

		Responses			
	Question	1	2	3	4
Q1	Q1 – Do you agree with the proposal to reduce both the prior attainment funding factor and the KS3 and KS4 funding rates in order to maintain overall affordability, following the change in the prior attainment funding allocation criteria?	Yes	Yes - schools now receive an additional £500 in catch up premium in addition to their budget share for any student who comes in below level 4 in English or Maths. Therefore this partly offsets the drop in the prior attainment funding.	Yes	Yes
Q2	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposal to retain the Looked After Children per pupil funding factor rate at £2,811?	Yes	Yes - These students do have a very high incidence of need and schools require additional resources to support them.	No - The children affected are already in the system and therefore subject to an education and if they are struggling they would be picked up by the school as needing assistance and they get support under the normal school's operation.	Yes
Q3	Q3 – Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the Lump Sum rate by £850 in order to fund the increased number of children that will attract funding through the Looked After Children factor, as a result of the change in the dataset used by DfE?	Yes	Yes	No - As Q2: Plus the volumes are so low that it makes no sense to make the change	Yes
Q4	Do you agree with the proposal not to use the pupil mobility factor to allocate funding to schools?	Yes	Yes	Yes - This will have a positive impact	Yes
Q5	Do you agree with the proposal to retain a single lump sum rate for both Primary & Secondary schools?	Yes	No - in an all-through school, our governors have always argued that there should be greater flexibility in the way that the lump sums are allocated and that Mayfield should be entitled to two lump sums	Yes	No - It is this academies view that the model should be moving towards a reliant of pupil led factors rather than the lump sums. Whilst we accept that this will take time to minimise impact on MFG we would like to see a year on year reduction.
Q6	Do you agree with the proposal not to create a falling rolls fund?	Yes	Yes - Future predictions in the city suggest this is not likely to be a problem for good or better schools	Yes	Yes - Falling rolls should be anticipated at school level and planned for financially
Q7	Do you agree with the proposal to establish a contingency fund	No	Yes - In the past we have benefitted from the contingency fund so we feel that it is only right that we now contribute some of this money and support schools who face sudden and unexpected difficulties	No - Schools should manage themselves appropriately, and those that are merging have plenty of time to prepare their finances accordingly. If there is an emergency, the LA could use the funds from the "Loan Scheme" that was recently stopped.	This has no impact on the academy so we will not make a comment
Q8	Do you have any further suggestions which may help us improve the proposed funding formula?	More student funding , less institution given that there are too many schools in Portsmouth	No - We are generally happy with the new funding formula and how it operates. It is transparent and there appears to be a good balance between the pupil led factors and safeguards for schools	No response	No