

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**

THIS FORM IS NOT INTERACTIVE. If you wish to respond electronically please use the online response facility available on the Department for Education e-consultation website (<http://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.

Reason for confidentiality:

Name	Charlie Stripp
Organisation (if applicable)	Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI)
Address:	Monckton House Epsom Centre White Horse Business Park Trowbridge Wilts BA14 0XG

If you have a query related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact YPLA on

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 Authorities (LAs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Provider or X stakeholder organisations	<input type="checkbox"/> Awarding organisations
<input type="checkbox"/> Learner	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Association	Other

Please Specify:

MEI is an independent curriculum development body for mathematics. As part of its work MEI runs the Further Mathematics Support Programme. For more information about MEI, please see www.mei.org.uk

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?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

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?

Option 1

Option 2

Option 3

Other (please comment)

Comments:

No comment

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?

Option 1

Option 2

Option 3

Other (please comment)

Comments:

No comment

**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?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

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

Comments:

No comment

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

Yes

No

X Not Sure

Comments:

No comment

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

Yes

No

X Not Sure

Comments:

No comment

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?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

This would create a disincentive for providers to offer larger programmes appropriate to students' needs and aspirations. This would affect post-16 mathematics education adversely in two ways:

- 1) Recent reports from Nuffield ('Is the UK an Outlier?', December 2010), the Advisory Committee for Mathematics Education ('Mathematical Needs', June 2011) and the Vorderman Task Force ('A world-class mathematics education for all our young people', August 2011) suggest strongly that it would be beneficial for far more young people to be educated in mathematics post-16, and it is the government's aspiration, stated by Michael Gove in his speech at the Royal Society in June 2011, that 'we should set a new goal for the education system so that within a decade the vast majority of pupils are studying maths right through to the age of 18.' This will require large numbers of A level students to take level 3 mathematics qualifications in addition to their A level programmes, resulting in larger programmes. For this increased participation to take place, providers must have access to additional funds to offer it.
- 2) As detailed below, Further Mathematics provision would be severely threatened.

Further Mathematics

This option is likely to have an especially serious effect on the uptake of Further Mathematics because

- a. Further Mathematics is typically taken as a fourth or fifth A level subject for students aiming to progress to prestigious STEM courses at university. [Based on incomplete data (National Strategies list of top 100 subject combinations involving Mathematics, 2006/7) we have strong reason to believe that at least 2/3 of students take FM as a 4th or 5th subject; anecdotal evidence suggests the actual figure is much

higher than that.]

- b. Further Mathematics is frequently taught in small classes, especially in school sixth forms, which means Further Mathematics is relatively expensive to run.

Paragraph 4.26 of 'The Importance of Teaching' white paper states:

'The teaching of A level further mathematics will be supported by funding initiatives such as the further mathematics support programme.'

Access to Further Mathematics tuition is an important equal opportunities issue. Students need Further Mathematics qualifications to be able to access many of the most prestigious STEM degree courses. The Further Mathematics Support Programme (FMSP), funded by the DfE, has proved a very successful initiative. The FMSP has increased access to tuition in AS/A level Further Mathematics significantly, resulting in large increases in the number of state-educated students taking AS/A level Further Mathematics qualifications.

A move to funding all full-time learners at the same rate is likely to result in fewer providers offering A level Further Mathematics, so undermining the success of the FMSP and acting against the government's aim to support strategic curriculum subjects, particularly in mathematics and science.

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

Yes

X No

Not Sure

Comments:

The International Baccalaureate diploma should be treated in the same way as other larger programmes. Relatively few providers can offer the IB, so most students cannot access it. Access to enhanced programme funding should not be influenced by where a student lives.

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

X Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Larger programmes are important to meet the needs and aspirations of some students, and are more expensive for providers to offer. Funding should recognise this.

In particular, many of the most prestigious STEM degree courses now require that students take A level Further Mathematics as well as A level Mathematics. Larger programmes are a requirement for students aiming for these courses. Without appropriate funding for larger programmes, many students will not be able to access the university courses they aspire to.

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

Option 2

X Option 3

Comments:

Option 3 can enable an appropriate level of flexibility to deal with different programme sizes appropriate to students' needs and aspirations, including 4 A levels or additional level 3 mathematics qualifications taken alongside A levels.

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

X Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Strategically important curriculum subjects could be weighted more highly to act as an incentive for providers to offer them.

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

Comments:

The subjects/combinations of subjects that can be included in larger programmes could be specified, to ensure such programmes are coherent and focus on strategically important curriculum subjects.

In addition, the provision should be carefully monitored in each institution, to ensure its quality. This could include both retention and achievement measures – see question 16.

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?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

Weighting for programme funding (paragraphs 95-107)

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

Funding should reflect the cost of providing the qualifications. For example, science qualifications require laboratory work and so are more expensive to teach than other academic qualifications. Removing the weighting could cause a disincentive for providers to offer strategically important curriculum subjects such as science A levels.

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

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

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

No comment

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

Yes

X No

Not Sure

Comments:

As for question 15, some academic qualifications are more expensive to teach than others.

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?

Option 1

Option 2

Option 3a

Option 3b

Other (please comment)

Comments:

Removing the success factor would help to address the issue of students being entered for undemanding programmes. However, it is important to ensure providers deliver high quality teaching.

A level programmes are not generally considered undemanding. It may be appropriate to retain the success factor for some programmes and remove it for others.

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:

No comment

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:

No comment

Short programme modifier (paragraphs 136-140)

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Comments:

No comment

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:

No comment

Equality analysis (paragraphs 147-149)

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

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Students with high academic aspirations will be disadvantaged if providers are not funded for larger programmes.

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?

Three Years

Longer Period

Other (please comment)

Comments:

This will depend on the actual effects of the changes as they are implemented.

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

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Sudden changes tend to result in unintended consequences. Phased implementation can enable changes to be adjusted in the light of experience.

Further comments

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

X Yes

No

Comments:

Any changes should be considered in the light of their likely impact on the uptake and quality of provision of strategically important curriculum subjects.

As explained in our response to questions 7a) and 12, an unintended consequence of some of these proposals would be to damage the provision of level 3 mathematics and science.

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:

No comment

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?

X Yes 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