

**London Borough
of
Barking and Dagenham**

**Early Years Funding Formula
2015-16**

**Consultation Response
Document**

Consultation Question 1: Sustainability Re-apportionment

We are proposing to stop using the formula element for Sustainability. We propose increasing the deprivation element to counteract this. Are you happy with this solution, and if not where would you like it to be included?

- (a) Yes, Happy to increase deprivation to compensate
- (b) No, not happy to increase deprivation
- (c) If No, please suggest alternative factor to adjust

There were 12 responses to this question as follows:

Option	Total	Percentage
A	12	100%
B	0	0%

Additional Comments

'Increasing the deprivation factor to compensate for sustainability seems to be the most sensible option especially in LBBD where the deprivation element has always been higher than national averages.'

Response

There was unanimous agreement to the proposal of removing the sustainability factor and increasing the deprivation element accordingly.

Consultation Question 2: Deprivation Factor Bandings

We currently use 5 IDACI bands to assess deprivation needs. The school funding formula uses only 2 selecting only the schools in the two lowest classifications receiving funding. Would you prefer to adopt this method for EYFF or suggest an alternative?

- (a) Continue using the current method
- (b) Adopt the schools 2 band method
- (c) Other – Please state how you would assess deprivation, and adapt the formula to fund this.

There were 11 responses to this question as follows:

Option	Total	Percentage
A	3	30%
B	8	70%
C	0	0%

Additional Comments

'In order to streamline the formula in line with the school funding formula adopt the schools 2 band method.'

Response

Majority support was for adopting the schools two band method.

Consultation Question 3: Quality Element in Formula Funding

Do you want to keep the quality element in the formula, currently assessed on staff qualifications, and are you happy to keep staff qualifications as the deciding factor?

- (a) Stay using current formula.
- (b) Abolish Quality element.
- (c) Keep Quality element, but qualify it using a different method.
- (d) If (c) please detail alternative below

There were 11 responses to this question as follows:

Option	Total	Percentage
A	10	90%
B	1	10%
C	0	0%

Additional Comments

‘Abolish Quality element. In order to maximise the deprivation factor it seems most appropriate to abolish the quality element.’

‘The Quality Factor should ideally be based on outcomes for children, so there should be an aspiration to move from qualifications towards an impact based measure (distance travelled rather than an absolute at exit measure). Settings not attracting the Quality Factor should be getting more help from services such as Early Years Advisory Teachers paid for by Centrally Retained spend.’

Response

Majority support was for maintaining the current formula, however proposals put forward to: a) abolish quality in favour of deprivation b) move towards a more outcome based approach.

Consultation Question 4: Re-allocation of the DSG blocks

Of the 33 London Boroughs our Barking and Dagenham is ranked as the borough who gives 7th lowest proportion of their DSG to the Early Years Block (EYB) giving Early Years only 5.2%. The London Borough average is 6.81% and the National Average is 6.6%. You are asked to consider re-aligning the blocks to meet the London Borough or National average EYB proportions.

	Early Years Block £million	DSG Total £million
Current funding	11.647	218.008
London Average EYB (6.81%)	14.846	218.008
Increase in EYB to reach London average	3.199	
National Average EYB (6.6%)	14.389	218.008
Increase in EYB to reach London average	2.742	

- (a) Do not re-align the blocks.
- (b) Re-align the blocks to London Average
Please state where in the DSG to fund £3.199 million from
- (c) Re-align the blocks to National Average
Please state where in the DSG to fund the £2.742 million from

There were 12 responses to this question as follows:

Option	Total	Percentage
A	5	45%
B	7	55%
C	0	0%

Additional Comments

'For Question 4 the argument would be in favour not to re-align the funding blocks since EY makes up a relative small element of school's overall budgets. If the re-alignment would go ahead it would ultimately mean a reduction in the main school block funding which will have to be top sliced, which could possibly have a knock effect in an overall funding reduction for schools.'

'From my understanding there is still a significant difference between the primary and secondary funding ratio compared to the rest of London and nationally so could the shortfall be funded form realigning that?'

'From School balances'

'This must not come from Secondary school funding'

'Schools Block formula adjustment'

Response

Split response as to whether the blocks should be re-aligned.

Consultation Question 5: Any other comments or suggestions

Concerns raised by secondary schools regarding the impact of funding changes and any potential re-alignment of the funding blocks given the funding reductions they have taken through the main Schools Block formula.

Request received for additional information around the Early Years funding and a workshop on school funding generally.