

	Q1 – Do you agree with the proposal to have separate basic per pupil entitlement rates for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposal to use only the 'Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index' (IDACI) as the indicator for allocating funding for deprivation?	Q3 – Do you agree with the proposal to use the Looked After Children factor for allocating funding to primary and secondary schools?	Q4 – Do you agree with the proposal to set the proxy indicator for SEN at the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile threshold of 73 points rather than 78 points?	Q5 – Do you agree with the proposal to have a higher rate of funding in secondary schools for English as an additional language?	Q6 – Do you agree with the proposal to use the optional 'lump sum' factor (of £140,000) within the funding formula for schools?	Q7 – Do you agree with the proposal for PFI schools to continue to receive an allocation equal to the estimated affordability gap through the optional PFI factor within the funding formula for schools?	Q8 – Do you agree with the proposal not to use the optional pupil mobility factor within the funding formula for schools?	Q9 – Do you agree with the proposal to implement a financial cap of 1.5% to restrict funding gains, to those schools which would experience an increase in funding under the new funding arrangements?	Q10 – Do you agree the proposal to adapt the traditional 'A – H' banding mechanism to allocate the necessary top-up funding for pupils in Special Schools for the financial year 2013-14?	Q11 – Do you agree with the proposal to use the 2012-13 per pupil funding values as the basis for calculating the appropriate rates for the Resourced Units in 2012-13?	Q12 – Do you agree with the proposal, in keeping with the local arrangements, to require mainstream schools and Academies to pay the top-up element of the funding as well as the AWPU to the provider for the rest of the financial year and the following financial year, where the exclusion occurs after the October pupil census, in cases of permanent exclusion?	Q13 – Do you agree with the proposed treatment of the central expenditure items as detailed within table 2?
1	yes	yes - because FSM pupils receive additional funding via pupil premium	Yes - it has very little impact on most schools but could be significant where there are high numbers in a school	Yes - if there are less qualifying pupils there will be more funding for those who have the greatest need	Yes - pupils joining a secondary school as EAL are further behind their peers than those joining in KS1/2	Yes - in the short but only because it reduces the overall level of turbulence it would be harder to justify as a long term principle.	no - but accept that it is historical where MX is concerned. I would strongly oppose this in any future PFI projects	yes- appears to have little impact	Yes - but only due to the pragmatic nature of the arrangements and the impact of the minimum funding guarantee	yes	no - much more work is needed to determine an appropriate per pupil funding model particularly in THS where the current level is historical and may be over generous	no - and this has not been discussed with schools or at BAG	no - item 5 maternity costs should also be de-delegated item 7 ... Schools can't be expected to de-delegate THS costs and pay top up costs for AP placement
2	n/a	No - by including FSM within IDACI, visibility of the accounting for use of additional funds given for P Premium inc. FSM might be lost	yes	yes	n/a	no - don't understand the justification as to why the lump sum has to be the same for all schools. It would make sense to apportion the amount of pro-rata basis - smaller schools get less, larger schools get more	no - this would potentially remove money from the general funds available to non-PFI schools	yes	yes	yes	yes	no - As an Infant school, we only have the child for 3 years so paying for a 2nd financial year would penalise the school unfairly. We could agree if more was put into pre-school to identify needs thus removing the immense activity and investment that the school makes. There is also the issue of dual registration that exists and needs to be resolved for this	no - The maternity costs at Para 5 need greater explanation before we can agree
3	We are a Junior School so therefore are unsure what level of extra costs a Key Stage 4 pupil incurs	yes	yes	no - The level should be 78, as if a child does not meet the average score of 78 they will require extra support and interventions during KS1 and KS2 to ensure they can meet their targets	yes - if this means that secondary schools will receive a higher weighting of funding but funding is still available for the first 3 years to primary schools.	This appears to be inequitable, a lump sum will be a bigger proportion of the overall budget for smaller schools than larger ones, and therefore worth less to the larger the school. Not sure of the overall reason behind PCC using lump sums.	yes	yes	yes - It is important to ensure turbulence is kept to a minimum and that schools have time to plan and implement savings in schools that are overall losers in the new formula. This we assume can only be funded by managing the increases over time to schools that gain, and thus the MFG is very important and therefore the financial cap too	yes	yes	Agree with AWPU and any extra top up from PCC to follow the pupil and be adjusted in the census. Need further clarification on the 'top up element' as regards non statement children and children with statements	yes
