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Summary of Consultation Responses
Introduction

In July 2010 a consultation was launched by the Government setting out its proposals for a new pupil premium and confirming the continuation of the spend-plus methodology for distributing the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2011-12.

This document provides an analysis of responses to the consultation. It sets out:

- an overview of the issues raised in the responses to the consultation and
- a summary of the responses to the questions

We received a total of 746 responses to the consultation, broken down into the following organisations:

- School: 30%
- Other: 27%
- Individual Local Authority: 10%
- Schools Forum: 10%
- Teacher: 8%
- Local Authority Group: 5%
- Parent/Carer: 4%
- Governor Association: 3%
- Other Trade Union/Professional Body: 1%
- Teacher Association: 1%
- Campaign Group: 1%
- **Total:** 100%

77 responses were received from Knowsley. The responses were mostly from schools, using a common template.

A full list of the organisations that responded can be found at Annex A.
Overview

The main comments from responses to the consultation are set out below:

- On the question of whether to adjust the distribution of the pupil premium to reflect differences in the system for funding deprivation, over half of those who responded to the question supported the proposal, with over a quarter disagreeing.

- The majority of those who responded on the question of which deprivation indicator to use to allocate the pupil premium supported the use of a measure based on Free School Meal eligibility. None of the three FSM options included in the consultation document received overwhelming support; there was fairly equal support for them. FSM in-year was slightly ahead, which was seen as simple and straightforward. The “Other” category received the most support but a range of different approaches was suggested (mainly a mix of different factors).

- There was considerable support for the pupil premium being extended to looked after children. Support for the premium being extended to service children was much lower, although for those schools and local authorities with service children support was considerably stronger.

- On the methodology for allocating Dedicated Schools Grant for 2011-12, a majority of respondents supported using actual take up as a basis for funding three year-olds. The highest proportion of respondents supported the continuation of dual subsidiary registrations for pupils at Pupil Referral Units.

- The highest proportion of respondents supported proposals to provide support to schools with large numbers of service children, which see pupil reductions due to troop movements; and a majority agreed with proposals to provide additional funding in support of elective home educated pupils and also to continue to operate a cash floor for LAs.
Summary of Consultation responses

(NB – in some case percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding)

1 Do you agree it is right to give a higher premium to areas that currently receive less per pupil funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure:</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

659

A majority of respondents support ‘scaling’ the premium, which would have the effect of allocating a higher premium to those authorities currently receiving less per pupil funding. Those supporting the proposal thought that using the pupil premium to try to reduce the inequalities in the current spending methodology was a good idea. It was commented that “the idea of gradually increasing the amount of premium to more equitable levels is a good principle to work towards”. It was suggested that scaling the premium might better address the issues of rural deprivation and pockets of poverty not fully covered through current system.

Those against the proposal thought it fairer to give the same level to all eligible children and that the premium should not be used to address failings in current funding arrangements. It was commented that authorities with higher levels of funding per pupil tended to be the more deprived and to have the greatest needs. It was suggested that scaling would shift funding from deprived authorities towards the more wealthy. One analysis made the comment that “funding for deprived pupils is already higher in less deprived areas than in more deprived areas” which would be exacerbated by a scaled premium. It was also argued that: “The differences in the DSG per pupil amounts per LA are … legitimate and reflect the different characteristics of each area, so to target funding differentially based on these amounts will level out funding across all LAs”.

Some respondents commented on the use of the hybrid approach to determine the Area Cost Adjustment for the pupil premium. It was suggested that it would complicate the overall funding system to use the hybrid approach as part of the pupil premium methodology and the General Labour Market approach to calculate the ACA for the DSG.

