

## 2014/15 School Funding Formula - School's Consultation Response Form

**1. Lump Sum** – The DfE have reduced the maximum value of the lump-sum allocation to £175k (from £200k). Schools Forum has unanimously proposed to maintain the Lump Sum at this maximum possible value to protect the smaller schools.

For information:-

71% of LA's had a lump-sum between £100,000 - £160,000

15% of LA's had a lump-sum greater than £170,000

8% of LA's had a lump-sum greater than £190,000

Any reduction in lump-sum from the existing value will result in Primary schools with fewer than 254 pupils and Secondary schools with fewer than 1,061 pupils 'losing' from the change (before any MFG protection is applied).

***Consultation Question 1 - Do you agree with maintaining the lump-sum at the maximum possible value - £175k?***

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 28 Sec – 4
No	Prim -2 Sec – 1
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>Although awarding this amount makes Hartlepool sit out of kilter with most authorities we feel it is important to ensure all types of schools are viable after funding award. Although the definition of a small school has been hard to define (should it be under one form entry?) it is our belief that they need to be supported so as stated they are financially viable moving forward and able to provide outstanding education.</p> <p>“Reducing the size of the lump sum supports our aim of moving towards a more pupil-led funding system... Our aim is to put more money through the pupil-led factors so that funding genuinely follows pupils.”</p> <p>This quotation comes from “School Funding Reform: Findings from the Review of 2013-14 Arrangements and Changes for 2014-15 June 2013” and should provide a reference point for our deliberations.</p> <p>Since the government has indicated that it intends to move to a national funding formula we should attempt to move towards national and local averages. Failing to do so will mean that we will not be prepared for its introduction. A high lump sum disadvantages students in larger schools and moves away from a pupil-led approach.</p> <p>Having the highest lump sum in the country means that the AWPU for students is</p>	

<p>skewed. It is unacceptable that a key stage 4 student in Hartlepool should be funded on an AWPU which is £1500 lower than that used in Middlesbrough.</p> <p>I feel the current system is unfair to KS3/4 having one of the highest lump sum in the country means that the AWPU for students is skewed. It is unacceptable that a key stage 4 student in Hartlepool should be funded on an AWPU which is £1500 lower than that used in Middlesbrough.</p> <p>Although awarding this amount makes Hartlepool sit out of kilter with most authorities we feel it is important to ensure all types of schools are viable after funding award. Although the definition of a small school has been hard to define (should it be under one form entry?) it is our belief that they need to be supported so as stated they are financially viable moving forward and able to provide outstanding education.</p>	
---	--

**2. Prior Attainment (Low Cost, High Incidence SEN) – The DfE have amended the criteria for determining this factor.**

Primary – EYFSP – Pupils not achieving a good level of development in Year 1 combined with the existing measure for all other pupils of achieving an EYFSP score lower than 78.

Secondary – KS2 pupils not achieving a level 4 or higher in English *or* Maths as against the existing measure of not achieving a level 4 in English *and* Maths.

***Consultation Question 2 - Do you agree with the Forum proposal to maintain the overall quantum of funding allocated for this factor (£1.3m – 2.2%) and to adjust the per pupil value accordingly to ensure that this total is not exceeded?***

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 30 Sec – 5
No	
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>With the new criteria for primary it is imperative that the agreed total is capped; as looking at GLD across the authority many more pupils will meet the criteria, for example in one school where GLD is 14%, 86% of cohort would access additional funding.</p> <p>LA need to do some moderation of assessment in EYFS so that funding is targeted to the right pupils.</p> <p>I think it is right to have a cap. The use of EYFSP data does not look to be a terribly secure basis for funding, given what look to be disparities/inconsistencies in the results across the town (maybe a more rigorous level of moderation is called for if funding relates to the outcomes). The assessment system was new this year, and few welcomed it.</p>	

**3 & 4. Pupil Mobility** – There is no existing factor in Hartlepool’s current formula for this.

The DfE definition of mobility is a pupil who started in each of the last three academic years, but did not start in August or September (or January for Year 1). A 10% threshold applies from 2014/15 so that this factor can only support schools which experience a significant change in their pupil numbers.

