main groups on Schools Forum might not approve a formula change if it were against the interests of that voting block. In such cases there would need to be a mechanism for achieving a final budget decision. Such a mechanism might be an appeal to the Secretary of State.

Paragraphs 2.27 to 2.31 discuss functions the EFA could provide to ensure scrutiny and challenge at a national level. They are (i) checking compliance and/or (ii) acting as a review body.

Question 7: Do you think we should implement option (i), (ii), both or neither?

(i)

(ii)

Both

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: Perhaps as a first step an appeal process to School Forum would be useful and only after for the EFA or Secretary of State to step in. DFE could judge whether compliance is helpful. We can't imagine why Schools Forum would not comply with eth funding regulations. Surely a School Forum provides this function and if the powers and responsibilities of School Forums are enhanced as per Q6 then there is even less need for a compliance and review body. In exceptional cases the Secretary of State can presumably override Schools Forum?

Arrangements for Free Schools

Paragraphs 2.33 to 2.35 discuss arrangements for the funding of Free Schools:

Question 8: If we introduce the new system in this spending review, do you think that Free Schools should (i) remain on the Free School methodology for 2013-14 and 2014-15 or (ii) move straight away to the overall funding system?

(i)

✓ (ii)

Not Sure

Comments: Free schools should be funded exactly as all other schools as soon as practicable.

Chapter 3 - The Schools Block – formula content

In paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 we discuss formula content and propose that the new formula could consist of:

- A basic per-pupil entitlement ✓
- Additional funding for deprived pupils
- Protection for small schools
- An Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)
- English as an Additional Language (EAL)

Question 9: Are these the right factors to include in a fair funding formula at a national level?

✓ All

Some

None

Not Sure

Comments: The treatment of business rates needs to be specified nationally as it can be a sizable cost for some schools and is currently funded at cost by local authorities not to disadvantage pupil spend.

Deprivation

Paragraphs 3.14 to 3.17 discuss possible indicators we could use in a national formula for reflecting deprivation.

Question 10: Do you agree that we should use Ever FSM to allocate deprivation funding in the national formula? Should this be Ever 3 or Ever 6?

Ever 3

Ever 6

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: Ever 3 or Ever 6 years FSM is fairer than solely FSM entitlement due to the under reporting and pupils moving between entitlement and not on a regular basis. Herefordshire has preferred a basket of deprivation indicators includes FSM, low prior attainment and IDACI to smooth out such variation and provide a more consistent method.

Small school protection

Paragraphs. 3.19 to 3.28 discusses funding protection for small schools, suggesting that a £95,000 lump sum would be sufficient to provide protection, that it should be applicable to primary schools only and should adopt Middle Super Output Areas to derive the sparsity factor. If a local authority formula is used a choice between a lump sum payment and a sparsity measure is offered and there is also discussion on whether the threshold for eligibility should be narrowed so that sparsity funding is focused on the most sparsely populated areas.

Question 11: If we have a school-level formula, do you agree that £95,000 is an appropriate amount for a primary school lump sum?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: The analysis in Appendix B is simplistic and the regression analysis coefficient (R square) is not published. Analysis of Herefordshire primary schools suggests a fixed sum of £65k and has R square value of 0.958 i.e. a very good fit but clearly less than the national formula. Such a simplistic analysis will include business rates and these would be included within the £95k base allocation. However business rates vary considerably which is why local authorities pay at actual cost, e.g. academies and VA schools receive 80% charitable rates relief.

To determine whether the £95k is a fair sum for primary schools it is necessary to analyse fixed costs at a school by school level rather than a statistical analysis of local authority funding formula allocation. If fixed costs is the rationale for allocating a lump sum then why are secondary schools not included as they too have (higher) fixed costs?

Question 12: Do you agree that the lump sum should be limited to schools with Year 6 as the highest year-group?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: If the school lump sum is to meet fixed costs then secondary and special schools have fixed costs in exactly the same way that primary schools do. If it is meant to be a small protection payment then Herefordshire small secondary schools also receive small schools protection to help meet the fixed costs of the admin/bursar function. Clarity is needed about whether the lump sum is payment to meet fixed costs or small school costs? If it is fixed costs then secondary schools need to receive a similar/greater sum.

Question 13: If we have a local authority-level formula, should we use a primary school lump sum or the sparsity measure?

Primary School lump sum

Sparsity Measure

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: The sparsity measure better reflects the additional costs of rural authorities in maintaining smaller primary schools.

