

16-19 Funding Formula Review

Consultation Response Form

The closing date for this consultation is:

4 January 2012

Your comments must reach us by that date.

Department for
Education



**Young People's
Learning Agency**

Telephone: 024 76 82 35 13

e-mail: yplaformulaconsultation@ypla.gov.uk

If you have a query relating to the consultation process you can contact the Consultation Unit on:

Telephone: 0370 000 2288

e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk

Please select one box which best describes you as a respondent

<input type="checkbox"/> General FE colleges (GFEs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Sixth form colleges (SFCs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Academies
<input type="checkbox"/> Schools with sixth forms (SSFs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent private providers (IPPs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent specialist providers (ISPs)
<input type="checkbox"/> Local X Authorities (LAs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Provider or stakeholder organisations	<input type="checkbox"/> Awarding organisations
<input type="checkbox"/> Learner	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

Section 1: Introduction

There are no questions in this section.

Section 2: Funding disadvantage

Principles for the operation of disadvantage funding (paragraphs 33-34)

- Disadvantage funding would be an additional sum of funding allocated to a provider delivering to:
- any economically disadvantaged young person aged 16 or 17 who participates in education and/or training, and meets the terms of raising the participation age legislation and
- any economically disadvantaged 18 year-olds in full time education.
- The above categories cover all 16-19 provision, including Apprenticeship provision.
- It would be paid at a standard flat funding rate for all young people who qualify, regardless of where they live or other circumstances.
- It would be paid pro-rata for part time learners.
- It would be calculated as an allocation to the provider.
- The provider would be free to decide how disadvantage funding should be invested to the benefit of disadvantaged young people, in line with the Government's objectives.
- The funding would not be ring fenced and would not be accounted for at an individual level. However providers will be expected to demonstrate publicly to the communities they serve, to governors, and to the government the progress they have made in addressing issues of disadvantage through the use of this funding.

1 Do you agree that these are the right principles for the operation of disadvantage funding?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments: Alignment with Apprenticeship funding is very positive.

Need to ensure that flexibility on how disadvantage funds are applied does not result in funds being used for other purposes.

Options for the scope of funding for disadvantage (paragraphs 37-43)

Option 1: A single fund to recognise all forms of disadvantage

Option 2: A fund to address economic disadvantage only with a separate budget to address other support needs and low level LDD needs, very similar to current arrangements

Option 3: A fund to address general economic disadvantage only, with a separate budget to address low level LDD needs. Funding to address other learning support needs to be integrated into programme funding.

2 Which of these three options would you support? Do you have any comments on the three options or additional options that should be considered?

<input type="checkbox"/> Option 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Option 3
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please comment)		

Comments: More transparent to have a separate element relating to economic disadvantage only.

Option 2 represents less impact on providers whilst separating from main funding formula.

Options for calculating and allocating disadvantage funding (paragraphs 45-49)

Option 1: Mirror pre-16 eligibility

Option 2: Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)

Option 3: Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)

3 Which of the three options for establishing eligibility for disadvantage funding would best reflect the Government's objectives? Do you have any comments on these three options or are there other options that should be considered?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Option 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Option 3
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please comment)		

Comments: Need to align with pre-16 funding.
--

**Determining eligibility for additional funding for specific groups
(paragraphs 50-56)**

4 a) Do you agree that the removal of the additional categories for funding purposes is a welcome simplification?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments: Whilst there is agreement that the additional categories need to be fewer, there is a significant risk that removing them entirely could lead to vulnerable groups of learners facing barriers to progress.

4 b) If not, what is your case for recognising some or all of these categories for all provider types?

Comments: Key groups to remain eligible for uplift would be:-

- Basic skills learners
- Learners living in hostels or supported accommodation
- Learners with mental health problems
- Travellers
- Learners where statutory education has been interrupted
- Learners in care / leaving care
- Asylum seekers
- Refugees
- Offenders / Ex-offenders
- Full time carers

5 Do you believe that children in care and recent care leavers should attract additional funding?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments: These learners remain a clear priority with current data still demonstrating barriers to achievement and progression.

6 Do you believe that service children should attract additional funding?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Consultation section 3: Simplifying participation funding

Options for funding full time learners (paragraphs 64-85)

Option 1: Funding all full time learners at the same rate

Option 2: Uplift to recognise larger programmes

Option 3: Funding to recognise different programme sizes

7 a) Do you agree that a single rate for all full time learners based upon historical average delivery (option 1) is appropriate?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments: Real risk of large programmes not being delivered.

