Grammar School Heads' Association

Chairman: Russel Ellicott
Chief Executive: James Skinner
jimorjamesskinner@gmail.com
gsha.org.uk

Newsletter - Edition 23 Spring 2017

The proposed NFF:
A Funding Crisis for our Schools

On the morning of 14 December several GSHA Heads and executive officers attended a really positive roundtable discussion with Justine Greening and Nick Gibb entitled 'Lifting the ban on Grammar Schools'. Justine apologised that she would have to leave before the end to announce the phase 2 NFF consultation in Parliament. She neglected to apologise for the fact that she was about to announce a funding betrayal to the lowest funded 400 secondary schools, including the vast majority of grammar schools.

The next day I wrote to her, Number 10, Graham Brady MP, Tom Goldman and various other DfE contacts expressing our great dismay and requesting a number of urgent meetings. As I said to the Secretary of State:

In the proposed National Funding Formula, many grammar schools are set to lose funding. This is despite the fact that some of our schools are in the lowest funded LAs and within them they receive the lowest per pupil funding of secondary schools. Yet it is these schools which are being worst hit, many with the maximum -2.9% loss.

We had understood that the first priority of the NFF would be to ensure that the basic per pupil funding must be fair and sufficient to provide a good education for everyone and in all the discussions we have had with MPs and ministers we were assured that this was exactly what NFF would achieve.

I also included some data and rather more in the letter to Tom Goldman, the Deputy Director who is leading on NFF. We have now had two further meetings with Tom one of which was with the GHSA steering group on 20 January. The Secretary of State delegated our request to meet with her to Nick Gibb which was arranged for 25 January. Ironically, he had to cancel when 2 days beforehand, the Labour Party opted to use one of the Opposition Day debate slots on 25 January for school funding. This meeting has now been rearranged for 8 February and executive officers will meet with officials at No.10 after that.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

There were some encouraging contributions to the opposition debate. Perhaps most significantly, Neil Carmichael who chairs the education select committee, said:

> We are obviously in a consultation process. The Education Committee is part of that process, in a sense, because we will be seeing the Minister for Schools shortly, and we will expand on many of my points then.
>
> In a funding situation where schools in a county like Gloucestershire are, in effect, no further forward and some are actually going backwards, there are clearly issues to explore. One of those is the need to lift the baseline, which can be done in a number of ways; I will suggest three. First, we must look at the deprivation assessment in line with the pupil premium, because the two things are clearly related, and it would be wise to consider the impact of one in the context of the other. That provides scope to lift the baseline.

His other two issues were small schools and recalibrating the 3% floor.

Geoffrey Clinton-Brown (Cotswolds) made a whole range of strong and clear points and concluded by saying:

> It is inevitable that some of my secondary schools, which face some of the largest cuts, will have to reduce the breadth of the curriculum they currently offer. That would be unfair because every child in the country should have roughly the same breadth of curriculum in their schools. I accept that that is often difficult in smaller secondary schools, but it will be very hard for children and their parents to bear if their A-level choices are no longer available as a result of Government policy.
>
> I simply say to my hon. Friend the Minister that I know this is a consultation, but I am looking for some very radical changes. The weighting for deprivation and other measures in the consultation is too high, and the basic pupil funding should never in any circumstances be cut.

Well said sir! Nick Gibb, in responding and concluding the debate was fairly non-committal, as is the nature of such things, but did include:

> We are consulting, and we are listening to the responses to the consultation and to the concerns raised by my hon. Friends and by Opposition Members. The Secretary of State and I have heard representations from some low-funded authorities about whether there is a de minimis level of funding that their secondary schools need in circumstances where few of their pupils bring with them the additional needs funding. We will look at this, and at all the other concerns that right hon. and hon. Members have raised.

It is clear that our best approach is to gather as much concrete evidence as possible to demonstrate that for any secondary school £4800 per pupil aged 11-16 is the sustainability minimum. This will need to rise with inflation. With the Area cost allowance for outer London factored in the figure is about £5200. There is good evidence they are looking closely at this. It has featured in various meetings that executive officers have had and some of the meetings some heads have had with their MPs. It is encouraging that Nick Gibb mentioned this in the debate but we need to help drive it home. The best way to achieve this is simply to raise the value and % of funding for the basic per pupil amount and reduce some of the additional needs values. However, they may find it politically easier to introduce a single floor value such as the suggested £4800.