Some suggested that the level of the premium should be different for different key stages with a higher premium for key stages 1 and 2 called for.
2 What is your preferred deprivation indicator for allocating the pupil premium?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (not listed):</td>
<td>149 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM - in year:</td>
<td>151 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM ever - 3 year:</td>
<td>111 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM ever - 6 year:</td>
<td>111 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACORN/MOSAIC:</td>
<td>58 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure:</td>
<td>46 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Work Tax Credit:</td>
<td>29 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No single factor received majority support although a majority of respondents favoured one of the three the FSM measures proposed. The Out of Work Tax Credit indicator had least support. Using a geodemographic measure such as ACORN or MOSAIC was favoured by 9% of respondents.

24% favoured alternative options and, of these, most thought that some form of hybrid indicator was needed. The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) was supported by a number of respondents, either on its own or as part of a hybrid. A range of alternative approaches were suggested, often reflecting current deprivation indicators used in local formulae. Besides IDACI, the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), English as an Additional Language (EAL) and prior attainment were also suggested as elements of a hybrid indicator.

FSM in-year scored highest of all the individual measures. Responses suggest that this is down to practicality – it is straightforward to collect and is easy to understand. Some were more positive than others about using FSM with some calling it a reliable indicator but others referring to it as the least-worst option. Overall, respondents were generally positive about using one of the ‘FSM-ever’ options, feeling this would smooth distribution for schools from year-to-year and would pick up those whose parents were in an out of work.

Arguments against using FSM repeated many of the limitations set out in the consultation document. It was felt that it was a blunt tool, too inaccurate for use at individual pupil level and that many eligible parents did not apply. It was suggested that a measure which identifies those eligible for FSM without them applying should be investigated. It was pointed out that there were cases of “…..parents preferring their child not to have a free school meal (which can be associated with particular ethnic cultures)”.

It was suggested that the actual criteria for eligibility for FSM should be widened. There was concern that Gypsy, Roma and Travellers might not be picked up by any FSM measure and that it does not take into account ethnic minorities. This suggests that those with English as an Additional Language should be eligible for the premium.
3 Do you agree the coverage of the pupil premium should include looked after children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure:</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was very strong support for the introduction of a pupil premium for looked after children, citing the high level of need for additional support for this vulnerable group and their very poor level of attainment. Those against the proposal considered that these children already receive significant funding and do not need more. There was concern that they treating them as a single block of children ignored their individual circumstances - there may be instances where looked after children are settled, achieving well and no different emotionally or academically than their peers. There were also concerns about the interaction with other funding streams for such pupils – either that other sources of funding would cease or that, where a local formula already provides funding for such children, this would result in double funding.

On eligibility for the LAC premium, some thought it should not be limited to those in care for over six months, as the effects of disadvantage are more long lasting than the time in care. It was suggested that it should include those in care for more than four weeks, or that an 'ever' LAC measure should be considered, where a child who has been LAC within the previous 3 (or 6) years should also draw funding to the school. It was pointed out an ‘ever’ LAC measure would enable the child to retain eligibility for the premium if adopted, which some thought preferable. There was also support for extending the premium to children on the Child Protection register and those where the family is receiving support through Section 17 of the Children Act 1989.

There were suggestions that if a LAC moves school because of a placement change, then both schools should be eligible for the premium for that child, e.g. where a LAC is placed in a Pupil Referral Unit.

4 What are your views on the operation of the looked after children element of the pupil premium? In particular, how might the funding arrangements work at local authority level for pupils educated outside of the local authority with caring responsibility?

The majority of comments supported the concept that the funding should follow the child and be allocated to the school where the child is being educated. However, for looked after children who were looked after by one authority (the ‘home’ local authority) but educated in another (the ‘educating local authority’) there was no consensus over whether the ‘home’ authority should receive the funding, and either distribute it directly to schools in the ‘educating LA’ or pass it to the educating LA to distribute; or whether the funds should go directly to the educating LA for distribution, or if the funds should go directly to the schools.
There was considerable concern about the costs of administering any of these methods. One local authority estimated that it had ‘over 100 looked after children being educated in at least 35 other local authorities’. One school, however, reported that ‘We currently have LAC students [from outside the LA] and receive the funding directly from the home authority into our school budget which works well and the school recommended it as a model for proceeding. There needs to be a certainty that the money given to the authority is fully distributed to the schools and not top sliced for any other purposes.’

