

Committee:	School Forum
Meeting Date:	25 th April 2014
Title:	Fairer Funding Consultation
Author:	Lea Minnican
Decision making / consultative / information:	Consultative

What is the Forum being asked to decide?

1. Schools Forum is being asked to note the information in the fairer funding consultation released by the EfA on the 13th March (Annex A).
2. Schools forum are being asked to note the recommendations and agree direction, made by the Resource Allocation Working Group (RAWG) on the distribution of the additional £9m available to Suffolk in 2015-16. We will come back with a firm proposal once we have confirmation of the amount of funding this will be after the consultation ends.
3. Schools Forum is being asked to agree to submit the answers/thoughts suggested by RAWG and the schools accountancy team in the consultation response document (Annex B) as the Suffolk school forum response.

Reason for recommendation

4. RAWG have considered the £9m, and want as much as possible to go to schools to help arise attainment. However the group is mindful of the cost pressures on the high needs block and feel it would be prudent to invest £2m of the £9m in future proofing this funding.
5. RAWG agreed that the School Accountancy team where best placed to understand the sparsity calculations and therefore comment on the DfE proposal.

Alternative options

6. Forum could decide to allocate the £9m entirely to Schools and manage the high needs block by tightening assessment criteria or potentially lowering top up bands.
7. The Forum could agree a different spilt of funding between Schools and High needs.

8. The Forum could decide to tier the funding so more was directed at Primary or Secondary rather than apply a flat increase or could target the funding via one of the factors such as Low Cost High Incidence (LCHI) or deprivation.
9. Schools Forum members who have a specific interest in sparsity could provide responses for the consultation.

Who will be affected by this decision?

10. All Schools in Suffolk.
11. Any pupil in Suffolk in receipt of high needs provision funded by Suffolk County Council.

Main Body of the Report

12. The consultation released is not what we were expecting; it is not the next step in funding reform but a mechanism to distribute more funding to the lowest funded authorities. The minister's statement makes it clear that the next stage of funding reform will follow at some point after the next comprehensive spending review.
13. The government have identified £350 million of funding, of which Suffolk will indicatively receive £9.2m from April 2015 which will become part of schools budgets in 2015-16. The consultation has stated that MFG will remain at -1.5% there is no changes to the formula for 2015-16 apart from a suggestion to look again at sparsity.
14. The funding has been allocated using a formula based on what the DfE consider the minimum funding should be for local authorities. This we believe is based on averages from all Local Authority submitted pro formas. We are still awaiting the technical note to explain the exact calculation and source data.
15. The local authority cannot move the minimum funding rates outlined in the consultation and the consultation does state that it is still up to local authorities how they allocate their funding. The DfE calculation assumes that all of the school block funding is distributed to schools however in Suffolk we have £12m centrally retained to support historical decisions, which the national formula allows us to keep.
16. The proposal was put to the RAWG on how the £9.2m should be allocated in 2015-16. The RAWG suggested distribution was as follows:
 - i) £7m is allocated to schools. This is divided by the number of pupils in Suffolk and added to the AWPU values as a flat increase.
 - ii) No other factors in the formula are changed, to provide some stability to schools with the exception of sparsity which may be revised by the government following the consultation.
 - iii) £2m is put aside for High needs, £1m as a contingency and £1m to undertake an external review of the block and what it funds. This review has already started and a paper is due to come to forum in July outlining progress to date. The £2m would be used as start-up funding/double running costs to get out of county provision "set up" in Suffolk if the review finds that this would be cost effective or to re-design services following the

review, this would be invest to save funding which would only be available for 2015-16.

17. The group then discussed sparsity and some of the issues that had arisen. Michael Davis then explained some of the issues that sparsity was causing to the MFG calculation and the group felt that he was best placed to response to the consultation regarding sparsity.
18. There are three questions in the consultation regarding sparsity, the first question wants to know if the sparsity factor was useful in supporting small schools in sparsely populated areas. We have responded that he has been useful at targeting funding. However the funding hasn't always had the effect we were expecting on schools budgets due to the effect of sparsity on the MFG calculation, the removal of sparsity as an exceptional factor lowers the MFG £ per pupil which has a positive impact for schools on MFG but limits the amount that a school can gain if they are capped. We have asked for clarification from the DfE on the treatment of sparsity next year in the MFG calculation.
19. The second question looked at moving to average number of pupils in each year group, rather than the number of pupils in the school. We have said this would make the calculation overly complicated.
20. The last question asks for changes you would like to suggest to improve the operation of this factor, and why. We have suggested the removal of "as the crow flies" measure and replace this with "distance by road".