Some key facts are that:

- Only 60 grammar schools gain whilst 103 lose, of which 62 are on the -2.9% floor and therefore with time and inflation will ultimately lose more in real terms. A spreadsheet showing all grammar schools was emailed to heads on 6 January
- Most of the grammar schools that are set to gain currently receive less than £4300 per 11-16 pupil with some below £4100
- These schools need a far greater increase than proposed to reach the £4800 threshold: the lowest funded grammar school is set to receive 5.1% over 2 years which will only raise it to £4283pp
- Several school set to lose money currently get less than £4300, many less than £4500 and virtually all grammar schools less than £4800
- Calculations show that it would only require the 25% of highest funded schools to lose 1.5% to achieve a £4800pp minimum for all secondary schools
- The current per pupil allocations for all school can be seen at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/schools-block-funding-allocations-2016-to-2017
- Several schools set to lose **less** than the maximum -2.9%, currently receive over £8000 and some over £8500pp, with Pupil Premium on top.

Tom Goldman has asked us to supply him with as much evidence as possible. To this end we have given him 2 case studies from schools and we expect to have sent him several more by the time you read this. Your regional representative may well have asked you for such information, but if not and you think you can contribute, please send it to me by the end of February. There is no set format but for illustrative purposes the one from North Halifax Grammar School is on page 12.

Graham Brady had a meeting with Justine Greening where she also expressed interest in evidence which shows how, even with large sixth forms, there is a need to cross subsidize post 16 from the already inadequate pre-16 funding. It is important to supply this evidence separately from that on pre-16. There are several ways to do this but one simple one, just looking at teaching costs from Rugby High School is shown on page 10. Again, anything you can send me by the end of February will add to the evidence.

It is of course also crucial that all schools respond to the consultation and get as many other people -Governors, staff etc. - to do so. Numbers of responses do count. The consultation closes on **22 March**. There is guidance on how to respond on page 6. Equally important is writing to and ideally meeting with your local MPs, which I know many of you have already done. Give them as much evidence as possible including copies of any case studies. Finally ask parents to contact their MP.

Schools that Work for Everyone - expansion of selection

As part of the consultation process GSHA was represented at a large number of meetings. Several heads were invited to DfE or RSC stakeholder meetings and it was the major item for discussion at the Autumn term DfE admissions group. Executive officers attended meetings with the new selective education DfE team, which is led by Josephine Howarth, and Nick Timothy, one of the PM's 2 chief advisors at No. 10. In addition, just after the consultation closed, executive officers and several other heads were invited to a round table discussion with Justine Greening, Nick Gibb and officers on the next steps on 'Lifting the ban on Grammar Schools'. The same day executive officers also met with Will Tanner and Helen Alderton from the No. 10 policy unit.

It is clear that both the DfE and No.10 are keen to engage and work with us on developing proposals for new grammar schools and expansion of existing ones, as well as the best ways for selective schools to support other secondaries and primary schools. They want to work through ideas and check with us that they are heading in the right direction. Clear evidence of this was the request from them for examples of support and outreach work, to which we had a very good response. I was able to send through 27 examples covering a wide range of support and outreach, for which they were very appreciative. Recently executive officers met with Lesley Jones, Head of School Organisation and Admissions, as well as Josephine Howarth and her team to discuss and begin to flesh out what the final proposals will look like. These are likely to be announced in the late spring. We of course have stressed, that the ambition to see increases in selective school support for non-selective schools and outreach work with disadvantaged pupils in primary schools, will be completely undermined if the funding crisis presented by the proposed NFF, is not addressed. And of course, we were delighted that Theresa May attended and spoke at our House of Commons reception in October.

