



Department
for Education

Consultation on fairer school funding for 2015 to 2016

Government response

July 2014

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of responses received and the Government's response	4
Main findings - fairer funding	5
Question 1	5
Question 2	6
Question 3	7
Age Weighted Pupil Unit	9
Deprivation	9
Looked After Children	11
English as an additional language (EAL)	11
Low prior attainment	12
Lump sum	12
Sparsity	13
Question 4	15
Question 5	15
Question 6	16
Main findings – sparsity	19
Question 7	19
Question 8	21
Question 9	22
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	24

Introduction

A consultation on [Fairer Schools Funding for 2015-16](#) was published on 13 March 2014.

In this public consultation, we set out a proposal to provide additional funding in 2015-16 to the least fairly funded local authorities in England. Our proposal was first to meet the Government's commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15; then to allocate an additional £350m to fund schools in the least fairly funded authorities.

We proposed to do this by setting minimum funding levels that every authority should attract for its pupils and schools. Under our proposal, if a local authority currently attracts less than our proposed minimum funding levels for the pupils and schools in its area, we would increase its budget so that it met those levels. For local authorities already attracting at least these minimum funding levels for 2014-15, we would not make any changes to its amount of funding per pupil.

This is a big step towards fully fair funding. The approach set out in this document will mean that, for the first time in a decade, funding is allocated to local areas on the basis of the actual characteristics of their pupils and schools rather than simply their historic levels of spending.

We wanted to hear views on our proposed methodology: whether the pupil and school characteristics we selected were the right ones; whether the values we proposed for each minimum funding level were appropriate; and whether differences in area costs should be taken into account as part of the methodology and if so, how.

We said that we did not intend to make significant changes to local school funding arrangements for 2015-16, except possibly small changes to how we support small rural schools through the sparsity factor. We wanted to understand how helpful local authorities have found the introduction of the sparsity factor for school funding in 2014-15 and whether any small changes would be helpful for 2015-16.

The consultation closed on 30 April 2014. We received 578 responses to the consultation from a wide range of stakeholders, including: maintained schools (114), academies (95), parents (91), local authorities (90), school governors (83), schools forums (36) and bursars (16).

We have welcomed the debate that this proposal has generated. We have listened carefully to the full range of views expressed during the consultation period.

The final arrangements for school funding in 2015-16 are set out in [Fairer Schools Funding: Arrangements for 2015-16](#).

Summary of responses received and the Government's response

The consultation has confirmed there is an overwhelming view that the current school funding system is unfair. In responses we have received, we have heard many examples of very similar schools currently attracting very different budgets.

A small majority of responses (excluding those 'not sure') agreed with our proposed list of the pupil and school characteristics to which a minimum funding level should apply.

For each proposed minimum funding level, a small majority of responses (excluding those 'not sure') agreed that the proposed values for the minimum funding levels were appropriate.

A small majority of responses (excluding those 'not sure') agreed that the labour market should be taken into account as we allocate the additional funding, but a small majority did not agree that we should use the hybrid approach we proposed.

Despite a generally positive response, we have heard particular concern about our proposal to apply minimum funding levels only to the schools block unit of funding, rather than across the entire dedicated schools grant (DSG). There was also a frequently expressed concern that an area cost adjustment should not be made as part of the methodology, because differences in area costs are already reflected in the current distribution of funding to local areas.

We have carefully considered both of these challenges and the wider concerns that have been raised, and provide our detailed response to these points in this document. We have concluded that the methodology we proposed is the fairest way of distributing the funding we have in 2015-16.

In the consultation we also asked about how helpful the sparsity factor has been for school funding in 2014-15 and whether small changes would be helpful. There was a high degree of uncertainty about whether this factor has been helpful. We suspect this is because, for many authorities, issues of sparsity are not sufficiently significant to consider allocating additional sparsity funding to a small number of schools. Many responses found that the factor had been unhelpful because of the inflexibility of the nationally set maximum sparsity thresholds.

We have carefully considered all the views expressed on the sparsity factor, and we intend to make two changes: to replace the school size criteria with new average year group criteria for each school type; and to allow local authorities to allocate an exceptional additional sum to very small secondary schools in very sparsely populated areas.

Main findings - fairer funding

Question 1: Do you agree that the existing distribution of school funding is unfair?

We received 566 responses to this question.

Yes	511 (89%)	No	28 (5%)	Not sure	32 (6%)
-----	-----------	----	---------	----------	---------

The vast majority of responses agreed that the current distribution of funding is unfair. There is significant concern among schools, parents and local authorities that the amount of funding a local area receives is based on historic decisions rather than the current needs of pupils and schools in each area.

We heard strong views in responses about how pressures on high needs budgets were adding to the sense of unfairness in the current funding distribution, in particular concerns about increasing numbers of pupils with special educational needs. Similar concerns were raised from areas that are experiencing basic need pressure (i.e. an increasing number of pupils for whom a school place is required).

Just under a third of responses to this question (153) expressed the view that fairer funding cannot be achieved until there is a formula based approach that covers the whole of the DSG rather than separate reform within each block. Without this, it was felt that our proposal would add to the existing level of unfairness, because funding outcomes under the Government's proposal were linked to historical decisions about the split of funding across the notional blocks of the DSG – schools, high needs and early years – in 2012-13.

In recognising the unfairness of the current funding system, 12 responses expressed disappointment that the department was not consulting on the introduction of a national funding formula for 2015-16.

Government response

The strength of views that have been expressed about the high level of unfairness in the current funding system firmly supports the Government's plans to begin to address this in 2015-16 by distributing additional funding based on the characteristics of pupils and schools.

We intend to implement a national funding formula when the government has set spending plans over a longer period of time, allowing us to give schools and local authorities more certainty about how the formula will affect them over a number of years. Throughout the consultation period, we have heard consistent calls for reform across all three of the notional DSG blocks from both local authorities and schools. We agree that this is a vital next step.

We have always been clear that we want to progress school funding reform at a pace that local authorities and schools can implement effectively; and that reforms to the schools, high needs and early years blocks will be considered separately.

We believe that it would be wrong for us to alter the allocation of high needs and early years funding without sufficient evidence on how and why the need for funding varies between different areas. We are taking steps to collect this evidence to allow for reform in future years. We believe that we should aim to move to a more formulaic way of distributing high needs block funding as soon as this can be done on a basis of adequate knowledge. We are planning a substantial research project that will help to fill some of our information gaps, and help in decisions on how to move forward in this direction.

Addressing unfairness in the schools block in 2015-16 is only the start of the process.

Question 2: Do you agree with our proposed choice of characteristics to which to attach minimum funding levels?

There were 542 responses to this question.

Yes	262 (48%)	No	226 (42%)	Not sure	54 (10%)
-----	-----------	----	-----------	----------	----------

A small majority of responses (excluding those 'not sure') were in favour of the proposed choice of characteristics. The main reason cited was that these are characteristics that are already recognised and established in the funding system.

Responses disagreeing with our proposed choice of characteristics tended to be expressing a more general concern that minimum funding levels should be applied across the entire DSG, rather than a specific concern about one or more of the proposed characteristics.

12 responses suggested there should have been a minimum funding level for mobility, to recognise the additional needs of pupils who move between schools on a regular basis and the costs incurred for schools receiving such pupils.

21 responses called for a factor to be included to reflect the needs of authorities with significant basic need pressure (pressure for additional school places due to an increasing number of school-age children).

Government response

We selected the characteristics we think matter most to the attainment of pupils, and proposed indicative minimum funding levels for each of these based on the average funding across the country. We remain convinced that the proposed characteristics are those that should underpin the fair funding of pupils and schools – a view shared by a majority of those responding to this question.

