

Appendix 5:- 2017-18; School funding formula consultation response

Reponses	
Primary	9
Secondary	3
Special	0
Academy Trust	1
Total responses	13

Funding Formula Proposals				
		Y	N	Neither
1	Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the IDACI factors by £161.00 to enable affordability	11	2	
<p>Academy Trust 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31 schools see an increase in funding in option 2 compared to 27 schools under option 3. <p>Primary 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This primary school could be approx. £47K decrease - although capped this year a further decrease could happen next year. <p>Secondary 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portsmouth IDACI rates are still considerably higher than EFA published MFLs so this seems the most appropriate way forward. Consider asking EFA for an MFG exclusion for IDACI funding since some schools will have received inappropriate funding last year due to the shift in the bandings. <p>Primary 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree, on the basis this is equitable as effects all schools <p>Secondary 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authority's modelling demonstrates that this methodology has the smallest impact on the smallest number of schools and so is the best way forward. This said I am concerned that using this methodology means the impact of reductions in funding will be felt most acutely in schools with high levels of deprivation. This situation could be exacerbated by changes to the prior attainment factor. Forum will need to monitor closely the impact of these decisions on particular schools. 				

		Y	N	Neither
2	Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the LAC factor from £2,811 to £1,000 and increase the basic entitlement to reflect the reduction in funding on the LAC factor	12	1	
<p>Academy Trust 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looked after children needs are significant and diverse. In order to fund manpower and resources, any reduction in funding would have a significant detrimental effect on the outcomes of this group of children. <p>Primary 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep in line with national funding <p>Secondary 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portsmouth currently provides 5th highest value nationally for LAC. This is protected by MFG even if LAC moves schools, so the reduced amount seems more appropriate <p>Primary 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree, on the basis that monies can be used flexibly for pupils who are looked after by family members and not just for LAC pupils. 				
		Y	N	Neither
3	Do you agree with the proposed de-delegation rates for 2017-18 as set out in paragraph 3.41	10	3	
<p>Primary 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The difference in deprivation amounts between primary schools is outstanding – the highest amount being £756k NOR 518 compared to other large primary schools £83k NOR 677, £64k NOR 488, £41k NOR 473. No wonder schools are financially struggling in low deprivation areas. Could some of deprivation be redistributed to basic entitlement? <p>Academy Trust 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in line with 1% increase in salaries. <p>Primary 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Happy with central control. Not sure what and why there is a school contingency. Note: If traded STGBS would buy into FSM admin and Library services. We are happy with centrally delegated money for FMS admin and Museums and library. However the new 'contingency' was a matter of discussion. What do you want this for? It doesn't seem to be a large sum to be of any good as a contingency. <p>Primary 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are concerned by the plan to de-delegate eligibility for free school meals. 				

We do not feel that the school is equipped to do this work itself and we are concerned that the cost to the school will increase considerably if it becomes a traded service.

Secondary 2

- De-delegation is a matter for HTs and governors to discuss and agree by phase. Given the government's aim to discontinue de-delegation and the increase in the pace of academisation, it may be more appropriate to offer all as traded services and let maintained schools and academies make up their own minds.

Primary 8

- Agree

Secondary 3

- This seems like a sensible move although I would like to see detail of the traded service costs for FSM administration to judge this fully.

Additional Comments:

Primary 2

- Would have liked to look at figures regarding number / percentage of pupils affected by the cuts.