Key points which have emerged are:

- Justine Greening says the response to the consultation on increasing selection was not 'an overwhelming flood of negativity'
- Ministers and officials agree with us that there are a lot of people, who are philosophically opposed to selection, who keep saying it damages the education of other pupils but present little or no evidence to support this claim
- There is a recognition that grammar schools have too often been excluded from many groups and opportunities
- Selective schools can support others in a range of different ways, however if the structure is right, MATs are seen as having the advantage of being better placed to have the support for areas the lead selective school has less expertise on
- They want a diverse school system to meet the needs of pupils and more opportunities to meet parental demands
- They still want to still see 'top 25% pupils' in comprehensive schools
- New selective schools will probably have a narrower ability range, perhaps more like top 10%
- The new opportunity areas and other cold spots are clearly priorities for new selective schools, but no areas are excluded where there is parental demand
- There is a move away from focusing on social mobility to social reform
- There has been an over focus on Pupil Premium and there is a determination to address the needs of 'JAMs'
- There is recognition that admission policy priorities for disadvantaged pupils is just one strategy and that intensive primary outreach work from an early stage is crucial, but needs funding
- They wish to work with us and the test providers on further developing coaching resistant tests
- They are considering a national selection test which would address 'test tourism'
- There is interest in making more use of review processes and primary headteacher input into selection decisions especially for disadvantaged pupils
- There is a recognition that entry at 14 is problematic and likely to destabilise other schools
- The significant opportunities provided by existing selective schools for 16+ entry is recognised and further expansion would be welcomed
- In the short term new selective places will be provided either within MATs or by onsite and annex expansion of existing selective schools
- £50m is available for each of the next 3 years to support this and as notified to members in December schools interested, especially for the 17-18 funding, should contact Kathryn Coates at the DfE: kathryn.coates@education.gov.uk
- New selective schools are likely to be opened as free schools and the first are most likely to admit their first pupils in September 2020.

Although only 46 schools completed our Admissions and Social Mobility Survey in the Autumn, one striking statistic was that 85% had a primary school outreach programme. These programmes are probably the most effect tool we have, to improve social mobility. How ironic that rather than expand these to be even more effective, many of our schools are being forced to abandon or severely curtail these, due to the Funding Crisis.

Responding to the Schools National Funding Formula Stage Two

Consultation ends: 22 March 2017. The consultation document can be found at the following link:

https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula2/supporting_documents/NFF_Stage2_schools_consultationdoc.pdf

There are 14 questions, all listed on page 43-44. The crucial questions are Q's 1, 4, 5, and 14. In the online response form, all questions have a box for comments as well as option boxes to click on -some are Y/N whilst others contain several options.

Commentary on the consultation questions

Below are some of the key issues you might like to highlight. As always it is best to use your own words where possible, as they give less weight to lots of responses which say exactly the same thing.

Q1. In designing our national funding formula, we have taken careful steps to balance the principles of fairness and stability. Do you think we have struck the right balance?

It is a definite **No** and I recommend going in hard here. The proposed NFF fails to achieve fair funding. It fails to ensure all schools receive the viability minimum to deliver core provision. It fails to reduce unjustifiable differentials between schools and geographical areas. Under the proposed National Funding Formula around 400 secondary schools will be funded below sustainable levels. All these schools face the same challenge: how to provide a core curriculum and cover normal running costs with insufficient funds. There is an urgent need to ensure all schools receive a minimum per pupil funding amount and for secondary schools £4800 is considered viable.

Q2. Do you support our proposal to set the primary to secondary ratio in line with the current national average of 1:1.29, which means that pupils in the secondary phase are funded overall 29% higher than pupils in the primary phase?

Different schools may have different views here, but I think it is about right so would be inclined to say yes and not detract from our main concerns.

Q3. Do you support our proposal to maximise pupil-led funding, so that more funding is allocated to factors that relate directly to pupils and their characteristics?

Again you may have different views but I would say yes. The bulk of the non-pupil-led funding goes into the lump sum.

Q4. Within the total pupil-led funding, do you support our proposal to increase the proportion allocated to the additional needs factors (deprivation, low prior attainment and English as an additional language)?

Absolutely NO!

The fundamental problem is the proposal to reduce basic per pupil funding from 76.6% to 72.5%, whereas it needs to increase to at least 80%. Equally the proposals to increase low prior attainment and deprivation funding are not justified by impact evidence. Further this funding will not all be directed at these areas: schools will have to use some of it to provide core school provision. Schools in receipt of little such funding will have to reduce their curriculum and still some of these will be judged by auditors to no longer be financially secure or viable.

Two key points to make are:

- The proposed basic per pupil values of £3797 (KS3) and £4312 (KS4), are below the current AWPU values used by virtually all LAs and well below the DfE's 15-16 indicative values of £3950 and £4502.