We have carefully considered whether a minimum funding level should apply for pupils that are highly mobile. We recognise that schools face additional costs when pupils arrive and depart from a school outside of the normal dates for starting school and we will continue to allow local authorities to target additional funding to schools through their local formulae to reflect these additional costs. We have decided not to include this characteristic in the minimum funding level methodology because currently less than half of all local authorities use this factor in local formulae and, where they do, very little of the overall schools budget is targeted towards mobile pupils (in most authorities this is less than 1%). Also, there are currently very highly variable per pupil rates where this factor has been used.

We note that responses to this question continued to express strong views that the overall minimum funding levels methodology set out in our proposal should be applied to the whole dedicated schools grant (DSG), not only to the schools block unit of funding. We have provided our response on this point above.

Question 3: Given our proposal to set minimum funding levels such that we can afford to fund all local authorities at those levels or above in 2015-16, do you agree with the proposed values of the minimum funding levels?

General comments

For every characteristic, a majority (excluding those 'not sure') agreed with the proposed value for the minimum funding level.

There were 23 responses expressing the view that the rationale for each minimum funding level should be based on evidence about the costs of meeting the needs of pupils, rather than the average per pupil or per school amounts within existing local formulae. There was also some concern about the appropriateness of deriving averages from a system where there are a number of optional factors and where local authorities use factors in a specific way in order to replicate a historic distribution of funding between schools.

A number of local authorities called on the Department to make it clearer that the purpose of the minimum funding level methodology is to determine the amount of funding that each local authority attracts from the Department, not the amount of funding that schools should expect to receive in their budget for 2015-16. From the consultation responses received from head teachers, bursars and governors, there was some evidence that there was an emerging expectation that individual schools' budgets in 2015-16 would, as a matter of course, be set at or above the minimum funding levels.

Government response

We have taken the decision to base our approach on the current average amount that local authorities have applied in their local schools funding formula. We believe this is a fair and sensible approach, which ensures those local authorities that are currently the least fairly funded receive additional funding to bring them closer to the current average. Using the average value for each chosen factor means we are taking into account the range of decisions taken in each local authority area about the amounts schools should attract for their pupils. The central values we have applied reflect the amounts most local authorities have both chosen and can afford to provide in their local formulae.

As we look to develop a national funding formula in the future, it is unlikely that per pupil and school amounts would be based on current local formulae averages. As we start to develop this formula, we will take into account the wide range of views that have been provided about the right amount of funding for each pupil and school characteristic and the commentary on appropriate measures.

The proposed minimum funding levels were set as close to the current local authority average as we could afford with the additional £350m we had available. As the majority of consultation responses support our proposed values (with the exception of sparsity), we will re-calculate each minimum funding level based on the additional amount of funding we have available to distribute for 2015-16. We will do this using an unchanged methodology. We said in the consultation that we would use the most up to date data available in making the final allocation of additional funding, including the 2014-15 pro forma data and the 2014-15 schools block data set. This means that, despite an unchanged methodology, local authority outcomes may change from those presented in the consultation.

We have always been clear that each of the minimum funding levels represent an amount of funding that each local authority should attract for its pupils and schools. Local authorities will have the same freedom to set local formulae for their schools as they do for school funding in 2014-15 (other than minor changes to the sparsity factor), working with their schools forum to agree a formula that reflects circumstances in their local area. Schools should not expect to receive each minimum funding level directly.

Specific comments in relation to each proposed characteristic

Age Weighted Pupil Unit

There were 529 responses to this question.

Yes	264 (50%)	No	82 (16%)	Not sure	183 (34%)
-----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

There were a small number of responses (6) expressing concern about the scale of the difference in values across each of the phases, largely because it was felt that the primary rates should be increased to ensure schools can intervene earlier for children that are not attaining well.

Government response

Our approach is based on the average amount that local authorities currently allocate for pupils in each phase. We have not formed a view about the correct ratio of funding between the primary and secondary phases. Currently, across all local authorities in England, the primary: secondary ratio is 1:1.26, but there is a range – the lowest ratio is 1:1.15 and the highest is 1:1.51. For 2015-16 it will be for local authorities, working with their schools forums, to agree how to allocate funding across the school phases.

The minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount in primary will be £2,880.

The minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount in Key Stage 3 will be £3,950.

The minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount in Key Stage 4 will be £4,502.

Deprivation

There were 533 responses to this question.

Yes	250 (47%)	No	86 (16%)	Not sure	197 (37%)
-----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

There was broad agreement that deprivation is an important part of the minimum funding level approach, but mixed views about whether the levels proposed were too high, or too low. Views were generally in line with whether the respondent was drawing on experience from an area of low or high deprivation.

14 responses expressed the view that the funding system now provides too much funding for deprived pupils. These responses felt that the minimum funding level should be reduced in recognition of the funding now available through the Pupil Premium.

There have also been strong representations made in responses on the minimum funding levels for deprivation about the most appropriate way of identifying deprived pupils, with concerns expressed about the effectiveness of both of the existing measures used in the school funding system (free school meals (FSM) and the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)).

Concern was also raised that the explicit deprivation funding provided by local authorities in areas of high deprivation is lower than would be expected, because funding for deprived pupils in these areas is channelled through other factors (mainly the age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU) and lump sum). It was felt that this could mean that the average weighting for deprivation funding would appear lower than it should, with the result that the minimum funding levels for deprivation would be set too low.

Government response

Our approach will ensure that every local authority attracts at least £882 for a primary pupil identified using the FSM measure and at least £1,052 for a similar secondary pupil.

We have not formed a view about how much funding a deprived pupil should attract over and above the proposed minimum funding level and the Pupil Premium. Local authorities will continue to be free to determine how much funding should be allocated to deprived pupils in their area.

We agree that the existing measures of deprivation do not provide a perfect measure for use in the school funding system. We will return to some of the evidence that has been submitted regarding the problems encountered in using both FSM and IDACI as we look at whether there might be better and more consistently reliable ways for us to identify pupils from deprived backgrounds. For now we have used the measures currently used in local formulae and have taken a pupil-weighted average of the amounts local authorities target through both IDACI and the permitted FSM measures (which include pupils who are currently eligible for free school meals and pupils who have been eligible at any time in the past six years).

The minimum funding level for deprivation in primary will be from £882 to £1,573¹.

The minimum funding level for deprivation in secondary will be from £1,052 to £1,871.

¹ The primary and secondary range stated would apply for a pupil who is registered for free school meals, or has been in the last 6 years. The lower amount would apply where a pupil is registered for free school meals, but does not live in an IDACI banded area (1-6). The upper amount would apply for a pupil that is registered for free school meals, and lives in an IDACI band 6 area. Pupils that live in deprived areas (IDACI bands 1-6) that are not registered for free school meals (and have not been at any time in the last 6 years) will attract between £208 (IDACI band 1) and £689 (IDACI band 6) in primary and £288 (IDACI band 1) and £816 (IDACI band 6) in secondary.

Looked After Children

There were 518 responses to this question.

Yes 248 (48%) No 76 (15%) Not sure 194 (37%)

There were a small number of responses (14) that expressed concern that looked after children were attracting too much additional funding, particularly given the level of funding provided through Pupil Premium Plus.

Government response

We have always been clear that funding provided through the Pupil Premium and Pupil Premium Plus is additional to the mainstream funding provided to schools through the dedicated schools grant. We think it is right to continue to include looked after pupils as one of the five selected pupil characteristics.

Local authorities will continue to be free to set an amount for looked after pupils that reflect the circumstances in their local authority.

The minimum funding level for looked after children will be £1,004

English as an additional language (EAL)

There were 518 responses to this question.

Yes 231 (45%) No 85 (16%) Not sure 202 (39%)

There were a small number of responses (8) that expressed concern that the value proposed for both the primary and secondary minimum funding levels were too low, (8 responses). There were also a very small number of responses expressing concern about eligibility, as EAL funding is only attracted for pupils that arrived in the school system in the last three years.