Question 14: If we have a sparsity measure, do you think we should narrow the sparsity threshold as described above?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: It is right that funding is focussed on the authorities with the greatest need for rurality. The deprivation factors do the same based on the greatest funding for those authorities with the deepest deprivation needs.

Area Cost Adjustments

Paragraphs 3.29 to 3.33 (and annex D) discuss approaches to calculating the area cost adjustment.

Question 15: Which option should we use to calculate the Area Cost Adjustment: the current GLM approach or the combined approach?

GLM Approach

Combined Approach

Other

Not Sure

Comments: Seems fairest as it reflects the national pay bands for teachers for all authorities.

English as an Additional Language and Underperforming Ethnic Groups

Paragraphs 3.34 to 3.38 considers what further factors of underachievement there might be for school age pupils and proposes the inclusion of an EAL factor in a national formula.

Question 16: Do you agree that we should use an EAL factor in the national formula?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: The consultation paper suggests additional funding for EAL is not necessary as their results are comparable with national average for those children without additional needs but then suggests economic deprivation is the key priority – so should fund on deprivation factors not EAL but with initial support costs.

Question 17: Do you agree that this should cover the first few years only? How many years would be appropriate?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: 2 years would seem appropriate.

Transitional Arrangements

Paragraphs 3.39 to 3.41 discuss transitional arrangements to minimise turbulence.

Question 18: Do you think we should:

- (a) Continue with a maximum decrease of -1.5% per pupil each year and accept that this will mean very slow progress towards full system reform; or
(b) Continue with a -1.5% per pupil floor in 2013-14 but lower it thereafter so that we can make faster progress?

(a)

✓ (b)

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: No point having a national formula without progressing schools onto it in a reasonable timeframe.

Chapter 4 - Central services and defining responsibilities

Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.7 discuss the development of a funding model, having first defined the respective responsibilities of maintained schools, Academies and local authorities. The model would clarify what elements of funding would be delegated to schools or centrally retained for maintained schools, if there is local discretion.

Question 19: Do you agree that some of these services could be retained centrally if there is local agreement by maintained schools?

✓ Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Academies should be bound by the same vote of Schools Forums if they are represented at Forums. Don't see how academies can vote at Schools Forums on matters that only affect maintained schools. This is the schools equivalent of the "East Lothian" question and should be avoided – School Forums votes affect all schools otherwise why have academy representation?

Paragraphs 4.8 to 4.13 set out details of the funding blocks which make up the funding model and their functions. Funding blocks for schools, High Needs Pupils, early years, central services and formula grant are proposed.

Question 20: Do you agree that the split of functions between the blocks is correct? If not, what changes should be made?

<input type="checkbox"/> Completely Correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broadly, but some changes required	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
---	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments: re - School Budget – contingencies are used for changes in special school numbers particularly in September. Do not see why academies should be entitled to a share of this. Funding for schools in financial difficulties is more difficult as it is not funding for all schools but is set aside for specific schools – academies should be no more entitled to a share than all other schools.

Chapter 5 - Future arrangements for the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG)

Paragraphs 5.1 to 5.9 discuss the future arrangements for the calculation of LACSEG.

Question 21: Do you think the funding for local authority LACSEG should be moved to a national formula basis rather than using individual LA section 251 returns?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

Comments: The LACSEG funding received by academies in Herefordshire should be consistent with the value of those services provided by the local authority to the non-academy maintained schools in Herefordshire i.e. transparent and consistent funding for all schools.

Question 22: Do you think the distribution mechanism should be changed to one that more accurately reflects the actual pattern of where Academies are located?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Surely this has been subject to a separate consultation on “the basis for the decision on the appropriate amount of a academies funding transfer for 2011-12 and to 12/13” which closed on the 16th August 2011. Not sure how we can have two consultations on the same question. (para 5.7 & 5.8)

Chapter 6 - Children and Young People requiring high levels of support

Principles

Paragraph. 6.7 sets out the high level principles behind the proposals for funding children and young people with high levels of need.

Question 23: Is this the right set of principles for funding children and young people with high needs?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

A Base Level of Funding for High Needs SEN

Paragraphs 6.11 to 6.18 discuss proposals to set a base level of funding to reflect high needs SEN.

Question 24: Would it be appropriate to provide a base level of funding per pupil or place to all specialist SEN and LD/D settings, with individualised top up above that?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Herefordshire, like most other authorities, formula funds special schools and a number of special units where the funding is above the £10k suggestion for special schools and £6k for units. Substantial care will be necessary to change the formula to a flat rate without creating significant additional paperwork to claim the top-up, for example all pupils in a special school will have to claim the top up. Will create more workload for special unit complexity rather than less.