Although there was agreement that the money should follow the child, there was no consensus over whether or not it should follow the child in-year, be a termly payment or be paid annually. Some respondees thought that in the longer term School Census data should be used on a termly basis and that in time it could record the date of entry to care.

There were suggestions that it could be administered by (a) Extended Schools Coordinators or (b) Cluster Managers or (c) the Virtual School Heads\(^1\). It was suggested that many LAs already have effective systems in place through the Virtual School Heads to allocate any additional funding directly to schools or carers in response to identified needs at Personal Education Plan (PEP) reviews\(^2\), and that the LA receiving the funding should delegate funds to the educating school on receipt of the child's PEP.

Accountability was also mentioned, with one respondent suggesting that the school should report back to the local authority looking after the child on the use of the premium. Another suggested that the looked after children element needs very close monitoring so as not to be abused.

5 Do you think the coverage of the pupil premium should be extended to include additional support for service children? [Paras 61 - 66]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No: 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure: 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinion was very divided, with a small majority feeling that the pupil premium should not be extended to service children. A number of reasons for this were put forward:

---

\(^1\) Many local authorities now have a Virtual School Head for looked after children. This role is likely to be undertaken by a senior officer working in a local authority who has responsibility for promoting the education of looked after children as if they were being educated in a single school.

\(^2\) All looked after children have a care plan which is drawn up and reviewed regularly by the local authority which looks after the child. The care plan includes a personal education plan (PEP) which is the key document from which the child’s school and LA plan to meet the child’s educational needs.
• The pupil premium is directed at those children who are generally underachieving, and as service children attain as well as their peers, the case for extending the premium is not proven.

• The main reason for providing additional support to service children is that they are highly mobile, so it should be for all children whose families move around the country in connection with their work, including Gypsy, Roma and Travellers, rather than being limited to service children.

• While accepting the case for additional funding for these children, a number of respondents felt that the pupil premium was not the appropriate mechanism for doing so.

Several respondents thought that if a premium is to be paid for service children it should be at a lower level than the for the main pupil premium. A number pointed out that the Ministry of Defence contributes to independent school fees for officers’ children.

There was a fairly clear distinction between those LAs and schools who had experience of service children and those who did not. In general those with experience supported the premium being extended in this way and confirmed that the frequent changes of school and level of stress resulting from parents being on active duty did require additional support. “Service children suffer significant stress as a result of many moves, often to areas where there is no support network of families or friends. In addition the increasingly frequent deployment of service personnel to operational areas means that their home lives can be difficult and worrying. Schools can be a place of stability and support to these children - which comes at a cost in terms of the administration and resourcing of personnel to provide this support.”

The issue of income was also raised: “Although our families do not qualify for benefits which would trigger Free School Meals, we are aware that disposable income for many of these families is very low. There appears to be relatively high costs associated with housing/heating/mess fees/usage of relatively expensive local shops”. They felt that the issues for service children were not adequately understood more generally across the country.

It was suggested that although mobility occurs for many children whose parents are not in the armed forces, for service families the moves are on a more regular basis with many children attending six to seven schools in the course of their school career. Regular pupil movement means that children suffer from curriculum discontinuity. Schools then need to put in place special arrangements to ensure ‘catch up.’ There is also the issue that Service children live in fear of bereavement every day of their lives when parents are away on active duty causing much emotional, social and educational disruption. Bereavement counselling is a necessary feature within many of their schools and raising staff confidence to deal with situations has required additional professional development. Many schools with Service children provide pastoral support to include nurture groups, anger management, friendship groups, and one to one support plans. It was also suggested that the definition of a service child should be extended to cover one who has a parent who is currently serving in the armed forces or has served within the last two years as additional support can be needed after a parent has left the armed forces.
6 Should the pupil count for three year olds, used to allocate DSG for 2011-12, reflect actual take up or continue to reflect a minimum of 90% participation where lower?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Take-Up: 390 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Minimum: 163 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure: 69 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents supported a move to paying for actual take-up, rather than the current 90% minimum. The main reasons given were that this would bring it in line with other funding streams and that although the 90% minimum had been necessary to deal with a rise in the early years’ population the time was right for a move to funding on actual numbers.