For Information:-

59% of LA’s did not have mobility as a factor in 2013/14

**Consultation Question 3- Do you agree with Forum’s proposal that a Pupil Mobility Factor should be re-introduced into Hartlepool’s formula?**

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 25 Sec – 3
No	Prim -5 Sec – 2
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>Although we agree in principle that schools who suffer a significant change in numbers should access additional funding, we believe this should be accessed within the year the mobility factor is triggered. If we direct funding through formula we could be funding pupils after the event on historical numbers. The very nature of mobility means the pupils who attracted funding may have left the school.</p> <p>We believe the LA should retain an amount so that it can be distributed on immediate need and if not used within a financial year can be driven out to all schools.</p> <p>Funding through formula will probably mean that the funding comes much later than the immediate need (ie at the point a new pupil joins a school). The principle of funding a rise in pupil numbers is sound, but perhaps through formula is not the best method.</p> <p>We should adopt the practice of the majority of local authorities by not having a mobility factor.</p> <p>It seems that most authorities do not have this factor and therefore we should continue as before without this factor.</p> <p>We believe the LA should retain an amount so that it can be distributed on immediate need and if not used within a financial year can be driven out to all schools.</p> <p>We should adopt the practice of the majority of local authorities by not having a mobility factor.</p> <p>Many mobile children attract personalised funding from other streams. Eg SEN, EV6, LAC.</p>	

<p>Clarity required regarding whether the funding would apply to mobility over and above the 10% threshold or be inclusive of it providing as a school the threshold is met?</p>	
--	--

**Consultation Question 4 – If you agreed with Number 3 above, do you agree with Forum’s proposal that the funding rate for pupil mobility should be £642 per pupil with the additional funding coming from the AWPU?**

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 25 Sec – 3 N/A - 1
No	Prim - 4 Sec – 2
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>We agree with amount but believe this should not come from AWPU as again it would widen differentiation in AWPU between schools.</p> <p>We’re trying to get further away from AWPU being used for deprivation or deprivation-related funding. The amount is fine, just not the pot it would come from.</p> <p>We should not reduce the AWPU since it is already lower than average nationally, and lower than that of local and statistical neighbours.</p> <p>What about Pupil Premium and SEN funding? In our experience those children who experience mobility often attract this funding too?</p>	

**5. Primary : Secondary Ratio** – The ratio of funding between primary and secondary in Hartlepool was set at 1:1.26 which compares favourably with the national average of 1:1.27. Schools Forum proposed to maintain this funding ratio and not to move funding between sectors.

For Information:-

32% of LA's had a Primary : Secondary Ratio of between 1.25 and 1.30 in 2013/14  
 76% of LA's had a Primary : Secondary Ratio of between 1.20 and 1.35 in 2013/14

**Consultation Question 5 - Do you agree with the proposal to maintain the Primary:Secondary ratio at 1:1.26?**

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 30 Sec – 5
No	
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>The proposed primary – secondary ratio is broadly in line with the national average so it should be adopted. The same principle should be applied when considering other factors.</p> <p>We do not believe this can be looked at as the deprivation factor is such a big factor in the whole funding formulae. Once that has been looked at then this can be reconsidered.</p>	

**6. Capping or Scaling Gains** – The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) will continue for pupils in age ranges 5 – 16 at minus 1.5% per pupil in 2014/15. The DfE have made a commitment that the MFG will continue beyond 2014/15, but it is not yet possible to confirm at what level this will be, as this is subject to the outcomes of the spending review.

In order to fund the costs of the Minimum Funding Guarantee it is necessary to restrict the level of per pupil gains a school would receive and Capping or Scaling are the options. Capping applies a fixed maximum % increase whereas Scaling applies a fixed proportional increase.

***Consultation Question 6 - Do you agree with the proposal to continue to use Capping as the method of funding the MFG?***

Options	Please Tick
Yes	Prim – 25 Sec – 4
No	Prim - 5 Sec – 1
<p>If NO, please give a reason for your answer and suggest an alternative approach:</p> <p>Scaling seems a fairer approach</p> <p>As capping has been used in all previous years, we believe it would be prudent to be equitable this year.</p> <p>School and Gov. Body feel a sliding scale would ensure a more ‘personalised’ formula for schools and minimise the ‘big’ gains/losses to potential budgets.</p> <p>Prefer scaling</p> <p>I believe scaling to be a more appropriate methodology.</p> <p>We have been massively underfunded compared to other schools in Hartlepool for years. Scaling would increase our budget significantly but not unfairly redressing the balance between ourselves and other schools in Hartlepool who have benefitted from an unfair funding formula and additional funds from pupil premium. (Our school approx £9000 pupil premium, school of a similar size in Hartlepool approx £500,000 pupil premium)</p> <p>Scaling is a more appropriate methodology.</p>	