Government response

Local authorities will continue to be free to set an EAL amount that is higher (or lower) than the minimum funding level defined by the Department for the purposes of allocating additional funding.

The proposed amounts were based on the current average amount that local authorities provide for pupils for whom English is an additional language.

We want all schools to address English language need quickly. We do not want the funding system to reward schools for delay in this regard. This is why we permit local authorities to provide additional EAL funding for a period of three years only.

The minimum funding level for pupils for whom English is an additional language in primary will be £466.

The minimum funding level for pupils for whom English is an additional language in secondary will be £1,130.

Low prior attainment

There were 526 responses to this question.

Yes	243 (46%)	No	79 (15%)	Not sure	204 (39%)
-----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

There was a concern that under the new early years foundation stage framework more pupils are identified as not having reached a good level of development than under the old framework, and that this means that there is not a single broadly consistent number of pupils in each school year that the low prior attainment minimum funding level will apply to.

A number of responses suggested that the differential between the primary and secondary amounts is too big, and a small number suggested that the primary amount should be higher than the secondary amount so that schools can intervene earlier where pupils are not attaining well.

Government response

We recognise that there is some turbulence in the data for primary low prior attainment because of the new early years foundation stage framework. Under the new framework, data show that a greater number of pupils are being identified as not reaching a good level of development. We will continue to allow local authorities to apply a scaling factor to achieve consistency across reception year groups.

We have not formed a view about the right balance of funding between primary and secondary low prior attainment measures. Our methodology considers what the current local authority average amounts are for pupils with low prior attainment in both the primary and secondary phase.

The minimum funding level for pupils with low prior attainment in primary will be £669.

The minimum funding level for pupils with low prior attainment in secondary will be £940.

Lump sum

There were 519 responses to this question.

Yes	218 (42%)	No	96 (18%)	Not sure	205 (40%)
-----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

There were a small number of responses that expressed the view that having a lump sum in the methodology, at the level suggested, contradicted the principle of pupil-based funding. This was because it could act as a barrier to sensible school reorganisation and protect small schools from having to make difficult decisions (7 responses). In contrast, a larger number of responses supported the need for lump sum funding to protect small schools, and would have liked to see the minimum funding level set at a higher amount (28 responses).

A small number of responses (5) expressed concern that the proposed minimum funding level for the secondary lump sum was too low, and that the current cap for local formulae of £175,000 is too low.

Government response

We believe it is right to include a lump sum in the selected characteristics used in the allocation of additional funding through the minimum funding level approach. While our long term aim has always been to have a pupil led funding system, we acknowledge that a school based lump sum is needed to reflect the costs that schools face that do not vary with pupil numbers.

We have proposed values that are as close to the current local authority average as we can afford with the additional funding we have available.

For the vast majority of secondary schools we do not believe there is evidence to suggest that a lump sum exceeding £175,000 is required. We do recognise that there are very small secondary schools that may be exceptions and we say more about how we will support such schools in [Fairer Schools Funding: Arrangements for 2015-16](#).

The minimum funding level for the primary lump sum will be £115,797.

The minimum funding level for the secondary lump sum will be £125,155.

Sparsity

There were 520 responses to this question.

Yes	159 (31%)	No	76 (15%)	Not sure	280 (54%)
-----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

There were a small number of calls (8) for the sparsity minimum funding level to be differentiated by phase.

There was also concern that the combination of the lump sum and sparsity minimum funding levels would lead to the overfunding of a number of very small schools.

There was some concern that including sparsity in the minimum funding level methodology positively advantages rural areas with small schools but does not benefit less rural local authorities that, for a range of historical reasons, have a large number of small schools (for example, schools that are small by virtue of the buildings they occupy).

A number of responses, mainly from urban authorities, expressed concern that the inclusion of sparsity in the methodology moves funding away from areas that have the greatest pressures on pupil numbers.

Government response

We did not differentiate the sparsity sum by phase in our proposal because we had not yet built up a firm picture of how local authorities were using sparsity across the two phases. With the benefits of the final local authority formula data for 2014-15, we have decided that it is appropriate to use the current average amounts for both primary and secondary, to set two differentiated sparsity minimum funding levels.

We do not want schools to attract more lump sum funding than they need. For many local authorities, the introduction of the sparsity factor enabled them to reduce their general lump sum and allocate more of their funding through the pupil led factors. It is for local authorities, working with their schools forums, to agree how much lump sum funding schools in their area should attract.

There are currently around 1,360 schools that meet the Department's sparsity criteria, spread across 60 local authorities in England. Ensuring that every local authority attracts the minimum funding level for their schools serving sparse areas consumes a very small part of the overall additional funding, but we believe it is fair to include this factor in the methodology. This ensures that local authorities attract a budget that enables them to ensure that small schools that are vital to serving small rural communities attract sufficient funding to ensure their long-term viability. The Government's policy intention in relation to sparsity has been to ensure that schools that need to exist, in small rural communities, receive sufficient funding wherever they are unlikely to be able to survive on the basis of a largely pupil led budget and can't grow, merge or collaborate to achieve economies of scale.

Local authorities that are experiencing growth in pupil numbers will receive increases in their DSG funding from the Department as each annual allocation is made (because DSG is allocated on a per pupil basis) and can continue to retain funding centrally to manage in year increases in pupil numbers.

The minimum funding level for the sparsity amount in primary will be up to £44,635.

The minimum funding level for the sparsity amount in secondary will be up to £66,656.

Question 4: Do you agree that labour market cost differences should be taken into account as we allocate the £350m?

There were 528 responses to this question.

Agree	247 (47%)	Disagree	228 (43%)	Not sure	53 (10%)
-------	-----------	----------	-----------	----------	----------

Opinion was fairly evenly split on this question with a small majority (excluding those 'not sure') in favour of a labour market adjustment being included in the allocation of additional funding.

Just under a third of responses to this question expressed concern about duplication in consideration of differences in area costs. These responses contended that the existing level of funding attracted by authorities already reflects differences in area costs, so including an area cost adjustment in this methodology is not required.

Another common concern that was raised was that there should be a specific allowance in the methodology for areas with high living costs – particularly high housing costs. It has been argued that in areas including Cambridgeshire, Devon, and Oxfordshire, housing costs can be as high as they are in London and that our proposal is for inner and outer London authorities to attract a significant area cost adjustment while authorities outside of London do not.

Government response

We remain convinced that it is right to apply an area cost adjustment in the methodology. This is because our proposed methodology for allocating additional funding does not take into account any area cost adjustment used in previous funding allocation decisions – rather, our methodology ignores any previous area cost adjustment, meaning that we need to have one if we are to give proportionately higher funding to areas with higher staff costs.

We recognise that housing and general living costs are higher in certain parts of the country. However, these differentials are part of what drives differences in wage rates in different parts of the country and are reflected in both measures within the hybrid approach that we proposed and are adopting.

Question 5: Do you agree this should be calculated using the hybrid approach we have set out?

There were 519 responses to this question.

Disagree	236 (45%)	Agree	197 (38%)	Not sure	86 (17%)
----------	-----------	-------	-----------	----------	----------

A majority of responses (excluding those 'not sure') did not agree that the labour market adjustment should be made using the hybrid approach. In this group a significant number were disagreeing because they believe that (for the reason set out above) no area cost adjustment should apply in the methodology.

Those that presented a specific objection to the methodology set out in the proposed hybrid approach were concerned with either the general labour market (GLM) element or the teacher pay element.