Department
for Education

Launch date 13 March 2014
Respond by 30 April 2014
Ref: Department for Education

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

This consultation sets out the Department for Education's proposal to allocate an additional £350m in 2015-16, to increase the per-pupil budgets for the least fairly funded local areas. Our proposal will mean that in 2015-16, every local area will attract a minimum level of funding for each of its pupils and schools, making the distribution of funding to local areas fairer whilst ensuring that no area receives a cut to its per-pupil budget. This consultation invites views on how to set these minimum funding levels, and how we will distribute the additional £350 million funding.

We are inviting views on whether small changes to the operation of the sparsity factor would be helpful.

To Maintained schools; academies; local authorities; governors; bursars; parents; schools forums; trade union organisations

Issued 13 March 2014

Enquiries To If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact the Department on 0370 000 2288

e-mail: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

Contact Details

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's '[Contact Us](#)' page.

1 Introduction

1.1 Making school funding fairer

There is widespread recognition that the current school funding system is unfair and out of date. We are committed to addressing this so that, across the country, schools have a fair funding allocation that equips them to provide a world-class education.

Since we first consulted in 2011 on how to improve the school funding system, we have introduced a number of important changes to how local authorities distribute funding to schools. These changes have already led to a more transparent funding system with more money being allocated based on the needs of pupils. In 2013-14, local authorities allocated almost 90% of funding based on the needs of pupils, compared with 71% in 2012-13.

We are now determined to provide additional funding to the least fairly funded local authorities in 2015-16. After we have met our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15, we have decided to add a further £350m to fund schools in the least fairly funded authorities. This will be the first time in a decade that funding has been allocated to local areas on the basis of the actual characteristics of their pupils and schools, rather than simply their historic levels of spending. **No local authority or school will receive less funding as a result of this proposal.**

Although these proposals do not represent implementation of a national funding formula, this is the biggest step towards fairer funding for schools in a decade. The proposals we are announcing today put us in a much better position to implement a national funding formula when the time is right. This will be 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.

This proposal relates to 2015-16. Beyond 2015-16, the allocation of funding between local authorities will be a matter for the next spending review.

1.2 Allocating the additional funding fairly

1.2.1 We have carefully considered how we can allocate the £350m as fairly as possible – in a way that reflects the needs of pupils and schools. We are determined to avoid allocating it in a way that could perpetuate the flaws and inconsistencies of the current system, which we have been progressively reforming.

We propose to allocate the additional funding by setting minimum funding levels that a local authority should attract for its pupils and schools in 2015-16. If a local authority already attracts at least these minimum funding levels, then we will not make any change to the amount of funding per pupil that it receives. If a local authority attracts less than these minimum funding levels for the pupils and schools in its area, we will increase its budget so that it meets those levels.

We propose setting a minimum funding level for five pupil characteristics:

- a per-pupil amount ('age weighted pupil unit');
- pupils who are from deprived backgrounds;
- pupils who have been looked after¹, for example in foster care;
- pupils with low attainment before starting at either their primary or secondary school;
- pupils who speak English as an additional language.

In addition, we propose setting a minimum funding level for two school characteristics currently used by local authorities to allocate money to schools:

- a minimum funding level for each school on top of its per-pupil funding ('lump sum'); and
- a minimum funding level for small schools that are essential to serving rural areas ('sparsity sum')².

¹ For 2015-16, a single indicator will be provided, covering all pupils who have been looked after for one day or more on the 31 March 2014. This is the same measure as was set out in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

² The sparsity factor is one of a number of permitted factors that local authorities can use in their local funding formula. This formula factor allows local authorities to allocate additional funding to small schools that are essential to serving small rural communities.

We propose setting our minimum funding levels based on the average amounts³ that local authorities allocate to these characteristics in their local formulae at present. We propose to apply the minimum funding level for the basic per-pupil amount ('age-weighted pupil unit') at the average that local authorities currently allocate through this factor. In doing this, we will use roughly 75% of the £350m of additional funding⁴. We then propose to apply the minimum funding levels for the other characteristics using the rest of the additional funding (roughly 25%). This will mean that we can set each of the other minimum funding levels close to the level of its current local authority average⁵.

We propose to raise the minimum funding levels for local authorities in areas with higher salaries in line with a 'hybrid area cost adjustment'. This takes account of both teacher salary and general labour market data. We set out this approach in detail at Annex C.

Indicative minimum funding levels, based on the data currently available, are as follows. These are subject to revision when we have final confirmation of local authorities' local funding formulae for 2014-15.