**7. Deprivation Funding** – Schools Forum have proposed a recommended range of deprivation values for which they are seeking the views of all schools. The impact of each of the proposed deprivation proportions on each school is identified in **Appendices B to E**. The current overall deprivation in Hartlepool’s current formula is 17.9%. The proposals are between 15% and 12%.

For Information:-

National Average Deprivation	8.7%
Tees Valley Average	11.4%
Statistical Neighbours	8.8%

For every 1% point reduction in deprivation the impact is as follows:-

- Primary – schools with < 39% FSM6 will ‘gain’
- Secondary – schools with < 36% FSM6 will ‘gain’

**Consultation Question 7 - Please indicate which ONE of the following funding models you would recommend to Schools Forum and provide the reasons behind your decision.**

Options	Please Tick
Model 1 – Deprivation 15%	Prim – 14 Sec – 3
Model 2 – Deprivation 14%	
Model 3 – Deprivation 13%	Prim – 2
Model 4 – Deprivation 12%	Prim – 14 Sec - 2
<p>Please provide reasons for why you have chosen your preferred option:</p> <p>Having looked through each of the four models, above, deprivation at 15% has the least significant impact on what appears to be a reduction in our Indicative Budget (2014/15 in comparison to 2013/14).</p> <p>Although, clearly, changes to funding formula will have a significant impact on all, schools serving deprived wards have the additional, ‘aspirational’ challenges to contend with. Where possible, attempting to maintain the budget we have, allowing us to resource our school in the way our governors see fit, will enable us to continue to strive for the best possible outcomes for our pupils.</p> <p>There is an argument that Pupil Premium funding should support this reduction, which has already dropped by 7% in two years, but our opinion is that this funding should enrich the learning experiences of our pupils.</p> <p>I have chosen model 1 but really feel that the funding should be at least 16% . Whilst I realise that we have pupil premium this is meant to be provide additionally and not to replace funding which is deemed to be appropriate for pupils from deprived backgrounds.</p> <p>Model 1 is already a decrease of 3% which I think is a lot. Further reduction would adversely affect the pupils from the most deprived areas of Hartlepool and divert</p>	

funding which is supposed to close the Gap between them and pupils from better off backgrounds to providing for their basic education.

Due to the 44% increase in Pupil Premium!

This is the most controversial element of the consultation which has not been tackled over a number of years; due to its emotive nature and to some extent because of Forum representation; schools with above 39% FSM6 are highly represented. However this is not truly representative of the schools across Hartlepool where only 12 of the primaries would be impacted upon negatively. We believe consideration must be given to a number of fronts but most importantly to the principle of "fair funding".

- a) If the Local Authority wishes every child to have equal chances then the funding formulae should be based on pupils not on old formulas around deprivation. The funding needs to allow all schools to have an equal chance of raising achievement and providing outstanding education. It is our belief that every child matters in Hartlepool and not just those who live in the deprived wards. How can it be fair that schools with same numbers can be funded to the tune of £300,000 difference? This is not moral and even with a shift to 12% ratio between funding remains high in primary sector.
- b) The "Pupil Premium" has gone from £300 to £1300 for Primary students and from £300 to £935 to secondary schools. This is over 300% rise in the primary sector and 200% rise in the secondary, and this is targeted money for students who come from deprived backgrounds. We all recognise the need to support pupils from deprived backgrounds but believe this funding has to be taken into consideration.
- c) 12% seems to keep us higher than our statistical neighbours and will enable all schools to start to prepare for a future national funding formula, if we don't then we are just stalling and creating massive issues for later years. We are aware that some schools will say the deprivation factor was cut to 18% last year and a further cut to 12% is immoral; however we believe these schools have been significantly overfunded for some time and an interesting exercise is looking at benchmarking information which looks at how much schools spend per pupil compared to administration etc.
- d) Though the schools that serve the most "deprived" areas of Hartlepool feel they are being unfairly targeted it has to be noted that the base budget that the present formulae includes all "un-ring fenced" budgets that had been given to schools over the past 10 years, i.e. EIC, BIP. It is therefore illogical as the government said that the improvements in the schools should be sustained over a period of time and not need continual financial support. If a school was in receipt of these budgets in the past they should have ensured sustainability for the future.