- Most of the lowest funded LAs set AWPU figures above these because they recognised that they must to ensure all schools can cover core costs.

Q5. Do you agree with the proposed weightings for each of the additional needs factors?

There are several parts to this critical question. The first is about pupil based deprivation which is proposed at 5.5%. (with 3.9% for area based deprivation).Click the 'allocate a lower proportion option'. The first point to make is that the decision to increase deprivation funding from 7.6% to 9.3% is mystifying (you might want to use a stronger word). There was a clear expectation that it would reduce, as the stated government intention was that Pupil Premium would become the main means of funding deprivation. There is clear evidence that it is currently only as high as it is (7.6%) because many LAs have not adjusted their formulae to reflect Pupil Premium due to their tendency to try to maintain historic funding formula levels and the constraints of the current minimum funding guarantee. The Audit Commission report found that PP funding was having little impact, despite the requirement for schools to account for its expenditure. What evidence is there that increasing deprivation funding will have any impact on attainment?

The proposal to allocate £785 to FSM 6 pupils is double funding exactly the same pupils as the PP and contradicts previously stated government policy. The additional £440 proposed for current FSM pupils is justified, as it is intended to cover the actual meal costs.

The second part is about the proposed 3.9% area based deprivation which will be allocated on IDACI. Schools may have different views here and either opt for agreeing the proportion is 'about right' or opt for a lower proportion. It is the best way they have come up with to reflect the needs of 'JAMs' and is not direct double funding of PP. If you opt for 'about right' add the caveat that only if the pupil based % is drastically reduced so that overall deprivation funding is less than the current 7.6% as was the original intention when pupil premium was introduced.

The third part is about the proposed massive increase in low prior attainment funding. Click the 'allocate a lower proportion option'. There is no evidence to justify increasing the low prior attainment funding from 4.3% to 7.5% and £1550 per pupil. In fact, evidence shows that expensive approaches, such as smaller class size and extra adults permanently in the classroom, fail to improve outcomes. Effective approaches such as short term intensive catch up support can be delivered for well under £1000pp. Part of the argument is that this also reflects that schools have to meet the first £6000 of additional support needed for SEND pupils and this often correlates with low prior attainment. Therefore, it is worth adding that, schools, including selective ones have SEND pupils with ASD, dyslexia and a range of disabilities who do not have LPA. Consequently, it would be much fairer if at least some of the funding within the LPA factor, intended to support SEND pupils, was moved to the basic per-pupil funding.

The final part is about EAL. The proposal here is to increase total funding from 0.9% to 1.2% with, as now, 3/4s of this spent in the primary sector where the large majority of EAL pupils are. In this case the reasons for increase - some LAs not funding it or for less than the normal 3 years - seem sound and therefore you may well feel the 'proportion is about right'.

Responding to the Schools National Funding Formula Stage Two cont...

Q6. Do you have any suggestions about potential indicators and data sources we could use to allocate mobility funding in 2019-20 and beyond?

If you do please include them, if not just say no.

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed lump sum amount of £110,000 for all schools?

Schools may have different views on this one but I would be inclined to say yes. If it was higher it makes it even more difficult to raise the basic per-pupil amount, whilst a decrease won't help as on average grammar schools are slightly smaller than the average secondary school.

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed amounts for sparsity funding of up to £25,000 for primary schools and up to £65,000 for secondary, middle and all-through schools?

Q9. Do you agree that lagged pupil growth data would provide an effective basis for the growth factor in the longer term?

Again, you may have different views but I would go for Yes on both of these.

Q10. Do you agree with the principle of a funding floor that would protect schools from large overall reductions as a result of this formula? This would be in addition to the minimum funding guarantee.

Q11. Do you support our proposal to set the floor at minus 3%, which will mean that no school will lose more than 3% of their current per-pupil funding level as a result of this formula?

Q12. Do you agree that for new or growing schools the funding floor should be applied to the per-pupil funding they would have received if they were at full capacity?

Q13. Do you support our proposal to continue the minimum funding guarantee at minus 1.5% per pupil? This will mean that schools are protected against reductions of more than 1.5% per pupil per year.

