

Response ID ANON-HWBJ-DF6Z-5

Submitted to **Mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels in 5-16 school funding**

Submitted on **2019-10-22 16:33:08**

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:

Bruce Parvin

2 What is your email address?

Email:

bruce.parvin@northumberland.gov.uk

3 What is your organisation?

Organisation:

Northumberland County Council

4 Would you like us to keep your responses confidential?

No

Reason for confidentiality:

Calculating the minimum funding per pupil levels

5 Do you agree that, in order to calculate mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels, all local authorities should follow the NFF methodology? If not, please explain your reasons.

Further comments:

The DfE's proposals on the calculation and implementation of minimum per pupil funding represents real progress in reducing previous inequities in the system where a 3 tier (First Middle, Primary) education structure still exists. It is agreed that premises costs should be excluded in a standardised calculation as the inclusion of elements such as sparsity would penalise the small number of authorities such as Northumberland for whom this is a real issue.

Disapplying the mandatory minimum per pupil funding levels

6 Do you agree that any requests from local authorities to disapply the use of the mandatory minimum per pupil levels should only be considered on an exceptional basis and in the context of the grounds described above? If not, please explain your reasons.

Further comments:

Greater flexibility at local level - e.g to allow different levels, (perhaps within an agreed tolerance) to be used without the need for a disapplication request may be helpful for some authorities given the late publication of information by the DfE and consequently reduced time available for consultation.

Additional Comments

7 Please provide any additional comments you wish to make on the implementation of mandatory minimum per pupil levels.

Further comments:

The government's enthusiasm for the mandatory implementation of the minimum per pupil levels is understood but need to be fully resourced in order to ensure all Schools benefit as indicated around overall funding levels. As things stand, implementation of minimum per pupil funding in Northumberland will cost a quarter of the additional Education funding available.

Additionally the proposal, as it stands does not reflect the pupil patterns in some secondary and all through schools where the pupil numbers are higher in the secondary years - pupils typically having joined at Year 7 from other feeder primary schools.

A flat profile using the equation as per page 8 of the consultation document does not reflect this. Consideration should be given to weighting the respective year groups by the number of pupils within them, rather than simply relying on a flat profile which assumes pupil numbers are spread evenly throughout a school's year groups.

Public Sector Equality Duty

8 Do you think that any of our proposals could have a disproportionate impact, positive or negative, on specific pupils, in particular those who share a protected characteristic? Please provide evidence to support your response.

Further comments:

Given the element of the funding that is to be targeted in those areas with lower "per pupil" funding figures by definition this will mean these are areas with less deprivation, and consequently less deprivation funding. Consequently deprived areas will benefit less from this proposal.

9 How could any adverse consequences be reduced and are there any ways we could better advance equality of opportunity between those pupils who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not? Please provide evidence to support your response.

Further comments:

The overall % increase to schools benefitting from increased minimum per pupil areas should have been used as an average benchmark across all schools.

Further Contact

10 Would you be happy for us to contact you in relation to your consultation response?

Yes