All forum members recommended the support of small schools by keeping the lump sum at £175000. This must come from the deprivation as well as the AWPU section as otherwise it seems to be unfair. It would be an interesting exercise to see 50% from AWPU and 50% from deprivation and the affect that would have the level of deprivation funding.

Due to the introduction of the pupil premium and its year on year increase the funding formula has not taken this alteration into account with regards to the funding for deprivation. The funding formula is therefore no longer equitable for all



children in Hartlepool before deprivation is added in to the funding. This is made evident by the comparison to our statistical neighbours.

Small schools are also going to lose their small school funding, so affluent small schools are now under serious threat – not just the services we are able to provide but also staffing levels. This is a long term issue that needs to be faced at some point.

I agree that deprivation should be funded, but the funding has reached a point where it is no longer fair and we need to look at Hartlepool children as a whole, not just individual schools.

12% is still above the Tees Valley Average, and well above statistical neighbours and national averages. Although the drop from 18% to 12% may be considered a large one by some, the capping process to fund the MFG will protect schools from too big a hit.

In the long term the 12% deprivation model is a better model for our school as we would be losing less money in the budget compared to if the 15% model was agreed.

I would argue that we also need to consider Pupil Premium money because as we are a school with low deprivation, we will not gain as much through Pupil Premium funding and could also be losing out in the budget if the 15% model is agreed.

Funding needs to allow for staffing ratios and resources which help to raise the aspirations of the most disadvantaged pupils in the town. The cycle of deprivation will not be broken unless we all agree this is a priority. The money goes with the pupils according to postcode so directing the funding towards these pupils is the most sensible as far as we are concerned. Even though we are amongst those who gain by lowering the percentage we feel deprivation is funded appropriately in the town so a minimum change would be best.

Following consultation with Gov body, school feels that deprivation value should remain at its highest possible percent (15%). School recognise Hartlepool to be an area with increasing deprivation, therefore, the disadvantage associated with this needs to be impacted upon.

We agree that deprived pupils should attract funding, in addition to the pupil premium. The value which has been used in Hartlepool, however, is so out of line with other authorities that it distorts funding for all schools.

The reduction of the deprivation factor to 12% would bring this factor closer to the national and local average. Even at 12% it would be higher than the national, local and statistical neighbour average.

All Hartlepool children should be treat as equally as possible. Hartlepool is a deprived area, not just certain schools.

Recognition of the collective need to move towards Tees Valley average – albeit deprivation levels across the town are overall very high contrasted nationally.

The deprivation factor needs to be closer to that of statistical neighbours especially given the fact that additional pupil premium money is given and that it is set to rise again next year. This seems fairer to those schools that have little deprivation.

There has already been a reduction of 7% in the last two years.

Deprivation funding therefore needs to be **no lower** than 15%, which is in line with other locally deprived areas.

I appreciate that the Pupil Premium could be used as an argument for further reductions, but there is no guarantee that this funding will continue.

Looking at the secondary figures, the disparity between schools at 15% is huge and, I believe, very unfair to the children who attend the other schools. Also, at 12%, Hartlepool would still be higher than the national average and regional neighbours. If we are moving towards a national funding formula, then we need to take a sensible approach and bring ourselves closer in line in order to financially plan for the future.

To be closer to statistical neighbours and in line with the Tees Valley average.

To bring about **fairer** funding for Hartlepool schools, especially in light of increased Pupil Premium Funding

To ensure deprivation is based on current information and not historical factors.

Above all it is the principle to treat all schools equally, and provide the best opportunities for all children in Hartlepool.