There was concern that reform to teacher pay will mean that, over time, the teacher pay element of the hybrid could be eroded because of new freedoms in relation to teacher pay. There were also concerns that teacher pay has historically been influenced by the amount of funding an area attracts. There was a suggestion from opponents of using a teacher pay element that private sector wage rates provide a better indication of underlying disparities in wages that are attributable to regional effects. A number of London authorities in particular expressed a preference for a general labour market (GLM) measure to be applied in isolation because they felt that, to attract and retain skilled people into teaching roles, they are competing in the general labour market rather than in a market of teachers alone.

Responses that suggested the GLM should not be used expressed concern about the quality of the measure and the underlying data the measure uses.

Government response

We remain convinced that a hybrid labour market adjustment approach remains the most effective measure we could use to reflect the differences in labour market costs that schools across England will face in 2015-16. This is because, first, teacher pay band data is the best data we have on the likely variation across in the country in teacher pay costs, on which the majority of a typical school budget is spent. Second, we think that a GLM measure is the best measure we can use for non-teaching staff and we have weighted the GLM measure in the hybrid in line with the typical proportion of staff costs devoted to non-teaching staff.

We accept that changes over time to teacher pay regulations may mean that regional teacher pay bands become less relevant, particularly as more schools take up the freedom to determine teacher pay based on performance. However, for 2015-16 we will be using Autumn 2013 school workforce census data, and any effect from the 2013 teacher pay reforms will not be apparent in that data.

We agree that levels of teacher pay across the country may have a relationship to the levels of funding each area attracts, however our evidence suggests this is not a simple relationship. In our proposed methodology we explained how we control this by taking a

teacher in one area and looking at their pay, and calculating their equivalent pay if they were working in each of the other regional pay bands.

Question 6: If you do not agree that we should use a hybrid approach, what would you prefer we used?

There were 265 responses to this question.

Use an alternative method	219 (83%)	Use teacher pay bands only	24 (9%)
Use a GLM measure only	22 (8%)		

Of the responses that suggested an alternative method there was a similar level of support for using one or other of the two elements of the hybrid approach.

Of those who responded suggesting that we use only teacher pay bands, none supplied any explanatory text other than to confirm their support for this measure.

Responses that supported the continued use of GLM believed that it was accurate and fair; used readily available information; provided the best indicator of pay levels; took into account regional differences in the staff costs; was reflective of local need; and recognised that schools work within the wider labour market, taking account of general economic conditions when recruiting staff.

Other responses suggested using differences in agency supply cover costs as a proxy for teacher pay differentials, using Price Waterhouse Cooper's work review approach and cost of living indices.

A number of responses suggested that we should adjust for area costs at a much more granular local level, rather than at the level of a broad geographical area.

Government response

A large number of responses to this question continued to make the point that there should be no area cost adjustment in the methodology. Our response to this point is provided above.

We note the fairly even split between responses supporting a single GLM measure and responses supporting a single teacher pay measure. For the reasons outlined above, we believe that an approach that considers both of these elements is the best methodology to reflect the labour market costs experienced by schools across England.

We have looked at some of the alternative methodologies suggested, the majority of which are either more local (e.g. house prices) or track cost changes on a monthly or more frequent basis (e.g. using agency staff costs as an indicator of differentials across the country). We have concluded that for a national funding allocation methodology, it

would not be practical or reliable to use alternative measures of a very local or highly fluctuating nature.

Main findings – sparsity

Question 7: We introduced a sparsity factor for the first time in 2015-16. How helpful has this factor been in ensuring that sufficient funding is targeted at small schools serving sparsely populated areas?

There were 491 responses to this question.

Not sure	276 (56%)	Not useful	113 (23%)	Useful	102 (21%)
----------	-----------	------------	-----------	--------	-----------

A large proportion of the responses to this question indicated uncertainty about how helpful the sparsity factor has been, including a large number that said they did not use the sparsity factor therefore they had no view on this issue.

Of those that agreed the factor had been helpful, reasons cited included the need to recognise the impact of fixed costs in small schools and the limited scope for small rural schools to grow, merge or collaborate.

A significant number felt that the introduction of a sparsity factor was helpful in allowing them to target funding at specific small and rural schools. In particular, being able to have different criteria for primary and secondary phases was considered very helpful.

Some responses supported a sparsity factor but thought further work was needed to understand the level of additional funding small schools in rural areas require. There was particular concern from a number of authorities about the level of support small rural secondary schools attract through sparsity and whether after protection from the minimum funding guarantee unwinds, these schools can continue to be viable.

Of those that indicated the factor had not been helpful, it was suggested that authorities had chosen not to introduce the sparsity factor because it created unfairness in a local area for schools on the ineligible side of one or both of the two sparsity criteria thresholds.

11 responses questioned why additional sparsity funding was needed in addition to schools receiving a general lump sum through their local formula. It was recognised that there are additional costs related to small schools serving sparsely populated areas but there also needed to be greater consideration given to the pressures and costs that urban schools and areas faced.

4 responses suggest that the dedicated small school funding that rural schools attracted prior to the 2013-14 reforms should be re-introduced, allowing local authorities to determine an appropriate amount of small schools funding for each school in their area.

Government response

The consultation has confirmed that a significant proportion of the authorities that have eligible schools, have found the introduction of the sparsity factor helpful. We also recognise that there some authorities that have eligible schools that have not found this to be the case.

We note that the ability to set a separate primary and secondary sparsity sum has been welcomed by schools and local authorities. **We will extend flexibility in 2015-16 to differentiate the sparsity sum for middle and all-through schools.**

We recognise that there are concerns about how a pupil led funding system sufficiently supports the small number of very small rural secondary schools in the country. These are schools that are expected to provide a broad and enriched curriculum for their pupils in the same way that other secondary schools do, but without the benefits of large pupil numbers and economies of scale through collaboration with other schools. For 2015-16, **we will enable local authorities to apply to use an exceptional additional sum for such schools, subject to specific criteria about their size and their location.** The details of this are set out in [Fairer Schools Funding: Arrangements for 2015-16](#).

We recognise that for some areas, having fixed eligibility criteria has led to some local frustrations – particularly where there are similar schools and one qualifies for sparsity funding and another one does not. We do though remain convinced that having specific criteria that focuses on both school size and sparsity, continues to be the correct approach – even though this creates cut-off points that may be seen as unfair. This is because we want a pupil led funding system that incentivises good, small schools to grow and collaborate where it is feasible and efficient to do so and for sparsity funding to support those schools that by virtue of the communities they serve are less able to do so. Schools forums will continue to be free to exercise their own judgement about whether there is sufficient evidence of need to mean a sparsity factor should be included in their local formulae.

We recognise that there is some overlap between the purpose of a general lump sum and sparsity funding. However, we remain convinced that both factors are required so that local authorities that have both large and small schools, in urban and rural settings, are able to target the right amount of lump sum funding to their schools. Having only a single lump sum in 2013-14 meant that local authorities had to spend much more on lump sum funding than they wanted to so that their small schools received sufficient funding to be viable.

As we move towards a national fair funding formula, we cannot go back to a system in which local authorities determine separate small school funding amounts for every school. This is neither transparent, nor will it be compatible with a national funding formula in the future.

Question 8: Do you think it would be useful to revise the criteria for the sparsity factor to take into account the average number of pupils in each year group, rather than the number of pupils in the school? If so, how?

There were 483 responses to this question.

Not sure	327 (68%)	Not useful	88 (18%)	Useful	68 (14%)
----------	-----------	------------	----------	--------	----------

There was a high degree of uncertainty in the response to this question, reflecting both the number of authorities that do not use the factor and uncertainty as to whether the proposed change would be helpful or not.

Those who believed that the proposal would be useful felt that the number of pupils in each year group was a relevant factor. Some responses from local authorities stressed that schools for example with seven year groups of ten pupils, experience significant inefficiencies as they try to organise pupils into viable teaching groups.