Others thought that the 90% minimum should be retained to protect staffing ratios. Often children do not turn up when provision has already been made and without the 90% guarantee retaining staff would be a problem. It was also pointed out that as provision increases from 12.5 to 15, retaining the 90% funding would provide more flexibility for providers to implement. It was also suggested that the 90% minimum system allows flexibility for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children moving from one area to another.

A number of respondees pointed out that stability in funding is important for 2011-12 and as the DSG is to continue in its current form for another year, to allow for the implementation of the pupil premium, it was suggested that the 90% minimum is retained for another year while the impacts of the changes feed through the system.

It was commented that if a move to actual take up is introduced it should be phased to avoid too much disruption at LA level.

7 Should the pupil count used to allocate DSG for 2011-12 continue to reflect dual subsidiary registrations for pupils at pupil referral units?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 260 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure: 206 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 149 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest proportion of respondents felt that dual registration should continue. It was suggested that “Schools retain a pupil temporarily educated at a PRU on their role. The dual registration provides scope for the pupil to return at some point in the future to a mainstream school. Schools would be disadvantaged if they lost the funding intended for that pupil as they cannot offer that place to another pupil.” It was argued that “if
PRUs are to become places where students only stay for short periods, dual subsidiary registration seems the simplest and fairest mechanism..... during a financial year both the PRU and a school will incur costs relating to that pupil.” It was also pointed out that “The cost of each PRU placement is significant and this should be recognised in some form. Even with this double counting, the cost of the provision far exceeds the funding received.” One respondent added: “As the DSG is to continue in its current form for another year we would favour not changing the arrangements around pupil count, as any changes may destabilise funding.”

Those who said that it should not continue did so on the grounds that it is not right to double fund and that “the double funding arrangement only came about because the necessary information was unavailable. Now that the subsidiary registrations are identified it would be appropriate to remove this anomaly.”

Several respondents felt that the issue depended on the length of placement at the PRU, and one suggested that “If full funding is ruled out for dual registrations partial funding to recognise that these costs exist and to assist the links should be considered – say 0.5 General Unit of Funding. “

8 Do you support our proposals for additional support for schools catering for service children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest proportion of respondents supported giving additional support to schools catering for service children but a sizeable minority had reservations. Those supporting the proposal recognised the problems caused by large scale troop movements. Where there has been a sharp decrease in pupil numbers due to a reorganisation by MoD this is often followed by a period of instability before the numbers increase again. This is not an uncommon occurrence with units being moved or based closed. One respondent quoted the example where “due to troop movements there has been a dramatic reduction in pupil numbers over the last three years with all schools in the area experiencing a 50% reduction in pupil numbers. This will be reversed over the next three years. The shedding of many experienced staff has been a problem and they will not necessarily be there when numbers rise.” It was felt that schools with transient populations should not be penalised by short-term and damaging cutbacks in staff. Also raised were the difficulties caused by new admissions coming at irregular intervals and possibly missing the census date, so funding is not available until the following year.

Those with reservations considered that this should a matter for local consideration and that the existing formula factors and arrangements are more appropriate and fair to other groups of children. Local authorities have adopted local factors within their formulae to address the issue. Also raised was the question of whether the problem was only one for service children. Some felt that schools traveller children should also
be considered, along with any school where pupils were highly mobile. It was pointed out that currently schools with service children are often supported, along with others, by a mobility factor within local formula.

Finally there were a number of respondees who suggested that it would be sufficient to provide funding either through a service premium or this provision but not both. It was also suggested that separate funding arrangements should be made – perhaps via a contingency fund - as these are case specific.

9 Do you support our proposals for home educated pupils?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>432 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>115 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure:</td>
<td>78 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of those responding supported the proposal, arguing that it would enable young people to access the mainstream examination systems (in preparation for university) more easily and that it was right that costs incurred centrally by local authorities for elective home educated pupils should be reflected through national funding arrangements. It was mentioned that some of these pupils could be vulnerable and that it was particularly pertinent to meeting the educational needs of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children. It was also suggested that additional funding for home educated pupils would be beneficial to enable parents to support their children and apply for additional tutoring or access to assessment and diagnosis. A number of others felt that where there is a link with child protection and home education, the funding would ensure that there are visits made to check provision at home is adequate. A small number of respondees suggested that the 10% figure was not adequate and should be higher.

Those disagreeing with the proposal commented that if parents decide to home educate the LA should not get involved. A number of respondees felt that, if parents choose to educate their children at home, resources that are available to the majority should not be diverted to accommodate this choice. It was suggested that a choice to home educate is similar to choosing an independent school. Some suggested that any support should be given to reintegrate these children back into mainstream schools.

It was mentioned that funding could be re-directed towards sport / museums / libraries etc. and give these settings a responsibility to consult with the local home education community. It was also pointed out that unless there is a significant variation in home education across the country it would appear to be unnecessary to further complicate LA school funding arrangements to cater for this, especially if the proposed allocation is a modest figure.
10 Do you think that there should be a cash floor at local authority level in 2011-12?

| Total Responses |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Yes:            | 362 55%         |
| No:             | 139 23%         |
| Not Sure:       | 130 22%         |

The majority of respondees supported the retention of a cash floor, which would have the effect of protecting local authorities with falling pupil numbers. Those supporting it thought that it assists schools in planning and that removal of the floor could destabilise funding. In some cases the cash floor is being used to support small schools. It was also pointed out that retaining good staff is essential and a cash floor enables them to do this when perhaps there is a drop in pupil numbers.

Respondees also pointed out that a cash floor makes it possible for decisions to be made in a sensible and reasoned way and that even for authorities not on the floor it provides reassurance that there is protection against a significant drop in pupil numbers. If the cash floor were to be removed there were a number of calls for the reduction to be phased over a number of years so that it could be properly managed. Some respondees felt it would be better to wait to make such changes until a new DSG allocation methodology is introduced.

Those supporting its removal considered that funding should reflect pupil numbers and not artificially protect local authorities from a reduction that must be dealt with at some point. They suggested that “It is far easier to predict a fall in pupil numbers than it is to predict increased demand “and “there is so much distortion to current funding rates caused by past floors and funding on a cost basis that any formula review intentions become lost.” It was also mentioned that “if the cash floor is removed, this provides an extra encouragement for authorities to reduce surplus places.”

11 Have you any further comments?

Many of the responses to this question either repeated or extended comments to the individual questions above. Most offered support for the concept of a premium, but several cautioned that considerable thought needed to be given to the indicator used, along with ideas on how the premium could be used and on the need for support for schools on how they should use it. A number of responses called for the premium to be extended to early years and there were suggestions that it should apply to SEN pupils, young carers and new arrivals from overseas who are not eligible for FSM.

Several respondees wondered about how schools would be held accountable and whether schools will use it for the benefit of the pupils who are eligible (particularly in challenging financial situations). It was suggested that pupil premium funding should be allocated against clear objectives and reportable under OFSTED regimes. Several local authorities felt that they and their schools forums should have responsibility for distributing the premium. There was concern that the premium might not be an effective
lever on schools’ admissions behaviour and that consideration should be given to integrating receipt of the premium into the statutory admissions code. It was also suggested that where pupils are excluded or otherwise taken off roll the pupil premium should move with the pupil.

Beyond these, there were concerns for children with mental health problems who might not be eligible for the premium and about the lack of support for elective home educated children. Although most respondents understood the reasons why the funding system was not changing for 2011-12, there was a call for fairer funding for authorities, with some support for the concept of a national funding formula. The problem of funding small rural schools was mentioned. There was comment on the minimum funding guarantee with calls to abolish it; keep it; and keep it, but with a negative figure. A number of respondents – mainly those working with ethnic minorities and with pupils who have English as an additional language - were concerned about the mainstreaming of grants, particularly the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant, arguing that ring-fencing the grant was essential if current services were to continue.
Organisations responding to the Consultation

Abbey Park Middle
Action on Access
Adswood primary school chair of governors
Advisory Council for the Education of Romany and other Travellers (ACERT)
Association for Education Welfare Management (AEWM)
Aimhigher Greater Manchester
Alban Way Extended Schools
All Saints CE Junior School
Alt Bridge Secondary Support Centre
Amberley Ridge School
AQA
Archbishop Cranmer Primary School
ASCA Partnership
Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)
Ashbury Primary School
Association of Colleges
Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA)
Association of Managers in Education (AMIE)
Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)
Aston Tower Community Primary School
Banbury School
Barnardo's
Barnsley MBC
Bates Wells and Braithwaite
Baycroft School
Beaconhill Community First School
Bedford Borough Schools Forum
Bedford Ethnic Minority & Traveller Support Services
Bedfordshire Foster Care Association
Bedlingtonshire Community High School
Bedminster Down School
Beeston Primary School
Beis Yaakov High School
Bicester Community College
Billericay Community Trust
Birchensale Middle School
Birmingham city Council
Blackminster Middle School
Board of Deputies of British Jews.
Bolton Council
Borough of Poole
Bournes Green Infant School
Bourton on the Water Primary School
Boxmoor Primary School
Bracknell Forest Council
Bracknell Forest Schools Forum
Bradley Stoke Community School
Briggs St Marys Grammar School
Brighton & Hove City Council
Brighton & Hove LA, Children and Young Peoples Trust
Bristol City Council
Bristol Extended Services
Broadmeadow Infant and Nursery School
Brookwood Primary School
Buckinghamshire Association of School Governors
Buckinghamshire School improvement Service
Burleigh Community College - Extended Services
Bury CE High School
Bury CLAS
CACI
Caldecott Primary School
Calderdale MBC
Cambridgeshire County Council, Learning Directorate
Cambridgeshire DSG
Cambridgeshire Minority Ethnic Regional Group for Equality in Education
Camden School for girls
Canonbury Primary School
Canterbury Christ Church University
Canterbury City Council
Catholic Education Service
Catton Grove Primary School
Central Bedfordshire Council
Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors (CIEA)
Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy
Cheney School
Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum
Chetwynd Road Primary School
Children & Young People's Mental Health Coalition
Children England
Children's Commissioner
Chilworth CofE Infant School
Chipping Sodbury School
Church Cowley St James Cof E Primary School
Church of England Education Division
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
City of York Council and York Schools forum
College Town Infants School
Collingwood College
Coombeshead College
Cordwalles Junior School
County Councils Network
Courtwood Primary School
Coventry City Council
Cranford Community College, Hounslow
Crays Hill Primary School
Cressex Community School
Crown Hills Community College
Cumbria County Council
Cuxton Community Primary School
Danesfield School
Darlington BC
De La Salle School
Dearham Primary School
Debenham High School
Derby City Council
Derbyshire County Council
Devon Association of Governors
Devon County Council
Dogsthorpe Junior School
Dorset County Council
Dorset Schools’ Forum
Dr Radcliffe’s CE Primary School
Droitwich Spa High School
Drybrook School
Dudley MBC
Dunraven School
Durham County Council
E-ACT
East Cheshire Council
East Oxford Primary School
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
East Sussex County Council
East Sussex NUT
East Sussex Schools Forum
Edleston Primary School
Education Bradford
Education Leeds
Education Otherwise
e-Learning Foundation
Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School
Englefield Green Infant School
English Outdoor Council
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Essex County Council
Ethnic Diversity Service
European Centre for Reading Recovery
Even Swindon Primary School and Early Years Centre
Ewelme CE Primary School
Excelsior Academy
Extended School Lynn Grove cluster
Eynsham Primary School
F40 Group
Fagley Primary School
FASNA
Fern Hill Primary School
Fitzharrrys Secondary School
Fitzwarin School
Five Acres Primary School
Food For Life Partnership
Forge Lane Primary School
Frank Wise School, Banbury
Frederick Gough School
Freeland CE Primary School
Furze Down School
Gateshead MBC
Gateshead Schools Forum
Geoffrey Field Junior School
George Pindar Community Sports College
Gillotts School
Gloucestershire County Council
Gloucestershire Race Equality and Diversity Service
Glouestershire Schools forum
Golden Hillock School
Grandpont Nursery School
Grange Hill Nursery
Grange Valley Primary School
Grange View CE First School
Great Rollright CE Primary School
Greater London Authority
Greenwich Council
Halewood Centre for Learning
Halewood C of E Primary School
Halton Borough Council
Hampshire County Council
Handale Primary School
Hart Primary School
Hartlepool Borough Council
Hartsdown Technology College
Hatfield & Rural Extended Schools Consortium
Havelock Academy
Havering Schools Funding Forum
Hawthorn Park Lower
Haydon Bridge Community High School
Heaton Manor School
Hemel East Ring Of Extended Schools
Henry Chadwick Primary School
Hertfordshire County Council
High House Nursery Ltd
High Tunstall College of Science
Hinde House 3-16 School
Holsworthy Community College
Hounslow Schools forum
Hull Minority Ethnic Achievement Team
Hull Schools Forum
Hummersea Primary School
Humphry Davy School
Huntcliff School
Huxlow Science college/Northamptonshire County Council
Huyton with Roby CE Primary School
Icknield Community College
Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS)
Independent Academies Association
Independent Panel for Special Education Advice (IPSEA)
Institute of Wellbeing
Isambard Brunel Junior School
Isambard Community School
Isleworth Town School
Islington Schools Forum
John Hampden and Tetworth Schools Federation
Kent City Council
Kent County Council - MCAS
Kent Schools Forum
King Charles the First School
King's Meadow School
Kingsdown School
Kingston Upon Thames Schools Forum
Kirkby Sports College
Knowsley MBC
Knowsley Park Centre for Learning
Ladygrove Park Primary School
Lakenham primary School
Laleham C of E Primary School
Lancashire Schools Forum
Laurence Jackson School
Leafield CE Primary School
Leafield Primary School
Leagrave Primary School
Leicester City Council
Leicestershire County Council
Leys Farm Junior School
Lincolnshire County Council
Lipson Learning Co-Operative Trust
Little Mead Primary School
Liverpool City Council & Liverpool Schools Forum
Liverpool City Region Directors of Children's services
Liverpool LA
Local Government Association
Local Government Associations High Ethnicity Authorities Special Interest Group
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London borough of Bexley
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Croydon Schools Forum (David Bradshaw)
London Borough of Ealing
London Borough of Enfield & Enfields Schools Forum
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Lewisham School Forum
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Newham behaviour
London Borough of Redbridge
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
London Borough of Sutton
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Councils and the Association of London Directors of Children's Service
London Diocesan Board For Schools
London School of Islamics Trust
Longfield School
Luton Borough Council