Hartlepool is one of the highest deprived boroughs in the country and this fact should be reflected in its funding model regardless of what other boroughs do

- A recent TV news bulletin announced that Hartlepool currently has the second highest rate of unemployment nationally for 17 year olds
- Hartlepool schools who benefit from deprivation funding have already 'buffered' a reduction from 20.9% to 17.9%. We think that 15% is the lowest we can go before a detrimental impact is felt for the children in our school
- Pupil Premium cannot be relied upon to replace Deprivation Funding. No one knows the viability of Pupil Premium and added to that we have first hand experience of Ofsted insisting that as a school we had to demonstrate effective impact of Pupil Premium which was over and above our everyday provision
- Like many schools in Hartlepool my school is a successful school which operates in exceptionally challenging circumstances. An example of this are the 12 children who have started with us in September/October 2013 (not counting the Reception intake)
  - All are highly mobile (my school is their 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> school)
  - All are highly vulnerable and require close monitoring and support
  - 8 are EAL with English as their second language. Four of these children are so highly traumatised they have difficulty in speaking
  - 4 children are under Child Protection
  - 7 children are from single parent families
  - 4 children have Special Educational Needs, 2 at SA+
  - 8 children qualify for FSM
- Small schools situated in the most deprived wards of Hartlepool rely on a higher level of funding to help towards costs of recruitment. It is already proving difficult to recruit outstanding, experienced practitioners into our schools as larger schools have the capacity to offer higher salary ranges. My school felt this impact when we recently advertised a Deputy Head Teacher position and were unable to appoint due to lack of candidates with the necessary experience
- In last weeks Schools North East Weekly Update: Week 6, which all Head Teacher's receive, there was a valuable report which adds further weight to our request not to reduce deprivation funding below 15%:

***“A report by Save the Children released yesterday has called for ‘bolder action on tackling educational unfairness’ after new analysis suggests that “by seven, nearly 80% of the difference in GCSE results between rich and poor children has already been determined.”***

*Key findings of the report include:*

- ***Fewer than one in six children from low-income families who have fallen behind by the age of seven will go on to achieve five good GCSEs, including English and Maths.***
- *Better-off children who are behind at age seven are more likely to go on to achieve well – but even they only have a one in four chance of getting five good GCSEs, including English and Maths.*
- *If a child from a poor family is already behind with their reading at the age of seven, they have just over a one in five chance of going on to achieve a C in English at GCSE.*

*The steady progress made over the past five years on the number of seven-year-olds who are able to read and write to the expected level is welcomed in the report but the researchers suggest that even if this progress is sustained at current levels, **by 2020, approximately one in eight children who are on free school meals would be behind in reading.***

- A final example, which highlights the negative impact of high levels of deprivation upon children, was when a vulnerable family moved briefly from my school to another school in a more affluent area of Hartlepool. The Head Teacher rang to tell me the children, for a variety of reasons “stood out” at their school. Do we need to say more?

From my understanding, the percentage differences above would make very little difference to my school if the increases are capped as our increase would always be around 1.5%, I have chosen model 4 as if scaling was adopted we could finally set a budget which would not fall into deficit, only being able to balance using our reserves. We could finally set a budget which would allow us to move the school forward rather than consider a “holding budget” with limited possibilities for the school and its plans for improvement.

12 % is also our choice because it would also bring the LA into line with other Tees Valley local authorities and closer to the national average for deprivation which was the stated objective of the Chief Exec of the council at a recent (July 2013) meeting with myself and my Chair of Governors.

Deprivation funding has been cut drastically over the recent past. Hartlepool has a high level of deprivation which means that students with Free School Meal entitlement are already over 20% less developed than their non FSM peers by the age of three. More funding is required to make this gap disappear. I do not believe that it is morally correct to reduce deprivation funding in a town with so many disparities between the rich and the poor. Pupil Premium funding does not, and was never meant to (as stated in DFE guidance), be used as a sum of money to make up for a lack of deprivation funding. It was meant as an addition.

The number of literacy, as well as social and emotional interventions required for deprived students make managing reduced budgets for schools with high FSM students very difficult.

It is important to recognise the uniqueness of Hartlepool in terms of deprivation.

Statistics do not adequately deal with levels of deprivation in particular

areas of the borough and cannot be averaged out. Hartlepool has traditionally been aware of deprivation in parts of the borough and we must not lose sight of this. A deprivation factor of 15% takes us below our nearest statistical neighbours in terms of deprivation (Middlesbrough.)

It is also important not to give in to the argument of "it will be covered by MFG".

There are no long term guarantees about MFG and deprivation is deprivation so should stay at the higher level of 15%.

We agree that deprived pupils should attract funding, in addition to the pupil premium. The value which has been used in Hartlepool, however, is so out of line with other authorities that it distorts funding for all schools.