Of the responses stating the suggestion was unhelpful, the main concern was that the proposal would add undue additional complexity. It was also suggested that allowing local discretion to support small and rural schools based on individual circumstances could avoid the need to revise the sparsity criteria.

Government response

We have carefully considered the arguments for and against this change. We accept the view that the sparsity factor is already, arguably, the most complex of the current school funding factors and further changes that add complexity should be considered carefully. However, we also recognise that the current number on roll criterion has required local authorities to provide sparsity funding to schools that for their type are not genuinely small, and do not experience the inefficiencies that genuinely small schools do.

We therefore intend to replace the current total number on roll criteria that applies to the 2014-15 sparsity criteria, with four, new, year-group size criteria. This change will enable local authorities to target a fixed lump sum, or tapered sum to those schools with average year groups at or below the new thresholds. We will also allow the sparsity sum to be differentiated for each school type within the authority within the overall cap of £100,000.

This change is set out in more detail in [Fairer Schools Funding: Arrangements for 2015-16](#).

Question 9: Are there any other changes you would like to suggest to improve the operation of this factor, and why?

There were 84 responses to this question.

52 responses suggested that the minimum qualifying distance should be reduced and local decisions on the setting of distances should be allowed – taking into account local factors such as local geography, local travel costs and local transport. This would enable local authorities to provide additional support to a greater number of small, rural schools.

34 responses stated that road travel time data should be used in the calculation of a school's sparsity distance. The majority of those who responded in favour of the use of road travel data, criticised the use of the straight line 'as the crow flies' methodology to calculate a school's sparsity distance. Many of those in favour of adopting this approach were resident in, or representing, rural or remote areas (e.g. Northumberland, Devon). They held the view that 'as the crow flies' did not take into account either rural geography or the actual road distances involved in travel.

A small number of responses suggested that the turbulence arising from using pupil postcodes in calculations should be addressed (6 responses), including by measuring the distance between schools rather than the current distance from a pupil's home to his/her second nearest school.

Other suggestions made were: making the use of the taper mandatory; the removal of the lump sum if sparsity was in place in an area; and consideration to be given to the presence of faith schools in the methodology (i.e. if the second nearest school is a faith school, it should not be included).

Government response

We accept that the use of distances as the crow flies is not ideal. We explained as we introduced the factor for 2014-15 that we have been unable to find a road travel dataset to generate a sparsity distance for every school in England based on every pupil's postcode. We accept that this creates sparsity distances for some schools that have limited bearing on the reality of the school's location and the journeys that pupils would have to do to reach their second nearest school. For 2014-15, local authorities have been able to apply to the EFA for disapplication of the school funding regulations in this regard, and where suitable evidence has been presented, these applications have been agreed.

We will continue to enable local authorities to do this for 2015-16 and apply as light touch an approach for existing applications as possible.

We recognise that the variability of the size of schools and the pupils attending them have a bearing on whether a school is eligible for sparsity funding. We have explored a number of options that might dampen this volatility, such as using a rolling three year average of a school's sparsity distance and/or number on roll. However, such an

approach does not prevent schools moving in and out of eligibility from one year to the next. The protections provided by the minimum funding guarantee mean that a school that received sparsity funding in one year and is ineligible for the same funding in the next year (or sees its sparsity amount fall) will have the previous year's sparsity sum locked into their MFG baseline and protection will be applied on that amount.

We accept that it is more appealing in some areas for the sparsity amount to be applied as a tapered sum, rather than a single lump sum, as this means sparsity funding reduces as the school's per pupil funding rises. We have applied a taper as we calculate the sparsity amounts schools attract under our minimum funding level methodology for 2015-16. However, we want to continue to allow local authorities, working with their schools forums, to be able to choose between a lump sum or a tapered amount.

We have suggested above why we think the funding system should include both a sparsity sum and lump sum.

We accept that not all pupils will want to attend a faith school, if their nearest school closed down. Local authorities have a duty to comply with parental preference, as far as possible, when considering the allocation of a school place for a child. However, the faith designation of a school is not part of the criteria a local authority must use in their consideration. For many areas that have a large proportion of schools that have a faith designation, excluding these schools when identifying a pupil's next nearest school would create a very significant increase in the number of schools the factor identifies – many of which would not need additional sparsity funding.

Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation

- Academy primary (M Henning)
- AET (Ian Deans)
- All Saints First School (Andrea Kenny)
- All Saints Inter-Church Academy (Liz Cowell)
- Alsager School (Sue Reissing)
- Archer, Keith (Burrough Green CE Primary School)
- Archway School (Chris Minett)
- Ashcroft, Jennifer
- Ashcroft, Martin
- Ashmount Primary School (Pana McGee)
- Association of School and College Leaders (Malcolm Trobe)
- Association of Teachers & Lecturers (Martin Freedman)
- Aylesbury High School (Alan Rosen)
- Aylesbury High School (Alan Rosen)
- Badgemore Primary School (Mike Lewin)
- Bailey, Jonathan
- Balgowan Primary Academy Trust (Andrew Swatland)
- Ball, Samantha
- Bannister, Alex
- Barker, Corinne
- Barker, Steven
- Barker, Steven (Parent)
- Barnes, Duncan
- Barnes, Duncan
- Barnes, Lisa
- Barnsley MBC (Joshua Amahwe)
- Bassingbourn Primary School (Rachael Schofield)
- Beaconsfield High School, Buckinghamshire (Debra Marsden)

- Beaufront First School (Eileen Daniel)
- Bedford Borough Council (Sharon Bellamy)
- Bennett-Tighe, Tracy
- Beths Grammar School (James Skinner)
- Bicester Federation of Learning (Beverley Munro)
- Birmingham City Council (David Waller)
- Bishopswood Special School (Elaine Mulvaney)
- Black Firs School (Martin Casserley)
- Blackburn, Louise
- Blackfriars Coppice Federation of Schools (Jim Kane)
- Blackpool Council (Hilary Shaw)
- Blackwood, Ken
- Blundell, Mark
- Bolton Council (Julie Edwards)
- Borough of Poole (Nicola Webb)
- Bottisham Community Primary School (Jacqueline Burke)
- Bottisham Village College (Kate Evans)
- Bounds, Christopher
- Bourn Church of England Primary Academy (Lynne McClure)
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council (Paul Clark)
- Bradley, Lesley
- Bradshaw CP School (Chris Short)
- Bradshaw CPS (Suzanne Robertson)
- Brealey, Louise
- Bridgewater High School (Adrienne Laing)
- Brighton and Hove City Council
- Brimpton CofE Primary School (Carolyn Purchase)
- Brister, Raymond
- Bristol City Council Schools Forum (Jean Denham)
- Brook Acre Community Primary School (Jo Holmes)
- Brooke Weton Trust, The (Debbie Tysoe)

- Broomfields Junior School (Eileen Jeffries)
- Broomfields Junior School (Peter Gleave)
- Brown, Gaynor
- Brown, Keith
- Brundall Primary School (Rick Stuart-Sheppard)
- Buckinghamshire County Council & Buckinghamshire Schools Forum (Nichola Stretton)
- Bungay High School (Lynn Eldrett)
- Bury Council (Children & Young People) (Peter Lowe)
- Butler, Simon (Teacher)
- Cadmore, Andrea
- Calderdale Council (Mark Woolley)
- Cambridge Meridian Academies Trust (Clive Paskell)
- Cambridge Primary Trust
- Cambridgeshire County Council (Martin Wade)
- Cambridgeshire Schools Forum (Philip Hodgson)
- Carter, Lorraine
- Cartledge, Natalie
- Caton, Claire
- Cawthorne's Endowed School (Fiona Ip)
- Central Bedfordshire Council (Dawn Hill)
- Central Bedfordshire School Forum (Richard Holland)
- Chapelford Village Primary School (Joanne Hewson)
- Cherry Tree Garden Primary School (Sharon Godfrey)
- Cherry Tree Garden Primary School (Michael Waldron)
- Cherry Tree Primary School (Christine Mitchell-Brown)
- Cherry Tree Primary School (Helen Graham)
- Cherry Tree Primary School (Louise Haskins)
- Cherry Tree Primary School (Sheila Woodyatt)
- Cherry Tree Primary School, Lymm (Joanne Young)
- Cherry Trees and Wightwick Hall School Federation (Paul Elliot)