Indicative minimum funding levels

- A basic per pupil amount – primary: £2,845; key stage 3: £3,951; key stage 4; £4,529
- Deprivation – between £893 and £1,974 – full breakdown in Annex A
- Looked after children – £1,009
- Low prior attainment – primary: £878; secondary: £1,961
- English as an additional language – primary: £505; secondary: £1,216
- A lump sum for every school – primary: £117,082; secondary: £128,189
- Additional sparsity sum for small schools vital to serving rural communities – up to £53,988
- An area cost adjustment to increase minimum funding levels in areas

³ In order to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document, we have used the published final 2013-14 pro forma data to calculate the average per pupil amounts – with the exception of the lump sum and sparsity sum, where we have used provisional 2014-15 school funding data. To calculate the average per pupil amounts for a particular characteristic, we have only included local authorities that allocated funding for the characteristic in question and the average amounts are calculated as a pupil-weighted average. When final 2014-15 pro forma data is available, we will review the minimum funding levels.

⁴ In using the final 2014-15 data this proportion may change. For example, if the average age weighted pupil unit is higher in 2014-15 than in 2013-14, this proportion will increase.

⁵ Each of the indicative minimum funding levels, with the exception of the minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount, has been scaled back from the current local authority average proportionately to use the remaining share of the total available funding (roughly 25%). October 2014 census data will be used to calculate each of the minimum funding levels before Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding is confirmed for 2015-16.

with higher labour market costs.

In order to calculate whether a local authority will attract additional funding to reach the minimum funding levels, we will first look at the amount each local authority would be due to receive in 2015-16 (Schools Block Unit Funding only), given our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15. We will then apply the minimum funding levels to calculate a new total. This will be done by:

- i. multiplying each of the minimum funding levels by the relevant number of eligible pupils or schools in the local authority⁶;
- ii. summing each of the totals in (i) to create a new funding amount for the local authority;
- iii. applying the area cost adjustment to the total in (ii);
- iv. if this total is more than the local authority's per pupil cash level in 2014-15, we will increase the local authority's funding to reach this new level;
- v. if not, the level of funding remains the same.

⁶ At the time DSG allocations are confirmed, the department will use October 2014 census data. The exemplification in this document uses October 2013 data.

A worked example of our proposed approach is set out below.

Worked Example: Authority X

The following example demonstrates how the minimum funding levels would be applied in imaginary authority X, which has 100,000 pupils. This authority only has KS3 pupils and every deprived pupil also lives in an IDACI 6 area.

i. Total funding 2014-15 £400,000,000

There are 100,000 pupils in authority X and in 2014-15 this authority will receive £400m with each pupil attracting £4,000.

ii. Apply each of the minimum funding levels:

- KS3 AWPU MFL x [100,000 pupils in LA] =£3,951 x 100,000 =£395,100,000
- Deprivation MFL x [5,000 deprived pupils] =£1,974 x 5,000 =£9,870,000
- LAC MFL x [250 LAC pupils] =£1,009 x 250 =£252,250
- LPA MFL x [5000 LPA pupils] =£1,961 x 5,000 =£9,805,000
- EAL MFL x [250 EAL pupils] =£1,216 x 250 =£304,000
- Lump sum MFL x [100 schools] =£128,189 x 100 schools =£12,818,900
- Sparsity MFL⁷ x [10 schools with 300 pupils] =£26,994 x 10 =£269,940

iii. New MFL total

- The sum of each MFL calculation above is =£428,420,090.
- Authority x attracts an ACA adjustment factor of 1.1.
- The adjusted MFL total would be £428,420,090 x 1.1 =£471,262,099
- Divided by the number of pupils in the local authority =£4,713 per pupil

Authority X would receive the higher total budget of £471,262,099 and the higher per pupil amount of £4,713, because their current funding and per pupil amount is less than these new totals.

⁷ In this example, each school attracts 50% of the sparsity MFL. This is because the sparsity amount is a tapered sum. With 300 pupils, the secondary schools attract 50% of the MFL. More information on how the tapering works can be found in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

The table at Annex B lists the 62 local authorities that currently attract less than the indicative minimum funding levels for their pupils and schools. The table indicates the new level of funding per pupil for 2015-16⁸ that would result from these indicative minimum funding levels. **Every other local authority will see its per pupil funding maintained in cash terms, consistent with funding decisions since the start of this Parliament. No school or local authority will lose money as a result of this proposal.**

Note that in most cases, we have used published 2013-14 local authority pro-forma data to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document. When final 2014-15 data is available we will review the minimum funding levels and **it is possible some local allocations may vary in order to fit within the envelope of funding we have available.** For example, if the average AWPU turns out to be higher in 2014-15, a greater proportion of the £350m funding would be allocated through the AWPU minimum funding level, meaning a smaller proportion of the overall pot would be allocated through the remaining factors.

1.3 The role of local authority in 2015-16

1.3.1 Our proposal uses seven of the characteristics used in local formulae, but we are not proposing that local authorities should be required to use those seven factors in their local formulae in 2015-16 (with the exception of the basic per pupil amount and the deprivation factor, which are mandatory). Nor are we proposing that local authorities choosing to use any of these seven factors should be required to weight that factor at or above the minimum funding level. It will remain for the local authority to decide how best to apply its local formulae to meet its circumstances.