The reduction of the deprivation factor to 12% would bring this factor closer to the national and local average. Even at 12% it would be higher than the national, local and statistical neighbour average.

This represents a move to support for school who do not benefit (as our school does) from the increased Pupil Premium. It brings us closer in line with our statistical neighbours.

- Tees valley are not true statistical neighbours
- Statistic neighbours are at a much lower rate
- National is a much lower rate
- Deprivation is a national issue which has been recognised by the government who are funding deprivation through pupil premium. This has gone up per child, £300. last year and proposed another £400.00.
- Very small schools ( of which we have 3 in the town ) with relatively low deprivation factors may be adversely affected.
- Historically deprivation over funded through AWPU in Hartlepool.
- This should be about fair funding for all children and not double funded for those who are deprived. This should come through other identified streams.
- Highest / Lowest ratios are still too high at approx 1:50 without consideration of targeted government funding which has increased year on year since its introduction currently adding another £900.00 per pupil , increasing to £1300.00 next year.

We can all argue that deprived schools need more but our well off school's need to be able to function too. The move to 15% from 17.9% will shift some funding towards them. My school is largely a "middle of the road" school in terms of funding but we are finding it increasingly more difficult to manage the falling standards on entry to nursery. I do believe that the issues we face in terms of lack of parenting, SEN, social care, as well as the constant pressure to "narrow the gap" can only be achieved with considerable amounts of money. I would like to increase access to after school care, increase the number of days my PSA works to full time from part time, provide specific speech and language programmes just to name a few.

Increasing the ability to provide basics needs to our children is becoming more apparent before we can even consider trying to teach them. My staff act as "social workers" to try to bridge the gap which takes them away from the core business of

teaching. More time is spent in social care meetings, SEN, pastoral meetings, than I have ever known before. I need to extend the capacity of my school to try to provide a support structure around my children and families to enable them to access education. This requires resources. Pupil Premium though very welcome is not enough for my school to do all that I have suggested above. However, I do recognise that this appears to be double funding but from where I am sitting, we need every penny we can get.

The reasons that **Model 1 is the preferred option** are as follows;

1. This issue is more about the fundamental principle of deprivation funding than the actual amounts involved. There is no guarantee that Pupil Premium will continue especially if there is a change in government. We need to be careful about setting a precedent that will see schools in deprived areas losing out on funding to their more affluent neighbours should deprivation funding revert back to that only generated via the formula. Would schools that would gain from lowering the deprivation factor be content with potentially losing funding in the future should this scenario happen?
2. The comparative data provided above, does not recognise that Hartlepool is **significantly one of the most deprived LAs in the country** and as such averages should not be looked at, more useful comparative data would have been the 'range', for example Middlesbrough a significantly similar deprived LA had approaching 16% deprivation in their local formula.
3. In 2011-12 the deprivation percentage for Hartlepool was 22%, 15% is a **7% reduction in two years**. How can this be morally right in an age where the numbers of deprived households are increasing significantly across the UK? A recent Children's Commissioner's report predicts that the number of children living below a 'minimum income standard' will rise to almost 7 million (52% children). We need to ensure that schools with high FSM cater for their needs efficiently.
4. Almost 50% of primary schools have FSM above 39%, they will **all have reductions in funding**, is this fair?
5. There may be colleagues that use the Pupil Premium as a reason for reducing deprivation. Pupil Premium is to provide 'additionality' that these pupils need as compared to higher income households. Does Hartlepool LA wish to see Pupil Premium funding supporting the drop in deprivation funding or allowing schools to use this funding to enrich their learning experience? After all there is significant accountability now with Pupil Premium and rightly so, and if it is not used effectively schools will be challenged on this.

In an area such as Hartlepool with well above areas of severe deprivation it seems perverse to reduce this factor any lower than 15% as this constitutes a 7% drop in two years.

The national funding formula may well reduce this element further in the future and schools with high levels of deprivation need to reduce their budget spend in manageable stages.

As the national austerity measures kick into the system the only effect within Hartlepool will be for further deprivation and we need to protect the educational opportunities for those children whose only hope of breaking out of a spiral of poverty and disadvantage is through their schools and the raising of self worth they offer their students.

## 8. Any Other Comments / Suggestions?

I believe Middlesbrough has a 16% deprivation funding. I think 16% is a much better option.