Question 25: Is £10,000 an appropriate level for this funding?

Yes

No – too high

No – too low

Not Sure

Comments: Herefordshire's base level for special schools in 2011/12 is £13,170 – why not allow local discretion and a gradual move to a common national amount with protection arrangements set nationally? This would mirror the local flexibility around the base national formula elements.

Applying this approach to post-16

Paragraphs 6.19 to 6.21 discuss proposals for funding high needs pupils to post -16 pupils.

Question 26: Is the idea of a base rate of funding helpful in the post-16 context?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: The same base level of £10,000 for all sections including post-16 is helpful in providing consistent levels of support to all pupils.

Question 27: Should local authorities be directly responsible for funding high level costs over £10,000 for young people in post-16 provision in line with their commissioning responsibilities?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Local authorities should only be directly responsible for funding high level costs for post-16 provision if the budget truly reflects the level of cost and need. It would reduce administrative bureaucracy for LA's to directly fund providers. The current post 16 block SEN grant is well known for its inadequate level of funding. Budgets should be set to reflect realistic assessments of need and cost.

Question 28: Do the proposed funding arrangements create risks to any parts of the post-16 sector?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Not as far as we can judge however the question would be better answered by post-16 institutions directly.

Funding by Places or Pupil Numbers

Paras 6.22 to 6.26 discuss whether institutions providing for high needs children and young people should be funded on the basis of planned places or pupil numbers. It also sets out four options for doing so.

Question 29: Should institutions providing for high needs children and young people be funded on the basis of places or pupil numbers?

Places

Pupil Numbers

Not Sure

Comments: Herefordshire has funded special schools on actual pupil numbers (with extra-funding for any increase in September's pupil numbers above forecast). This has worked well since its introduction in 2005. The previous formula was based on places and schools to bid for additional funding for support hours. Vacant places in

special schools have not been an issue and the schools have been funded to meet rising pupil numbers.

Question 30: Are any of options (a)-(d) desirable?

(a) (b) (c) (d) None Not Sure

Comments: Funding on actual pupil numbers has worked well, to change to (b)-(d) would be a retrograde step – but is this another case for local discretion?

Funding Special and AP Academies and Free Schools

Paragraphs 6.27 to 6.39 discuss how funding for special and AP Academies and Free Schools should be managed in the short term and, in the longer term, whether funding should be routed through the Education Funding Agency (EFA) or the commissioner.

Question 31: For the longer term, should we fund Special and AP Academies and Free Schools:

- a) with all funding coming direct from the commissioner?
- b) with all funding coming through the EFA and recouped from the commissioner?
- c) through a combination of basic funding from the EFA and top-up funding for individual pupils direct from the commissioner?

(a) (b) (c) Neither Not Sure

Comments: The simplest method is that the school charges the (home) local authority. It is not clear within the DfE's preferred option (c) how the DSG paid and recouped from local authorities would be adjusted, for example where is the £10k per place paid by the EFA is funded from? – if it is recouped from DSG and the authority pays the top-up then it might as well receive a bill from the school direct for the amount.

Question 32: If we go for the combination funding approach, should we pass all funding through the EFA for a limited period while the school is establishing itself before moving to this approach?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Provided DSG pupil count and recoupment questions are explained.

Constructing the High Needs Block for local authorities

Paragraphs 6.40 to 6.47 propose a new formula for determining the High Needs Block building on the research carried out for the Department by PricewaterhouseCoopers in 2009.

Question 33: Given there is no absolute method of determining which pupils have high needs, and given local variation in policy and recording, is this approach to determining proxy variables acceptable?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Question 34: Do you agree that deprivation is linked more to AP rather than the wider SEN needs?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Not sure because there is emerging practical evidence that attendance at our primary SEN school is linked to living in an adjacent deprived part of Hereford.

Paragraphs 6.48 to 6.49 suggest the need for substantial transitional arrangements in moving to a new formula as the formula will fail to reflect the spend of local authorities on high need pupils.

Question 35: Do you agree that in the short term we should base allocations to local authorities for the high needs block largely on historic spend?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: What does short term mean in years? Three to five?

Post-16

Paragraph 6.50 proposes aligning pre- and post-16 funding for high needs pupils over time.

Question 36: Do you agree that post-16 funding should also become part of the local authority's high needs block over time, but that there might be a particular need for transitional arrangements?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Question 37: What data should ideally underpin the funding allocations both initially and for a potential high needs block arrangement?

Comments: Not sure – it would have been helpful to set out more detail in para 6.50.

Issues Specific to Alternative Provision

Paragraphs 6.51 to 6.56 highlight issues specific to AP provision but suggest that AP should continue to be treated alongside SEN for funding purposes.

NB: Questions 38 is displayed together with question 39 in the document.

Question 38: Should AP continue to be treated alongside high needs SEN for funding purposes?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: PRU's have been given an historic budget and not linked closely to the number of pupils. Recently schools have been charged for the costs (on a pupil referral basis) for the additional costs of providing 25 hour teaching provision.

Question 39: What differences between them need to be taken into account?

Comments: Not sure how PRUs can be formula funded – would seem to more potential in charging schools for referrals.

Early Years

Paragraphs 7.5 to 7.8 set out current arrangements for early years funding and discuss whether the Early Years Single Funding Formula could be made simpler:

Question 40: Do you agree we should aim for a simpler EYSFF? If so, how?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Herefordshire already has a simple formula with limited factors which ensures the same rates paid to all providers (although we do not have nursery schools.) We are willing to share our approach with DFE.

Paragraphs 7.9 to 7.11 sets out options for improving the focus on tackling disadvantage and improving consistency in the support offered to disadvantaged children.

Question 41: How could we refine the EYSFF so that it better supports disadvantaged children?

Comments: We have included a deprivation factor and this should be maintained. A comparative study of deprivation payments to schools and PVI providers would be helpful. The percentage of deprivation payments in our EYSFF is below those made to schools in the same area. However the location of the PVI setting is not always reflected in the pupil attending e.g. commuters may use a convenient PVI in a deprived area but near a large workplace.

Bringing more consistency to free early education funding

Paragraphs 7.12 to 7.15 consider two options for continuing to fund local authorities for free early education: on the basis of their current spend or on the basis of a formula.

Question 42: Do you agree we should allocate funding to local authorities on the basis of a formula?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Locking in spend plus is wrong given the whole basis of the national funding formula is to unlock the current spend plus methodology. A formula approach plus short term damping is fairest and will allow consistency between neighbouring authorities.

Paragraphs 7.16 to 7.18 discuss how a formula to local authorities for funding early years would operate.

Question 43: Do you agree a formula should be introduced based largely on the same factors as the schools formula?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Seems sensible given that children in PVI settings quickly grow into children in schools.

Bringing greater transparency to free early education funding

Paragraphs 7.19 to 7.20 discuss what has been done so far to improve transparency and our plans for the future.

Question 44: We would be grateful for views on whether anything else can be done to improve transparency.

Comments: We would welcome more benchmarking for early years funding rates. Herefordshire has traditionally been a high value funder of PVI but is one of the lowest funded authorities – which seems not entirely consistent.

Pupil Premium

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.8 set out two options for extending the coverage of the pupil premium to include pupils previously eligible for Free School Meals: an ‘ever 3’ measure or an ‘ever 6’ measure which extend cover to those eligible for FSM at some point in the last three or six years.

Question 45: What is your preferred option for determining eligibility for the Pupil Premium from 2012-13? Should it be based on the Ever 3 or Ever 6 measure?

Ever 3

Ever 6

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: Ever 6 seems to better reflect the need in secondary schools by addressing the issue of declining registration in years 7 – 11.

Paragraphs 8.9 to 8.10 seek views on other issues for calculating the pupil premium, such as whether to reflect differences in funding already in the system.

Question 46: What is your preferred approach for calculating the Pupil Premium?

Comments: The same rate of pupil premium for all authorities nationally seems right in principle – the impact of deprivation is the same nationally so funding should be so also.

Timing for implementation

Paragraphs 9.1 to 9.4 consider the issue of when to begin the process of moving to a new funding formula.

Question 47: Do you think we should implement the proposed reforms in 2013-14 or during the next spending period?

2013-14

Next
Spending
Period

Neither

Not Sure

Comments: It is better to make a start in 2013/14 rather than delay. Perhaps there is an approach that will allow authorities to move towards the national funding formula in 2013/14 which will reduce the turbulence later. We intend, if possible, to take steps in 2012/13 which will prepare the way for later implementation. It is surely worth seeking further views from authorities when the shadow settlement is available?

Question 48: Have you any further comments?

Comments:

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?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 Carole Edge, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 738060 / email: carole.edge@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 11 October 2011

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

Send by post to:

Consultation Unit
Area 1C
Castle View House
Runcorn
Cheshire
WA7 2GJ