- Cherwell Academy Trust, The (Paul Battye)
- Cheshire East Council (Karen Bowdler)
- Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum (Charlotte Fenn)
- Chesterton Community College (Mark Little)
- Christ Church CE VA Primary School (Ian Williams)
- Church of England Education Division (Nigel Genders)
- Cinnamon Brow CE Primary School (Kate Keen)
- Cirencester Deer Park School (Chiquita Henson)
- Cirencester Kingshill School (Sarah Gardiner)
- City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (Sarah North)
- City Of York Council (Richard Hartle)
- Cobbs Infant and Nursery School, The (Emma Mitchell)
- Cobbs Infant and Nursery School, The (Kathy Bianchi)
- Cobbs Infant and Nursery School, The (Martyn Scobbie)
- Cobbs Infant and Nursery School, The (Ruth Grocott)
- Cobbs Infant and Nursery School, The (Yvette Blake)
- Cobbs Infants, The (Robert Mitchell)
- Codsall Community High School (Marjorie Tunnicliffe)
- Coleridge Community College (Beverly Jones)
- Collegiate of 12 Harrow High Schools and Academies (Ian Noutch)
- Community Primary School (Andy Ellis)
- Cooke, Lesley
- Cooke, Peter
- Cooper, Julie (Wymondham High Academy Trust)
- Corbet school, The (Philip Adams)
- Cornwall Council (Andy Winn)
- Cotswold School Academy Trust, The (Val Turner)
- Cottenham Academy (Stephen Ellison)
- County Council Network (Caroline Cunningham)
- Couves, Lorraine
- Coventry Schools Forum (Sybil Hanson)

- Crawford, Greg (Pooles Park Primary School)
- Cromwell Community College (Jed Roberts)
- Crooks, Janet (Horspath Primary School Governing Body)
- Crudginton, Alison (Castle School, Taunton, The)
- Cumbo, Annette
- Cumbria County Council (Caroline Sutton)
- Dale, Lois
- Daly, Andrew
- Darling, Sarah
- Da'Silva, Grace
- Davidson, Karen
- Davies Lane and Selwyn Primary School GB (Graham Moss)
- de Ferrers Academy, The (Maureen Evans)
- DENSON, OLIVIA (Le Cateau Community Primary School)
- Derbyshire Schools Forum (Chris Allcock)
- Devizes School (Alex Eaves)
- Devon County Council (Devon County Council)
- Devon County Council (Karen Powlesland)
- Dickson, Jeremy (NR18 0QT)
- Dillon, Mary
- Diverse Academies Trust (Jon Fearon)
- Doncaster (David Blakesley)
- Dorey, Sue (Farmor's School)
- Dosthill Primary School (Andy Jones)
- Dove, Linda (Alconbury CE Primary School)
- Dowdell, Pamela
- Downham Feoffees Primary School (Michelle Siequien)
- Dr Challoner's Grammar School (Mark Fenton)
- Dr Challoner's High School (Ian Cooksey)
- Dr South's (VA) CE Primary School (Calum Miller)
- Dry Drayton CE Primary School (Linda Ogilvie)

- Dunlop, Caroline (Wymondham High Academy Trust)
- Dunn, David
- Dunne, Stephanie (Wymondham High)
- Durbin, Ben
- Durham County Council (David Shirer)
- Dyslexia-SpLD Trust, The (Melanie Byrne)
- Ealing Council (Gary Redhead)
- Earl Soham Community Primary (Karl Pearce)
- East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Jonathan Fisher)
- East Sussex County Council (Edward Beale)
- Eaton Bank Academy (Elizabeth Whitehurst)
- Eaton, David (Blake CE (Aided) Primary School, The)
- Edwards, John (Headteacher)
- Ellison, Rachael
- Elm CE Primary School (Fiona McCallum)
- Elmwood & Penrose Federation (Liz Hayward)
- Ely St John's Community Primary School (James Thompson)
- Erme Primary School, The (Simon Hall)
- Essex County Council (Yannick Stupples-Whyley)
- Ethridge, Vanessa
- Evans, Michelle
- Evelyn Street C.P.School (Jennifer Hindley)
- Everitt, Mark (Loughborough University)
- Exton, Henry
- f40 (Doug Allan)
- Fairmead Community Special School (Diana Denman)
- FASNA (Peter Beaven)
- Federation St Luke's & Moreland Primary Schools (Ann Dwulit)
- FERGUSON, Richard (NCC)
- Field, Frank
- Fir Tree Junior School (Carolyn Ventress)

- Fir Tree Junior School, Wallingford (Glynis Wheatcroft)
- Fletcher, Lloyd (Bristol Schools Forum (primary governor representative))
- Flintoff, Karin (Netherhall School)
- Foster, Susan (Broomfields Junior School)
- Fox, Lesley
- Franks, Janette
- Frary, Paul
- Friary School Lichfield, The (Iain Liston-Brown)
- Furneaux, Robin (Shenington Primary School)
- Gateshead Schools Forum (Carole Smith)
- Gateway Academy (Louisa Lochner)
- George, Tracey (A Norfolk high school)
- Glass, Lyndsey (Schools forum member Warrington)
- Glenister, Christine
- Gloucestershire County Council and Gloucestershire Schools Forum (Stewart King)
- Glyn School (Ian Keary)
- Glyn School (Jon Chaloner)
- Gopall, Susan (Primary school)
- Gordon, Scott
- Gordon, Sharon
- Gorse Covert Primary School (Catherine Cooke)
- Gorse Covert Primary School (David Harrington)
- Gorse Covert Primary School (David Hart)
- Gorse Covert Primary School (Julie Bennion)
- Gorse Covert Primary School (Nathan Henaghen)
- Gorse Covert Primary School (Richard Sherratt)
- Gosling, Judith
- GOVERNING BODY – DODDISCOMBSLEIGH PRIMARY SCHOOL (W. R. Cope)
- Governor Outwoods primary school (Denise Shaw)
- Grace Academy (Michael Ison)

- Great Sankey Primary School (Barbara Titchard)
- Great Sankey Primary School (Victoria Briggs)
- Great Wilbraham CE (VC) Primary School (Kate Coates)
- Green, Jane
- Greenwood, Keith (Bridgewater High School)
- Guest, Simon
- Hadcroft, Liz
- Hall, Katy
- Hallam, Joyce (Primary School)
- Harbron, Pamela
- Hardenhuish School (Linda Stuart)
- Harris Academy Merton (Leo Gilbert)
- Harris Federation (Fiona Kelly)
- Harris Primary Academy, Kenley. (Kate Magliocco)
- Harrison, Ian
- Hartley, Albert
- Haythorpe, Gail
- Headteacher (Lesley Wells)
- Hednesford Valley High School (Anita Rattan)
- Hemingford Grey Primary School (Kate Fox)
- Herefordshire School Forum (Malcolm Green)
- HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (JONATHAN BURBERRY)
- Highbury Grove School (Henry Jones)
- Hill, Jaspaul (Mayfield Primary School)
- Hillview School for Girls (Bryan Key)
- Hinchingsbrooke School (David Riddick)
- Howard, David
- Howland, Jeremy (South Moreton School)
- Howlett, Mark Jonathan
- Hughes, Alison
- Hughes, Peter (Stockport Council / Schools Forum)