We are not proposing any changes for 2015-16 to the way in which local authorities can allocate funding to schools – except, possibly, minor changes to the sparsity factor. When we introduced the sparsity factor for 2014-15, we said that we would review how useful local authorities had found this factor. We would like to seek views on this through this consultation, particularly to understand if any changes would be helpful for 2015-16. We have set out a number of questions on the sparsity factor as part of the consultation response

⁸ Any additional funding allocated would be applied only to the schools block within local authorities' DSG allocations. Local authorities will continue to be free to move funding between their schools, high needs and early years blocks in 2015-16 provided they comply with the requirements of our Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG).

form provided alongside this document.

We will retain the Minimum Funding Guarantee, which has been in place over many years and which dictates that for the vast majority of schools, funding per pupil cannot drop by more than 1.5% per year⁹.

2 Annex A: Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16

- 2.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex A, the Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16.

3 Annex B: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

- 3.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex B, the Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16.

4 Annex C: Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

- 4.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex C, the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

5 Consultation

- 5.1 To respond to our proposals go to www.education.gov.uk/consultations. The consultation closes on 30 April 2014.

⁹ Some funding is excluded from the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. Details of this are in '2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities.

6 How To Respond

6.1 Consultation responses can be completed online
www.education.gov.uk/consultations.

by emailing: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

or send by post to:

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, Darlington, DL3 9BG

7 Additional Copies

7.1 Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from the Department for Education e-consultation website at:
www.education.gov.uk/consultations

8 Plans for making results public

8.1 The results of the consultation and the department's response will be published on the DfE e-consultation website in summer 2014.



Department
for Education

Consultation Response Form

Consultation closing date: 30 April 2014
Your comments must reach us by that date

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	

Name: Leanne Minnican	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Organisation (if applicable): Suffolk County Council – School Forum	
Address: Endeavour House 8 Russell Road Ipswich IP1 2BX	

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](#) page.

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained school	<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input type="checkbox"/> Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Governor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bursar	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Trade union organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

1 Do you agree that the existing distribution of schools funding is unfair?

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

Comments:

Schools serving similar pupils are not funded the same and that is fundamentally unfair.

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

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

Comments:

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?

3 a) Age Weighted Pupil Unit

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

3 b) Deprivation

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

3 c) Looked-after children

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

3 d) English as an additional language

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

3 e) Low prior attainment

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

3 f) Lump sum

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

3 g) Sparsity

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

Comments:

Please see comments in sparsity section for our reason.

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

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not sure
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Comments:

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Use teacher pay bands only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use a general labour market measure only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use an alternative method
---	---	--

Comments:

Sparsity Review

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?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

We welcomed the introduction of a factor helping support small schools in sparsely populated areas so in that respect it has been helpful. However we have found that in a small number of cases that very small schools who qualified for Suffolk's sparsity factor that they received less funding than if we had not included a sparsity factor. From our investigation it is because of the way sparsity is used in the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee and in that calculation it has significantly reduced these schools MFG £ Per Pupil. Suffolk applied a cap of 6.25% so therefore the schools can only gain this amount on the recalculated 2013-14 MFG £ per pupil.

In one case the schools 2013-14 £ per pupil has reduced to £748 and clearly 6.25% increase does not make a huge difference. A school in this position with an increasing roll receives less funding than we would expect. The year before the schools MFG £ per pupil was £2,834. Although it appears a small number of schools have not benefited as expected it has for the same reason protected schools with a falling roll as the amount they are losing per pupil is less than would be expected. We recognise that the capping we applied restricts the funding these schools receive but at the same time the effect on the MFG is still a key part of this calculation. We are assuming for 2015-16 that sparsity will no longer be part of the excepted items and it will help address the issue but all these schools will still in effect be receiving less £per pupil than they were at the end of 2013-14 purely due to the MFG re-calculation.

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?

<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
---------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

Comments:

It will over complicate the calculation and we do not feel it will add anything to this factor.

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

Comments:

Using distances “as the crow flies” is not favoured by our schools which are more remote when there is clearly only one road to and from a school and we would favour distance by road. We recognise we could make local adjustments but obviously making an adjustment for one school will inevitably lead to others and we applied the DfE values for the purpose of the calculation.

The effect of such large values being allocated through sparsity should be looked at for the reason stated in Q7 as we have concerns over the effect of the factor on schools Minimum Funding Guarantee.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply.

x

E-mail address for acknowledgement: Leanne.minnican@csduk.com

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Aileen Shaw, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 30 April 2014

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, DARLINGTON DL3 9BG

Send by e-mail to:

SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk