

## 16 to 19 Discretionary Bursary fund

- 1 The Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) represents over 19,000 education system leaders, heads, principals, deputies, vice-principals, assistant heads, business managers and other senior staff of state-funded and independent schools and colleges throughout the UK. ASCL members are responsible for the education of more than four million young people in more than 90 per cent of the secondary and tertiary phases, and in an increasing proportion of the primary phase. This places the association in a strong position to consider this issue from the viewpoint of the leaders of schools and colleges of all types.

### **Consultation responses:**

#### **Rationale for updating the 16 to 19 discretionary bursary fund allocations methodology**

- 2 Do you agree that using a 2009/10 EMA based disadvantage measure to calculate the 16 to 19 discretionary bursary allocations is no longer appropriate?

Response: Yes, for the obvious reason that this calculation is now 10 years old and the bursary should be calculated on present not past needs.

#### **Support for the most financially disadvantaged students**

- 3 Do you agree that using a postcode-based deprivation measure would be a better proxy for the overall financial deprivation of students at an institution than a FSM measure?

Response: Yes, because FSM are already calculated and funded separately.

#### **Deprivation measures**

- 4 Do you agree that using the latest available version of IMD, as the disadvantage measure within the methodology would better reflect the deprivation level of students, compared to using IDACI?

Response: Yes, as it offers consistency with the rest of 16-19 funding factors.

#### **Supporting students' travel costs**

- 5 Do you agree we should include a travel element to better match the allocations to the student need for travel support?

Response: Yes, but only where the data checking against different categories of travel eligibility does not become overly bureaucratic or burdensome. We also believe that the existing bursary funds should not be used to further subsidise T levels placements - funding for T levels should not cloud this arrangement and must be kept separate.

- 6 Do you agree that distance to travel and rurality are appropriate factors to build into the travel element?

Response: No, the factors should be distance and cost - we don't see how a rurality index could be classified/defined/constructed (perhaps if this was clearer we may agree with it).

### **Where travel costs are lower**

- 7 Do you agree we should reduce the travel element calculated for students with a home and delivery postcode in the London area by half, so as to account for the additional support these students have available to them via the TfL offer?

Response: No, this is far too simplistic and seems just to be a way of taking money away from London institutions to top up other areas as the overall pot is not big enough. It clearly discriminates against London students just because there is an existing policy in London which could change at any moment anyway. This is unnecessary and divisive.

### **Supporting students' additional costs to participate in T Level industry placements**

- 8 Do you agree we should introduce a small element in the discretionary bursary methodology that accounts for the additional costs likely to be faced by disadvantaged students undertaking T Level industry placements?

Response: No, this amounts to taking money out of the already under-financed national bursary pot and cross-subsiding T levels. Funding for all components of T levels must be kept separate and funding on top, as has been much heralded. This proposal therefore appears to be slightly devious and underhand.

### **Proposed methodology**

- 9 Do you agree we should support the 27% most disadvantaged students by IMD for the disadvantage element?

Response: No, we would want to see some modelling of what the adoption of the 27% would result in before we could agree or disagree.

- 10 Do you agree that we should include a wider cohort of the most disadvantaged students by IMD in the specific costs element of the revised allocations methodology?

Response: No, we do not agree with this because of our previous comments on industry placements.

### **Transition**

#### **Public Sector Equalities Duty**

- 11 Are you aware of any particular equalities impacts? Please provide evidence to support your response, including how any adverse impact could be reduced and whether there are any ways we could better advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not?

Response: No.

Kevin Gilmartin  
Association of School and College Leaders  
21 May 2019