Forum has requested many different figures and has to base any decisions on fact and the principle around fair funding for all Hartlepool pupils. It is unacceptable for so many schools to be put at risk by those that have and want to retain the funding. We believe the recent Ofsted judgements of previously outstanding schools evidences the impact the unfair funding is having on our schools. It is time they consider the good of all children.

We believe it is more important than ever to get the formula fair at source; as more schools convert to academy and are asked to contribute to services such as School Improvement Team, Attendance etc. for the greater good of all schools and pupils in Hartlepool, they must see that funding is equitable in the first place. Why would a school that is funded £300,000 less pay for the upkeep of an attendance team that is targeted more to the school receiving the higher proportion of funding.

Ultimately the decision is with the Local Authority and they need to make a decision that is transparent and based on principle, a decision which is best for every child in Hartlepool.

Reinforce the fact that schools which are not 'best fit' should have a more personalised formula.

Consultation finding for each question should be shared.

Eg. Q1. yes= 21 No= 9

Money is allocated to the local authority on the basis of pupil numbers. This money ought to be distributed to schools on the same basis – ie the money should follow students.

A sincere and big thank you to all forum members for their work with some contentious and difficult issues. They have shown a collective responsibility for education across Hartlepool.

The current 17.9% deprivation funding formula is having an impact as results are steadily improving across Hartlepool and as a school we would prefer the deprivation funding for 2014 – 2015 to remain at 17.9%. If this is not possible then:

We strongly urge the School's Forum to recommend to the Children's Services Committee to continue to be bold in their action. To be a strong voice for the poorest of our children in all their decision making with particular reference to the setting of the deprivation funding for 2014 - 2015 at no lower than 15%.

During 2012, the forum agreed to reduce funding available to schools, targeting SEND 1:1 support. As a result schools were expected to fund approximately the first 15 hours of support for these children. This was not unreasonable as pupil premium could clearly be used to fund these hours. I mention this as the forum made the most sensible move of considering schools which were adversely affected by this decision. My school was one of these schools. The forum agreed that schools could apply for exceptional funding if this decision had a significant, negative affect on its SEN provision. We applied for this exceptional funding and were successful.

I would suggest that the forum adopt a similar policy for schools adversely affected by the funding formula.

During a meeting with schools SENCo, the LA officer described in some detail the minimum requirement for delivering SEN in school. If the school did not have the funds to meet these basic requirements then this was the trigger which allowed the school to apply for this exceptional funding. I would suggest that this could be adopted by the forum when considering the funding formula for Hartlepool Schools.

I strongly believe that the funding formula is completely unbalanced. Some schools of similar size to my school have a Head Teacher then a number of non teaching staff and business managers, personal assistants, bursars etc. Even schools which complain of a lack of funding have these luxuries. These new posts for primary schools have only been created fairly recently as their budgets have soared at the expense of schools like my school where the deployment of staff is aimed directly at the children.

If a school has none of these luxuries, every staff member apart from the Head has a full teaching commitment and they still cannot set their budget, something has gone seriously wrong. At this point they should be able to apply for exceptional funding, not only an amount which would allow them to balance their budget but an amount which would recognise that schools aim to improve and move forward at all times. We have used only staffing as an example, it could be applied to many areas where schools like my school are deprived.

My school and its Governors have always supported additional funding for deprived schools in Hartlepool. We consider the 12% deprivation option, the rise in pupil premium along with an option to apply for exceptional funding to be a reasonable plan for fairer funding in Hartlepool.

Forum has requested many different figures and has based its decisions on fact. Unfortunately because the deprivation figure does not suit, ie the majority which are represented don't like it, then they refer to the highest amount they can. It is unacceptable for so many schools to be put at risk by those that have the funding. It is time they consider the good of all children.

Ultimately the decision is the Local Authority and they need to make a decision that is best for every child in Hartlepool, we hope they will.

Money is allocated to the local authority on the basis of pupil numbers. This money ought to be distributed to schools on the same basis – ie the money should follow students.

It is unacceptable that a key stage 4 student in Hartlepool should be funded on an AWPU which is £1500 lower than that used for Middlesbrough schools.

The declared aim of the DFE is for "national consistency". Some of the factors used in Hartlepool are way out of line when compared with other authorities. We now have an opportunity to begin to redress this.