These are potentially tricky. On the present proposals, many grammar schools are on the funding floor. However, if the basic per-pupil amount is significantly increased or a minimum funding level per pupil introduced into the NFF, then there is a case to be harder here both to free money up to achieve these changes and to move more quickly to truly fair funding. There is a lack of transparency: there is no information in either the consultation document or the technical notes, about how much more some schools would lose if the NFF was applied without the floor and the Area Cost Adjustment ratios which have been used are not stated, although they have opted for the hybrid method. This means that you cannot work out just how much some schools, especially in inner London, will continue to be funded above the level that this proposed NFF - which has been designed and distorted to protect such schools – would give them let alone what is actually fair.

The hybrid methodology was used in the 2015-16 Fairer Schools Funding, which saw 62 LAs receive additional funding. The ACA used then for inner London boroughs was 1.1863 and 1.0838 for most outer London boroughs. These values were calculated from the higher London teacher pay scales and the higher costs for other staff. Using these ACA values the secondary per pupil sustainability minimum per pupil value, would rise from the national £4800 to £5202 for outer London and £5694 for inner London. On this NFF all inner London secondary schools would be funded well above this figure, with some continuing to receive up to over twice as much per pupil as the lowest funded schools and that is **before PP** is added. There are both gainers and losers amongst the lowest funded schools set to receive less than £4300 under NFF whilst there are inner London schools still set to receive over £8500 per pupil and many set to receive over £7000. How can a NFF which sees some schools receive over twice as much per pupil as other similar sized schools be fair?

The drastic cuts in post 16 funding saw many schools, including grammar schools, lose over 10% of their funding over 3 years. For schools set to lose 9% or less the MFG was -3%, but schools that lost more simply lost a third each year. Using this as precedent, a strong case can be made on fairness grounds, for the floor to be -10% and the MFG -3%; but only of course if the formula is made fair first, so that no low funded schools below the sustainability level, lose money.

Q14. Are there further considerations we should be taking into account about the proposed schools national funding formula?

This is the place to suggest that if they don't increase the basic per-pupil amount significantly, then they need to include a minimum per pupil floor of £4800, index linked, for secondary schools to ensure all schools are sustainable. Several groups and organisations have put forward the £4800 figure. Logically they would need to be an equivalent but lower figure for primary schools. I haven't seen a figure for Primaries, but if you use the 1: 1.28 ratio it would be £3721.

There are 3 further questions on page 73 about allocations within the central schools block which you may also want to answer as well as the separate consultation on high needs.

Jim Skinner, CEO

Consultation ends: 22 March 2017.

The consultation document can be found at the following link:

https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula2/supporting_documents/NFF_Stage2_schools_consultationdoc.pdf

Rugby High School Cross Subsidy for the Sixth Form

Have you ever wondered whether your Sixth Form was being cross subsidised by the rest of the school but thought that the sum was too hard to work out? The calculation below shows you a quick and easy way of working out whether or not this is the case and, if so, the extent of the subsidy. It's not absolutely precise because it only looks at staffing but it does give you a very good rough idea. The figures here are Rugby High School's.

Total number of student of roll in the academic year 2016-2017 = 839
Total number of students in the Sixth Form = 265
Number of Sixth Form students expressed as a percentage = 31.59%
11-16 funding received in 2016-2017 = £2,410,201
Sixth Form funding received in 2016-2017 = £1,165,565
Sixth Form funding expressed as a percentage of the total funding = 32.59%
Total number of lessons delivered in a week (Years 7-13) = 1065
Number of Sixth Form lessons delivered in a week (Years 12-13) = 396
Number of Sixth Form lessons expressed as a percentage of the total = 37.18%
Total teaching staff costs = £2,459,878
32.59% of teaching staff costs = £801,674.2
37.18% of teaching staff costs = £914,582.6
Subsidy of KS 5 teaching costs = £914,582.6-£801,674.2 = £112,908.4

Why are we cross subsidising the Sixth Form?

The answer lies in the low level of funding for Sixth Form students and the number of groups that we have. Although we have increased class sizes, we still have some small groups under 10. These are caused by students changing their mind about which subjects they want to study. An A level French group fell from 14 to 6 between January when the students told us which subjects they wanted to study and September when they were actually sitting in front of the teacher. Because the system also allows students to hold multiple offers one has to guess who is likely to actually materialise in September and by the time one does know for certain, the staffing has long since been fixed so although I did collapse two Year 12 English Language sets to make one, I haven't saved on the staffing this year because I had already contracted to pay those staff for the six periods I've saved.