- Hull City Council (Milorad Vasic)
- Humphrys, Jane
- Hutton, Karen (Shebbear Community School)
- Ilsleys Primary School, The (Claire Milsom)
- Impington Village College (Robert Campbell)
- Institute for Fiscal Studies, The (Luke Sibieta)
- Isle of Wight Council (Andrew Minall)
- Islington Schools Forum (Barrie O'Shea)
- Jamson, Brian
- Jamson, Carol (Stretton St Matthew's)
- Jenkins, Ian
- JHGS (Stephen Nokes)
- John Donne Church of England Lower School, Blunham, Bedford (Peter Holden)
- John Hampden Grammar School (Kate Bailey)
- Johnson, Amanda (Wyndham High Academy)
- Johnson, Lindsey (Hawthorn Park Community Primary)
- Joint Response from Hampshire Schools Forum and Hampshire County Council (Andrew Minall)
- Jones, Mary
- Judd, Margaret (Dorset County Council)
- Kara, Faruk
- Kennet school Academies Trust (Paul G Dick)
- Kent County Council (Simon Pleace)
- Keswick School (Simon Jackson)
- King James I Academy (Darren Hall)
- Kingham Primary School (Jason Ratcliffe)
- Kings Nympton Primary School (Amanda Blewett)
- King's School Grantham, The (PETER Kirkbride)
- Kinnerley CE Primary School (Aleksander Sadowski)
- Kirk Smeaton CE Primary School (Ros Hanney)
- Kirklees Schools Forum (David Gearing)

- Knowsley Schools Forum (Diane Williams)
- Kucera, Sarah (Beaconsfield High School)
- Laing, Fergus (Broomfields Junior School)
- Lampard Community School
- Lancashire County Council (Andrew Good)
- Lancashire Schools Forum (John Davies)
- Lane, Alan (Rush Common Academy Trust)
- Lansdell, Jeff
- Larmour, Jonathan
- Latchford St James C of E Primary School (Jacqui Wightman)
- Lawton, Michael
- LB Bromley (Mandy Russell)
- Lee, Rachel (Wymondham high academy)
- Leeds City Council (Simon Darby)
- Leicester City Council (Martin Judson)
- Leicestershire County Council (Jenny Lawrence)
- Lennon, Helen
- Lewis, Clare (Parent)
- Lincolnshire County Council and Lincolnshire Schools Forum (Tony Warnock)
- Lindridge CE Primary School (Susan Warner)
- Linton Village College (Caroline Derbyshire)
- Liverpool School Forum (John Byrne)
- Local Government Association (Mike Heiser)
- London Borough of Bexley (Sam Aslett)
- London Borough of Camden (Gary Jarvis)
- London Borough of Enfield (Sangeeta Brown)
- London Borough of Hackney (Ophelia Carter)
- London Borough of Haringey (Steve Worth)
- London Borough of Harrow (Jo Frost)
- London Borough of Havering (David Allen)
- London Borough of Newham (Dianne Smith)

- London Borough of Redbridge (Sandra Hatt)
- Luton Borough Council (Jan Powley)
- Iwall Community Junior School, The (Lisa Maidment)
- Iwall Community Junior School, The (Susan Robinson)
- Lyons, Pat
- Maddox, Donna
- Manchester City Council (Reena Vandhna Kohli)
- Manchester Schools' Forum (Ian Fenn)
- Manea Community Primary School (Dicky Froggatt)
- Manley, Sarah (Willand School)
- Marland School (Keith Bennett)
- Marshall, Phil
- Martley CE Primary School (Andrew Massey)
- Mayne, Judith
- McCheyne, Janet (Bulphan C of E VC Primary School)
- McCormick , Jonathan
- McGee, Denise
- McGeehan, Jonathan
- McLennan, Paul
- Meadowside Community Primary (Paula Wilkinson)
- Melbourn Primary School (Stephanie Wilcox)
- Melbourn Village College (Simon Holmes)
- Merryfields School (Sarah Poyner)
- Mickley Community First School (Andrew Hudson)
- Middlesbrough Schools' Management Forum (Julie Cordiner)
- Miller-Marshall, Louise (Pilton Community College)
- Milton Keynes Council (Penni Powers)
- Monie, Marianne
- Monkfield Park Primary School (Sarah Porter)
- Moorfield, Dianne
- MP West Worcestershire (Harriett Baldwin)

- Myton School (Jane Burrows)
- Naegeli, Thomas (Alconbury CofE Primary School)
- NASBM (Steven Morales)
- NASUWT (Gareth Young)
- National Association of Head Teachers (Kathryn James)
- National Day Nurseries Association (Claire Schofield)
- National representative organisation – National Governors' Association (Gillian Allcroft)
- Nayna, Denise (Speen CE School)
- Neale-Wade Academy (E Graham)
- Newcastle City Council Schools Forum (Martin Surtees)
- Newnham Croft Primary (Sharon Williams)
- Norfolk County Council (Owen Jenkins)
- North East Lincolnshire Council (David Kirven)
- North Lincolnshire Council (Becky McIntyre)
- North Somerset Council (Louise Malik)
- North Tyneside Schools Forum (David Baldwin)
- North Yorkshire County Council (Anton Hodge)
- Northamptonshire County Council (Jon Lee)
- Northgate High School (Linda Walker)
- Northumberland County Council and its Schools Forum (Angela Whitehead)
- Nottingham City Council (Kathryn Stevenson)
- Nottinghamshire County Council (Neil Robinson)
- Nugent, Sarah (Wyndham High Academy Trust)
- NUT (Anita Brown)
- Nuttall, Pat (Culham CoE Parochial School)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Adele Davie)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Beverley Scott-Herron)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (G Bradbury)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Gary Cunningham)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Joanna Frank)

- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Julie Bennion)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Rachel McIntosh)
- Oakwood Avenue Primary School (Rebecca Cummings)
- O'Brien, Alison
- O'Kane, Hildegard
- Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council (Liz Caygill)
- Olympus Academy Trust, The (Julia Anwar)
- Osborne, Jenni (parent)
- O'Shea, Barrie (Duncombe Primary school)
- Ottaway, Lyn
- Oughtrington Community Primary School (Damien Ikin)
- Oughtrington Community Primary School (fleur Middlebrough)
- Oughtrington Community Primary School (Gill Marsland)
- Oughtrington Community Primary School (Ian Anstee)
- Oxfordshire County Council (Frances Craven)
- Oxfordshire Schools Forum (Carole Thomson)
- Palgrave CEVC Primary School (Andrew Berry)
- Parfitt, M
- Park Hill Thorns Federation (Ann Grigg)
- Park, Richard
- Piotrowska, Anna
- Pitt, Timothy
- Pomfret, Sarah
- Ponteland Community High School (Mike Brown)
- Ponteland Middle School (Caroline Pryer)
- Portsmouth City Council (Richard Webb)
- Pratt, Nicola
- Primary (Diane Kingdon)
- primary school (Chrissy Barclay)
- Primary School (Jamie Stone)
- Procter, Richard

- Queens Park Community School (Sebastian Mansfield-Steer)
- Ramsey Community Junior School (Patsy Peres)
- Rawlins Academy (Callum Orr)
- Ray, Timothy
- Reading Schools Forum & Reading Borough Council Joint (Russell Dyer)
- Reeder, Anna (Milton CE Primary School)
- Rhodes, Simon
- Richards, Joe
- Roberts, Rachel
- Robertson, Shirley (Toddler Group and St James school)
- Robinson, Susan
- Rochdale MBC (Christine Clarkson)
- Rodger, Alan
- Rose, Melanie (Harris Federation)
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (Joanne Robertson)
- Rowley, David (Broomfields Junior School)
- Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames and Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Schools Forum (Rachel Howard)
- Royal Grammar School (Roy Page)
- Ruislip High School (Martina Lecky)
- Russell, Sue
- Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School (Colleen Everett)
- Salford City Council (Debbie Fulton)
- Sandall, Chris
- Sandbach School (Deborah Torjussen)
- Sands, Cheryl
- Sands, Nick
- Sandwell Schools Forum (Rosemarie Kerr)
- Sandy Lane Nursery and Forest School (Michael Jones)
- Sankey Valley St James CE Primary School (Deb Feltham)
- Savage, Jason (Wymondham High School)