7 b) If yes, would you support an additional programme weighting for delivering the International Baccalaureate diploma?

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

Comments:

7 c) If no, do you believe that there should be recognition of larger programmes?

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

Comments:

8 a) If you do believe that there should be recognition of larger programmes, do you support option 2 or option 3?

<input type="checkbox"/> Option 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option 3
-----------------------------------	--

Comments: Option 3 ensures that providers are not disadvantaged for delivering larger programmes, whilst giving more transparency to provision funded at Level 1 and Level 2.

8 b) For the large programme(s), would you support a further rate or weighting?

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

Comments:

9 What would be the best way to avoid an upward drift to larger programme sizes?

Comments: There would need to be a link to approved provision or programmes. For example, whilst qualifications such as the International Baccalaureate need to receive the necessary funding, it is also important to ensure providers do not enrol learners on large provision (i.e. 5 A levels) in order to maximise funds.

Part time programmes (paragraphs 86-94)

10 Do you agree with the proposal of applying a proportion of the basic full time programme funding for part time learners?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments:

11 Do you agree that it is appropriate to fund at three part time levels?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments:

Weighting for programme funding (paragraphs 95-107)

12 Do you agree that we should merge the lowest two programme weightings into one?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments: Agree with the principle of simplification, but impact on provision previously weighted at 1.12 (i.e. sciences, engineering, design, etc.) would need to be carefully monitored during early stages of any changes,

13 Do you agree that we should reduce the number of weightings for vocational programmes?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments:

14 Would reducing the number of weightings for vocational programmes be a significant simplification?

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

Comments:

15 Do you think that the proposed weightings for programmes would appropriately reflect the relative delivery costs?

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

Comments:

Consultation section 4: Success rates (paragraphs 112-124)

Option 1: Continue to recognise success

Option 2: Remove the success factor completely from the funding formula

Option 3: Remove the achievement element but keep the retention element:

3a: retention element calculated at programme component level

3b: retention element calculated at learner level

16 Which option would you support for reforming success within the funding formula?

<input type="checkbox"/> Option 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Option 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Option 3a
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Option 3b	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please comment)	

Comments: Success rates are not a transparent indicator for schools, and it would seem sensible to move towards a retention based measure.

Section 5: Further simplification

Area costs (paragraphs 127-131)

17 Would you support retaining the current area costs methodology, or would you support a change to the same area costs methodology as used for pre-16 funding?

Current methodology

Change to same as for schools pre-16

Other (please comment)

Comments:

18 Do you support removing the calculation of residential care standards funding from the formula and distributing it directly to the providers that qualify?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: For volume of providers involved, this seems sensible.

Short programme modifier (paragraphs 136-140)

19 Do you agree that the YPLA should stop using a short programme modifier?

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	

Comments: Yes, but would need to ensure that registration and induction costs are a factor in the overall participation funding model adopted.

Data and audit (paragraphs 142-146)

20 Do you have any comments on the impact that the proposed options for changes would have on data collection or audit?

Comments: Audit scrutiny to remain a priority.

Equality analysis (paragraphs 147-149)

21 Do you believe these proposals will have an impact on any specific groups?

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

Comments: Certainly the removal of the uplift for vulnerable groups of learners poses clear risks with regard to their future achievement and progression.

Section 6: Implementation

Transitional protection (paragraphs 157-163)

22 Should transitional protection be applied across a fixed period of three years or extended across a longer period?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Three Years	<input type="checkbox"/> Longer Period	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please comment)
---	--	---

Comments:

23 Do you think that there should be phased implementation of the proposed changes?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments: Extending the period of changes could lead to more rather than less instability.

Further comments

24 Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

Yes

No

Comments:

Feedback on responding to this consultation

25 Please let us have your views on responding to this consultation (for example, the number and type of questions, was it easy to find, understand, and complete).

Comments: Clear and concise.

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

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

xYes

 No

All DfE public consultations are required to conform to the following criteria within the Government Code of Practice on Consultation:

Criterion 1: Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2: Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3: Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4: Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5: Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6: Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7: Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Carole Edge, DfE Consultation Co-ordinator, tel: 01928 738060 / email: carole.edge@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 4 January 2012

Send by post to: Consultation Unit
Area 1C
Castle View House
Runcorn
Cheshire WA7 2GJ

email: 16-19Funding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk