



TYTHERINGTON SCHOOL

PARENTS' GUIDE TO COMPLETING THE

NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

March 2017

The following are Tytherington School's responses to the questions contained in the Government's National Funding Formula Consultation Document, which may help you complete the survey.

The first five questions are very important. If you have limited time, please just answer these and submit your response.

There are eighteen questions in total, some of which are very technical. You can miss out any questions on which you have no opinion by simply moving on to the next one or clicking 'Continue' at the bottom of the page. If you wish to complete the consultation in less than 10 minutes, you could just answer the Yes / No questions and leave the comment boxes empty.

Just to be clear, we do not support any school losing funding although we feel that the way in which the consultation is set up forces respondents to make choices which are difficult. The responses below are scenarios which would benefit our particular school. We are not suggesting or requesting that you answer in the same way. It is better if you are able to use your own words and use our answers as guidance. The explanation for why we are suggesting a response is provided to help you to decide if you agree.

Please contact **Mr Botwe** if you have any questions or concerns regarding the National Funding Formula or the Consultation Document.

Question	Response	Explanation
<p>1</p> <p>Balance</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>We believe that the proposed formula has not achieved the right balance between the factors. The formula should be modified to take account of our concerns and the weightings then adjusted.</p> <p>The funding proposed per student per year for Cheshire East, for example, is less than the actual cost of providing a basic education for that child. This represents a cut of £87 per student, which is unfair.</p> <p>As a result, many schools are facing severe cuts, which will impact on the quality of education and care offered to students not just at Tytherington but at other secondary schools. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced teaching and support staff • Increase in class sizes • Cutting pastoral care and support services • Narrowing the curriculum • Reducing extracurricular activities • Little or no budget for resources including text books or IT
<p>2</p> <p>Ratios between secondary and primary</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Secondary schools should retain a marginally higher level of funding than primary schools as the associated costs at secondary level, such as specialist teaching and facilities are greater. Equally, we do not believe that the primary schools should receive any less than is proposed. Ideally, we would recommend that we maintain the status quo of 29% for the first year, whilst evidence for any future change is gathered. The Government should carry out detailed research to find out what the ration should be before making any changes.</p> <p><i>(The 'Primary to Secondary Ratio' relates to the amount of funding one level gets compared with the other).</i></p>
<p>3</p> <p>Lump sum</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The amount of lump sum should be reduced to allow more funding for pupil-led factors.</p> <p><i>('Pupil-led funding' refers to funding calculated on the needs of the students within the school, not en masse by postcode etc.).</i></p>

<p>4</p> <p>Additional needs factors</p>	<p>No – Allocate a lower proportion</p>	<p>The total amount for additional education needs factors should be lower, at about 14%. We would request at least 75% as a minimum is provided so that every child, regardless of where they live, should receive a basic minimum amount to fund their education. Reducing the current figure by 4.1% is fundamentally unfair.</p> <p><i>(‘Additional Needs Factors’ are circumstances such as family circumstances, living in poorer areas, not having done well at primary school and having English as a second language).</i></p>
<p>5</p> <p>Weighting for additional needs factors</p>	<p>‘Lower’ to all sub-questions</p>	<p>This issue requires further research to achieve the best balance between them but they all need to be lower to provide enough basic funding for any child.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>Suggestions for data sources to allocate mobility funding</p>	<p>Lagged Funding</p>	<p>The impact of lagged funding should be assessed and addressed. Detailed information already exists about schools educating children for free due to lagged funding.</p> <p><i>(‘Mobility’ refers to students moving from one school of the same level e.g. primary to primary, to another. ‘Lagged Funding’ refers to the way schools are funded for yearly increases in students. Funding is calculated on the previous year’s student numbers so any additions receive no funding for that year and are therefore educated by the school for free.)</i></p>
<p>7</p> <p>£110K lump sum</p>	<p>No opinion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move on to next question if you do not wish to answer 	<p>The difference between the actual fixed costs of secondary and primary schools needs to be investigated further. The ratio could be modified in future versions of the formula. Only answer if you feel the proposal is unfair.</p> <p>The Cheshire East School’s Forum recently reduced the local figure from £130K to £115K after much discussion.</p>
<p>8</p> <p>Sparsity funding</p>	<p>No opinion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move on to next question if you do not wish to answer 	<p>More research is required on the actual costs for running rural schools. Only answer if you feel that the numbers suggested are unreasonable.</p> <p><i>(‘Sparsity’ refers to the remote location of particular schools).</i></p>

9 Lagged funding data	Yes – in comment box	Tytherington has been a victim of lagged funding (see above), which has impacted on our ability to educate students at this school and we would want this factor implemented as soon as possible.
10 Funding floor	No	The existing Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) of minus 1.5% per student per year provides adequate protection and can be calculated on a school's actual student numbers. There is no need for further protection. <i>(A 'Funding floor' is the amount by which any school's funding can be reduced in one year due to a change in their circumstances. The 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' (MFG) aims to protect schools against funding drops of more than a certain percentage per student per year. Minus 1.5% means a reduction of 1.5% to the existing level of funding a school receives per student per year).</i>
11 3% funding floor	No – floor should be lowered	See previous question. The existing MFG is sufficient and there is no need for additional protection.
12 New/growing schools	Yes	Exceptions should be made for new schools and those that are growing rapidly to access additional funding.
13 Minus 1.5% MFG	Yes	We would support maintaining this mechanism instead of a funding floor to protect schools where the funding is decreasing.
14 – 18	No opinion – Move on to next question or go straight to end if you do not wish to answer	There is not enough information available or explanation of calculations used for us to feel able to comment on these areas. They mainly affect Local Authority funding streams.