Luton Borough Council, Virtual School for LAC
Luton Primary Heads
Luton Secondary Heads Group
Manchester City Council
Manchester Schools' Forum
Manor High School
Marlbrook Primary School and Little Dewchurch Primary School
Marlwood School
Mayhew Harper associates Ltd.
Medway Council
Medway Schools forum
Mencap
Menorah Foundation school
Middlesbrough Schools Management Forum
Millbrook Primary School
Milton Keynes Council
Ministry of Defence
MOD
Moons Moat First School
Moorside High School
Mount Street Primary School
NAHT
NAJOS
NALDIC
NASEN
NASUWT
National Association Of Teachers of Travellers and Other Professionals
National Childrens Bureau
National College of Leadership Online Discussion Group
National Day Nurseries Association
National Governors' Association
National Primary Headteachers
National Union of Teachers
NATT+
NCAS
NCB Special Educational Consortium
Needham Market Middle School
Netherhall School
Nettlebed Community School
Newcastle City Council
Newton-le-Willows Community High School
NIACE
Nine Tree Primary School
Nine Tree Primary School Governing Body
Redcar & Cleveland BC
Rivington Primary School
RM
RM Data Solutions
Rochdale MBC (Danny O'Malley)
Rose Hill Primary School Governing Body
Rotherham Children and Young People's Services
Rotherham School Effectiveness Service
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)
Salford City Council
Saltash.net Community School
Sandwell MBC
Save The Children
School Food Trust
SE Oxford Schools Partnership
Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council
Selly Oak Extended Services
Service Children In State Schools National Executive
Shamblehurst Primary School
Sheffield City Council
Sheffield CYPS
Shrivenham Primary School
Shropshire Schools Forum
SHS (School-Home Support)
SIGOMA
Slough Borough Council
Society of County Treasurers
Society of London Treasurers
Solihull Schools Forum
Somers Park Primary School
Somerset County Council
South Gloucester CYP Department
South Gloucestershire Primary Heads Executive
South Gloucestershire Secondary Heads
South Gloucestershire Schools Forum
South Stoke Primary School
Southampton City Council
Southampton Schools Forum
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council
Specialist Schools and Academies Trust
St. Aidan's Catholic Primary School
St. Aidan's CE Primary
St. Aloysius Catholic Primary School
St. Bartholomew's CofE (VA) Primary School
St. Brigid’s Catholic Primary School
St. Catherine’s Primary School
St. Columba’s Catholic Primary School
St. Dominics
St. Helens & Newton NASUWT
St. Helens Council
St. Hild’s C of E School
St. Joseph’s Catholic Primary School
St. Margaret Mary Infant School, Knowsley
St. Marks Catholic Primary School
St. Martin de Porres Primary School
St. Mary & St Thomas’ Primary School
St. Mary’s C of E Primary, Chessington
St. Mary’s Church of England Primary School
St. Michael and All Angels Primary School
St. Michael’s School Steventon
St. Nicholas Infant school
St. Paul's Catholic College
St. Peters and St Pauls
St. Peter's Catholic College
St. Peter’s CE (VA) Primary School
St. Peter’s Elwick CE VA Primary School
St. Saviour’s CE Primary
St. Thomas of Canterbury Junior School
Staffordshire County Council
Staffs CC Schools Forum
Stockport Council
Stockport Ethnic Diversity Service
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Schools Forum
Stockton Borough Council
Stockton Schools Forum
Stockwell Primary School
Stoke-On-Trent City Council
Stonesfield Primary School
Stourport High School and 6th Form centre
Suffolk County Council & Schools Forum
Sunderland City Council
Sunningwell CE Primary School
Surrey County Council
Surrey Street Primary School
Sutton Manor Community Primary School
TACT
Tameside Equality, Multiculturalism and Access Team
Tauheedul Islam Girls High School
West Byfleet Junior School
Westergate Community School
Westfield Nursery School
Westminster City Council
Westvale Primary school
Wheatley Park School
White House Education Consulting Ltd.
Wicklewood Primary school
Wigan Council
Wigan CYPS
William Morris 6th Form
Willowcroft Community School
Wirral Local Authority
Wirral Schools Forum
Wistaston Green Primary & Nursery School
Wokingham Borough Council
Worcestershire County Council
Wren's Nest Primary School
YoungMinds