- Sawston Village College (Croft Anonymous)
- Sawston Village College (Jonathan Culpin)
- Mottley, Keiran
- Scobbie, Martyn (Broomfields Junior school)
- Scranage, Victoria
- Settlebeck School (Judith Greene)
- Sheffield City Council (Mark Sheikh)
- Sheldon School (Neil Spurdell)
- Sheldon School, (Roger Hammett)
- Shropshire Schools Forum (Gwyneth Evans)
- Silver, Jo
- Sir Harry Smith Community Centre (Carole Taylor)
- Sir Harry Smith Community College, Whittlesey Cambridgeshire (John King)
- Skittrall, Carolyn
- Slaley First School (Rebecca Jackson)
- Slaven, Helen
- Slough Schools Forum and Slough Borough council (Atul Lad)
- Small, Stephen (Broomfields Junior School)
- Smith, Jonathan
- Snow, Karen (Chair of Governors)
- Society of County Treasurers (Geoff Dobson)
- Society of London Treasurers London Borough of Redbridge, The (Geoff Pearce)
- Solihull MBC (Stephen Fenton)
- Solihull School Forum (Derek Sheldon)
- Somerset County County (Ken Rushton)
- South Gloucestershire Council (Martin Dear)
- Southampton City Council (Lynn Franklin)
- Southend Borough Council (Andrew Ward)
- Southgate, Kay
- Special Interest Group of Municipal Authorities (Outside London) within the LGA, (Geoff Winterbottom)

- Spinney Primary School, The (Rachel Snape)
- Spisz, Jane
- Spring Common School (Kim Taylor)
- Springhead Primary School (Brian Anderson)
- St Mary and John Primary School Oxford (Joan Clanchy)
- St Aloysius College (T Mannion)
- St Bede's Inter-Church School (Geoff Cook)
- St Cleres Co-operative Academy Trust (Paul Connew)
- St Edmund's School (Annie Williams)
- St Edward's C.E. Academy (Maureen Evans)
- St Helens Council (Greg Tyrer)
- St John's CE Primary School (Lawrence Gittins)
- St John's Upper Holloway CE primary (Brian Welsh)
- St Neots Learning Partnership
- St Neots Learning Partnership (Ann Christie)
- St Peter's C of E Aided School (Mark Bennett)
- St Peter's Catholic Primary School (Helen Lea)
- St Robert's RC First School Governing Body (Benjamin Watson)
- St Vincent's Catholic Primary School (Anne-Marie Worrall)
- ST. ANDREW'S C.E. PRIMARY SCHOOL (Wendy McKinnon)
- St. Barnabas C.E. Primary School, Worcester (Angela Deakin)
- St. Catherine's CE Primary School (Sarah Power)
- St. Laurence School Chair of Governors (Brian Newey)
- Stacey, David
- Stafford Sports College (Jude Slack)
- Staffordshire County Council (Anna Halliday)
- Staffordshire Schools Forum (Stephen Barr)
- Stanton, Karen (Caldecote Primary School)
- Starkey, Rosalind (Alconbury Cof E Primary School (governor))
- Steeple Morden C of E Primary School (Richard Lloyd)
- Stephens, Linda (School)

- Stifford Clays Primary School (Anthony Peltier)
- Stoke on Trent City Council
- Stokes, Anita (Wandsworth Council)
- Stottesdon CofE Primary School (Katie Jones)
- Stratton Primary School (Phil Aldis)
- Stretton St Matthew's CE Primary School (Hazel Fryman)
- Suffolk County Council – School Forum (Leanne Minnican)
- Summersfield, Paula (Salford City Council)
- Sunderland City Council (Karen Atkins)
- Surrey County Council (Peter-John Wilkinson)
- Surrey Secondary Heads' Phase Council (Sarah Ayers)
- Sutton CE (VC) Primary School (Gill Gilbert)
- Swaffham Bulbeck Church of England Primary School (Amy Weatherup)
- Swavesey Village College (David Ruddy)
- Swindell, Victoria
- Swindon Borough Council (Steve Haley)
- Swinton High School, The (Dave Byron)
- Tait, Mark (Three Rivers Learning Trust Ltd., The)
- Tarbatt, Tracey
- Tavistock Primary and Nursery School (Lynnette Selbie)
- Taylor, Abigail
- Teather , Sarah
- Telford & Wrekin Council (Tim Davis)
- Templer Academy Schools Trust (Iain Freeland)
- Theodore, Jennifer
- Thomas Alleyne's High School (Denise Crocker)
- Thomas Clarkson Academy (Allison Baverstock)
- Thomas, Alistair (Lindridge CE Primary School)
- Thomas, Huw
- Thomas, Judith
- Tinsley, Stuart (Linton Village College)

- Tofts, Samantha
- Tower Hamlets Schools Forum (Robert McCulloch-Graham)
- Trafford Council (Deborah Brownlee)
- Trinity Academy Halifax (David Sheard)
- Turner, Rebecca
- Two Rivers Primary School (Tony Dooley)
- Uttley, Sara
- Vaardigans, Lisa
- Vance, Joy
- Verney, Sian
- Wakefield Council (Neil Hardwick)
- Walker, Nick
- Ward, Pauline (Wymondham High School)
- Warrington Association of Primary Headteachers (Davina Woods)
- Warrington Association of Primary Headteachers (Keith Greenwood)
- Warrington Borough Council (G Bradbury)
- Warrington Borough Council (Garry Bradbury)
- Warwickshire County Council (Sara Haslam)
- Watkins, Jacqueline (Brampton Village Primary School)
- Weaver, Walter
- Wells, Suzanne (Babcock International)
- West Berkshire Council (Claire White)
- West Sussex County Council (Nigel Street)
- Weston, Geoffrey (Iwall Community Junior School, The)
- Westwood College (Richard Hey)
- Whelan, Carla (Oakmeadow CE Primary school)
- Whitley Chapel First School (Jenny Morgan)
- Whittaker, Gordon
- Whittlesea Learning Trust (Margaret Leverett)
- Whittlesea Learning Trust (New Road Primary and Park Lane Primary and Nursery School (Robin Cattermole)

- Wilcox, Karl (Hagley Catholic High School)
- Wild, Karen
- Wilson, Dorothy
- Wiltshire Council& Wiltshire Schools Forum (Liz Williams)
- Wimbledon Park Primary School (Paul Lufkin)
- Windmill Primary School (Charles Newbury)
- Winstanley, Mark
- Wirral Schools Forum (Andrew Roberts)
- Witchford Village College (Marie Atmeare)
- Wong, Timothy
- Woodlands Academy (Adam Miles)
- Woodward, Brian
- Woolston CE Primary School (Anne Anne Jones)
- Woolston, Richard (Shurdington C of E Primary School)
- Worcestershire Association of Governors (Malcolm Richards)
- Worcestershire County Council (Andy McHale)
- Wymondham High Academy (Dawn Cameron)
- Wymondham High Academy trust (Russell Boulton)
- Wymondham High Academy Trust (Stephen Simms)
- Wymondham High School (Deborah Jeffrey)
- Yalcin, Huseyin
- Yaxley Infants Governing Body (P Dhanushan)



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v2.0. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2
email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus
download www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: DFE-00499-2014



Follow us on
Twitter: [@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk