

Appendix 1:- 2018-19 Consultation Responses - phase 2

Reponses	
Primary	9
Secondary	2
Special	
Academy Trust	11
Total responses	22

Funding Formula Proposals				
		Y	N	Neither
1	Do you agree with the proposal to maintain the use of the reception uplift factor for 2018-19? (Paragraph 3.22)	19		2
<p>Secondary 1 - N/A</p> <p>Academy 10 & 11 - N/A - this does not impact as pupils all start in Sept</p> <p>Primary 5 - We have high turbulence, we have gained 2 (possibly 3) new children since census and as the year progresses will be allocated more mid-term entry pupils.</p>				
		Y	N	Neither
2	Do you agree with the use of the funding released from the Primary Looked After Children pupil factor to be used to fund the new factor of Free School Meals (FSM)? (Paragraph 3.18)	19		2
<p>Secondary 1 - N/A</p> <p>Academy 10 & 11 - Yes, as this will apply to more of our intake and prevent funding for reducing drastically this year. AWPU means loss of £60.62 per pupil. But less drastic than NFF. Both FSM and Ever 6 funding had increased – beneficial to both schools. IDACI changes are a loss for both schools, SJS receive 3 factors, SIS 1 factor. Total sums are not large amounts to small impact to the budget. EAL and Prior attainment match the NFF and are higher than last year. Lump sum – universal reduction for all schools, though £2,500 than NFF so restricting the impact.</p> <p>Primary 5 - Do not understand the impact. Originally agreed LAC be divided out but why is this going to affect IDACI?</p>				
		Y	N	Neither
3	Do you agree with the funding rates as set out on page 9 proposed for the use of the calculation of 2018-19 funding formula?	15	4	2

Secondary 1 - By not introducing the NFF in full will cause this school financial difficulties. This (VA) School will lose over £80k, based on the Oct 16 Census figures used (Nearly £90k loss based on Oct 17 Census). Though I understand that NFF phase 2 2018/19 will be a 'soft' version, which gives LA's a transitional year prior to the full NFF implementation in 2019/2020, consideration must be given to this school's additional tax liabilities. As a VA school we are already in an unfair financial position, compared to LA maintained schools, by not being able to reclaim VAT on Capital works over £2k.

The Governors and the Headteacher firmly reject this proposal.

Academy 10 & 11 - PCC have tried to minimise reduction to benefit schools. NFF is considerably lower but the changes will allow schools to manage their budgets down to the NFF figures.

Primary 5 - We are IDACI band D and lose the majority of our funding through this reduction. It seems totally unfair deprived areas 54-70% while more affluent areas gain more than £200 per child. PCC proposal is more palatable. The Ever 6 in the proposal more than doubles but the total remains negative.

Academy 1 & 2 - The laudable attempt to protect primary schools by stepping the IDACI factors towards the national standards, whilst not matching the FSM recommendations has resulted in discrepancies and major underfunding for secondary schools.

Shortfall in proposed secondary basic entitlement allocation: £684,555

Impact of deprivation factor for secondaries: shortfall £1,558,251

Although this is partially off-set by the low attainment factor (which usually distorts distribution far more than deprivation factors), the real attempt to balance the books for secondaries comes in the MFG calculations, which, of course, is completely bogus in the long term and has caused genuine unfairness in Portsmouth's allocations over the last 10 years, which the proposed formula does nothing to address.

		Y	N	Neither
4	Do you agree with the per pupil contribution rate of £20.50 for the Education responsibilities for maintained schools?	8	3	10

Secondary 1 - This proposal will be a financial loss of £18,142 for this school. As a VA school, most of the listed services are not used. Also, do Academies have access to these services, if so what are their contributions? There is also a new grant from the EFA for LA's to cover school improvement and intervention.

The Governors and the Headteacher firmly reject this proposal.

Secondary 1 - I would need to see more detail on the need for this given the increase in Central block. Secondary schools contributing disproportionately to the

cost.

Primary 2 - I think this is very high and it would cost our school £8,405. I realise that costs need to be covered, but as budgets are reducing in schools, can the cost of these services not also be looked at.

Academy 10 & 11 - N/A

Primary 3 - Are maintained schools taking the full cost of moderation for all the schools. If there is a per pupil charge for these services why are we paying a Traded Services charge.

Primary 5 - How is this going to be managed going forward? Academies get more funding and then the chain take a percentage. How does £20.50 per child equate to a maintained school receiving similar to an academy and then paying a proportion back i.e. is this less than an academy school pays per child to their provider?

Primary 6 - In paying this what are schools getting for their money as opposed to academies who don't pay into this but still attend LA led meetings/ training – do academies pay at set rate like this to the LA or are they charged more to attend meetings/training? If they are not 'paying into the pot' then I would expect this to be the case.

Academy 7/8/9 - Not Applicable as we are an academy

Primary 8 - Can it be clarified what support we are getting for this money that is not covered through our existing SLA's?

		Y	N	Neither
5	Do you agree with the proposal to add the primary FSM factor to the factors to be adjusted to maintain overall affordability as set out in paragraph 3.15?	6	1	3

Secondary 1 - N/A

Primary 2 - I can't find any information relating to the new way that FSM Ever 6 would be funded. You mention it in your document but with no detail. What is this? What is it changing to? What do you mean by adding the Primary FSM factors????

Academy 10 & 11 - It not clear why FSM children that are 'live' get the lower entitlement than children getting Ever 6.
However, both schools have larger ever 6 lists so reduction is not as bad as, higher than NFF so this is beneficial too.

Primary 5 - unsure of the effect on schools -
AWPU ✓
Prior Attainment ✓
How are lump sum and cap effected?

		Y	N	Neither
6	Do you agree with the proposals set out in paragraph 3.27 to maintain the MFG at minus 1.5% in line with the agreed objective of a gradual transition towards the national funding formula?	20		1
<p>Primary 1 - It's only fair to protect schools in this transitional time</p> <p>Secondary 1 - Set by EFA</p> <p>Academy 10 & 11 - we are still subjected to this deduction. The reasoning behind maintaining the deduction is clear and makes sense to protect all schools.</p> <p>Primary 5 - Huge cuts cannot be managed immediately.</p> <p>Academy 1 & 2 - Reluctantly</p>				
		Y	N	Neither
7	Do you agree with the proposal set out in paragraph 3.28 to remove the cap of plus 1.5% to increase the gains available to schools subject to affordability?	18	2	1
<p>Primary 1 - Doesn't seem to make any sense for schools not to benefit from additional funding</p> <p>Primary 2 - This would have to totally depend on affordability and what the impact would on other school budgets.</p> <p>Primary 5 - Would like to have supplementary appendix/notes on how this would impact on the whole group outcomes i.e. is it actually possible to do this within budget.</p>				
		Y	N	Neither
8	Do you have any other comments?	7	5	9
<p>Secondary 1 - As a VA School our tax liabilities for Capital expenditure over £2k, has not been considered. This school has been grouped with all other maintained schools who do not have this tax liability!! Please review and adjust accordingly, we require a fairer funding solution.</p> <p>This school is also entitled to growth funding, details have not been received by PCC as yet for 17/18. Also, growth funding is applicable for 18/19.</p> <p>I am concerned with the changes to Resource Unit funding. 9 places will need to be preserved to ensure affordability – the £90k annual funding must be maintained.</p> <p>Primary 1 - Regarding the consultation it would be beneficial to have a brief explanation at the regular head's briefing that Mike Stoneman organises. This would</p>				

allow heads to have a discussion and get some clarity through asking questions directly. This would then improve the quality of the consultation and the responses you get.

Primary 5 - As per consultation 1 - how would this affect a school like ours who is increasing numbers significantly in 2018-19 when the figures are based on a census of Oct 17. We are likely to have 30+chn in Sept 2018 than recorded on our census last October. Will increased roll be taken into account? Otherwise it double cuts.

Academy 1 & 2 - As CEO of the Trust, I have to point out that the proposals penalise the Trust to the tune of £126 553 in principle, which then, after “adjustments”, results in the school under greatest financial pressure in the Trust (School B) missing out on £64 288 which it can ill afford in a year when lagged funding resumes (unless the EFSA have a change of heart) and yet the school will continue to grow far beyond its Oct 17 census number. Meanwhile, School A continues to be funded £2000 per pupil less than the best funded secondary school in the city.....

Primary 7 - It would be very useful to have a full Heads briefing with input and clarification prior to a consultation as this is a missed opportunity for Heads to have the opportunity to discuss changes

Primary 8 - It would be helpful prior to consultation to have someone from finance attend Primary Heads conference to talk through the funding formula so we are clear on what we are being asked about and can have any questions answered.

Additional Comments:

Academy 5 - I know you have requested that we fill in the consultation form, but I just wanted to say on behalf of our Headteacher and myself that the indicative budget shows that we will lose £71.880 from our deprivation budget. This Academy is a very challenging school with 60% or more of free school meals. Although it looks like we gain in other areas of the budget it shows a total loss of £85.599. Please could you pass this comment on to the relevant person?

Primary 2 - I do have a question on the new proposed changes to the FSM Every 6, what are they. I've looked at the DFE website and couldn't see anything. Would these changes have any impact on our Pupil Premium?