I'm sure that I'm not the only headteacher re-timetabling Year 12 classes as they move into Year 13 in order to try to save a few periods or trying to calculate whether the savings I will make by reducing the number of times a subject occurs in the timetable in Year 12 will be outweighed by the students I'll lose because they can't do the subject combinations they want. Making my staffing plan feels like walking a tightrope: it's never good being hundreds of feet in the air with no safety harness! The only consolation is that if I look left or right I see others in the same position. We are doing our best to ensure that ministers, their advisers and civil servants are aware of this issue which affects all small and medium sized post 16 providers. It will take more than a bit of web based advice about competitive tendering to solve it!

Charlotte Marten

Financial Case Study: North Halifax Grammar School

Introduction and Purpose

The medium to long term financial viability of our academy is in serious jeopardy following the recent announcement of the National Funding Formula (NFF). This paper aims to highlight the changes to our funding over the last few years, together with the mandatory increases to staff costs, and to show the impact that these changes are having on the future of our academy.

Changes to General Annual Grant (GAG)

Since 2011/12 there has been a consistent and continual reduction in our GAG funding ranging from 1% to 3% per annum and as a result, the GAG funding received for 2015/16 (£5.034m) was £445k less than that received in 2011/12 (£5.479m). The total GAG per student has reduced from £4,794 in 2011/12 to £4,427 in 2015/16. With all other factors remaining consistent, the GAG funding expected in 2019/20 will be £237k less than that received in 2015/16 giving a total reduction over the period of £682k which is equivalent to a 12.45% reduction from 2011/12. The reduction as a result of the NFF (based on the indicative figures provided by the EFA) is -2.6%.

Mandatory Increases to Costs

Over the same period, we have seen an increase in staff costs of £352k, despite already reducing our staff numbers, including through redundancies. This represents an 8% increase since 2012/13.

The increase in these costs is due to:

- an increase in the employer contribution rate to Teachers Pensions of 2.3%;
- the removal of the employer's National Insurance rebate of 3.4%;
- the mandatory introduction of the National Living Wage;
- the mandatory introduction of the Apprenticeship levy;
- the increase in the employer contribution rate to the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Voluntary Increase to Costs

In addition to the mandatory increases to pay costs, as a fair and transparent employer, we have also chosen to recognise earned progression through pay increments and have adopted the nationally agreed pay scales for both teaching and support staff.

Actions Taken to Date

To mitigate the reducing funding and the increasing costs, we have already taken a number of actions:

- restructured both teaching and support staff;
- made three staff redundant;
- increased the amount of teacher contact time by one hour per week;
- reduced the curriculum on offer in both KS4 and KS5, going from 32 subjects to just under 20:
- reviewed and replaced key contracts at lower prices ie printing, payroll, grounds maintenance;
- increased the PAN from September 2017 by 25;
- reduced the budget in key areas ie teaching resources, staff development, IT, capital;
- collaborated with other schools for joint purchasing ie grounds maintenance; and
- only appoint new staff on one year contracts.

Actions Planned Going Forward

In order to remain a financially viable organisation and a going concern, we are having to plan for the following actions:

- reducing the curriculum offer further in both KS4 and KS5 leading to a severely restricted choice of options at KS4, if any choice at all
- reducing the hours of teaching per day by shortening the school day;
- further staffing restructures and redundancies;
- further budget cuts;
- working with fund raising specialists; and
- asking parents to contribute towards the ongoing running costs of the school.

Overall Financial Impact

As a result of the changes highlighted above, the academy is expecting to see an overall negative financial impact of £1.034m by 2019/20. By 2019/20, the GAG funding will only cover staff costs.

This financial position makes it unlikely that we will be able to lead or join an existing MAT as any due diligence work will show that we are not financially viable in the medium to long term. This in turn limits our opportunities to make further cost effective savings through collaboration and working with other schools.

Summary

There are only three outstanding secondary schools in Calderdale, of which two are Grammar Schools. Both of these schools are facing the same extreme financial challenges which will be exacerbated by the proposed level of per pupil funding in the NFF consultation paper.

The National Association for School Business Managers (NASBM) has undertaken research and found that in order for a school to be able to operate and have the capacity to work with other schools, as required to support school to school improvement, the level of per pupil funding cannot be less than £4,800 per pupil. This level of per pupil funding will allow all pupils to receive an appropriate level of education, delivered by quality teachers within a weather tight building. It would also mean that all schools would have the capacity to provide support to improve standards across the country and for all pupils.

If our academy was to receive £4,800 per pupil in years 7 to 11, then this would mean that:

- we would have funding to cover non pay costs;
- we would maintain a broad and balanced curriculum to meet all students' needs; and
- we would have capacity to contribute towards system improvements.

There is sufficient funding already in the system to allow this to happen if those schools which are currently the highest funded had their funding reduced by less than 2%. NASBM research concluded that if the top 25% of highly funded schools each lost 1.5% of their GAG funding, then this would enable all pupils to be funded at a base rate of £4,800.

This does not negate the need for additional funding to be targeted towards areas of disadvantage but does support all pupils receiving at least a fair allocation of resources, and not just those who are educated alongside significant numbers of disadvantaged students.

This case study has been shared with the DfE, together with a spreadsheet detailing the financial changes above for the period 2011/12 to the projected period of 2019/20.

GSHA Admission Groups

has two admissions groups, the **CEM Admissions Group,** formed in 2012, with the first joint test sat in 2013 and the **GLA User Group** formed in 2015 chaired by Nicole Chapman and Heather Payne respectively. Both groups have meetings this term which will be looking at some of the broader issues relevant to all schools who use CEM or GLA for their entrance tests. Key personnel involved in the test development and delivery attend these meetings. Both meetings this term will be discussing topics including:

- ***Current test issues***
- ***Future test developments and options***
- ***Further improving resilience to coaching***
- ***Combating 'test tourism'***

The details are as below. Please do let the appropriate contact know if you wish to send a representative to enable us to organise catering and room layout. The meetings are suitable for Headteachers and other senior staff involved in admissions.

GLA User Group:

Tues 21 February 10.30am - 1pm London - actual venue to be confirmed. Please contact Heather Payne spayneh@qegs.lincs.sch.uk **by 9 February**

CEM Admissions Group:

Thurs 23 March 10.45 – 1pm The Shelburne Room, Lansdowne Club, Mayfair, London. Please contact Lara Hilling lhilling@cchs.essex.sch.uk **by 6 March**.

RSACADEMICS
HELPING SCHOOLS THRIVE

The best future for grammar schools

Date for your diary:

Monday 20th March,

evening event, House of Commons, London.

Heads and governors are invited to attend an evening reception hosted by GSHA, RSAcademics and Graham Brady MP.

There will be an opportunity to discuss (via panel debate) the new opportunities for Grammar Schools following recent government decisions and the role of Governors in working with Heads to achieve success.

Save the date!

More information to follow soon. Places will be limited.

13/14 June GSHA Annual Conference at the RAF Club, 128 Piccadilly, London

Booking forms and further details will be circulated later this term.

21 June GSHA Annual Conference for Deputy Heads and Senior Leaders

The Ambassador Hotel, 12 Upper Woburn Place, London.

Booking forms and further details will be circulated later this term.

17 October Seminar at Broadway House (1.30pm) and House of Commons Reception (6.30pm)

Booking details will be sent out in the summer term.

Executive Committee

Chairman:

Russel Ellicott - Pate's Grammar School

Vice Chairman:

Philip Wayne - The Royal Grammar School, High Wycombe
Charlotte Marten - Rugby High School

Treasurer:

Yvonne Wilkinson - King Edward VI Five Ways School, Birmingham

Chief Executive:

James Skinner

Regional Representatives:

Kent	Robert Masters, John Weeds, vacancy
Medway	Simon Decker
Buckinghamshire	Mark Sturgeon, vacancy
London	Desmond Deehan, Jonathan Wilden
Lincolnshire	Heather Payne, Simon Sprague
South West	Stuart Smallwood
Gloucestershire	Ewa Sawicka
Birmingham	Dominic Robson
Reading/Slough	Jon Constable
Lancs/Yorks/Cumbria	Martin Pearman, Andrew Fisher
Essex	Michael Skelly, Nicole Chapman
Midlands	Trudi Young
Trafford	Tim Gartside
Merseyside	Elaine Cogan
Warwickshire	Bennet Carr