4	n/a	no - preferred a mixture of free school meals & IDACI	yes	yes	yes	yes	No Answer	No Answer	no - This proposal yet again significantly disadvantages the pupils in this school - setting the capped increase at only 1.5% results in us losing out on approx £55,000 of additional funding that we would otherwise receive under the new funding formula	No Answer	No Answer	No Answer	No Answer
5	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
6	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	No Answer	yes	no - this schools budget 13/14 will reduce by approximately £230k compared with 12/13 budget, this deficit would be greater if the old formula is used. The schools budget will decrease due to a falling role (£19 compared to 880 12/13). The Cap should be set higher, to enable the school to receive allocated funding to minimise the deficit.	No Answer	yes	no - Should be on a prorated basis, to ensure the school does not lose allocation for additional months of attendance at the school (depending on date of exclusion). This will lead to LA gains in this area. Schools should only be required to pay a 'top-up' element equivalent to the SEN entitlement for the excluded pupil, and no more.	yes
8	n/a	no - Would like clarification on whether IDACI identifies catchment area or actual children	yes	yes	no - children with EAL would need the same amount of funding whatever shape of their Education	yes	Did not understand. Funding for repairs/maint should be based on age & size of building	yes	no - Should be on floor so schools do not suffer from too great a loss of funding, but no ceiling	no	yes	no	yes
9	no - Given the move to education until 18, I do not see why there is a distinction being made at this point. Children joining in KS3 will be staying until KS4 so schools should be able to plan ahead. There is no clarity on what additional KS4 costs are.	no - Funding for schools is increasingly being based on an FSM measure for example the Pupil Premium. Schools are expected to report progress of FSM children as well. It would make sense therefore to be consistent and to use FSM as a funding indicator. Given the fact that there is still the year 2014-15 unaccounted for, there is time to plan for changes to overall funding levels.	no - There is no stability within schools over LAC. A child may change to LAC and back within the space of an academic year. This would mean continual readjustment of funding as monies will inevitably have to be clawed back. As the city council is the corporate parent, it should hold back funding itself for LAC provision.	no - If this is a temporary measure until the review of EYFS it does not make sense to change this for a single financial year. The consultation does not allow a view on secondary SEN threshold to be expressed and one wonders why Level 4 is the average, level 3 is just below. Level 2 would be a better indicator as this is a complete key stage behind.	no - Most early language development happens in the primary phase. In my experience EAL children arrive unable to speak English but leave able to do so. Therefore this money should be more focussed on primary and not secondary schools.	no - There is not enough explanation of why a reduction of £60,000 from the DfE suggested figure is proposed for me to be able to support this. What is the effect, for example, of £160,000 lump sum?	no - PFI schools should not receive any money from the local authority.	no - Financial research is not the same as educational research. Mobility has a considerable impact on standards to the extent that primary schools can remove certain children from their published Key Stage 2 results depending on, amongst other factors, date of admission. This should be factored into funding.	no - Any change in funding will produce winners and losers. If those schools are due extra money then they are due it and it seems unfair to hold some back	no - it does not make sense to introduce an interim measure that most people I speak to - myself included - have no knowledge of.	yes	no - This penalises schools for permanently excluding. If the child left voluntarily there would be no such penalty so will lead to more unofficial moves and schools such as mine will continue to suffer	yes
10	yes	No Answer	yes	yes	no	no - If £200K is being allowed to go to schools from LA what is happening to the other £60K?	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes - Concern over bullet 1 and 2 - seems unreasonable for other schools to bear costs of mis-managed funds or re-organisation of schools
11	yes	yes - How does this link to page 23 - prior attainment being used as a proxy for SEN?	yes - Should we be looking at whether if ever LAC, not just currently LAC?	yes - Does this, by way of page 9 Secondary Schools and s level 4, include Secondary Schools too?	yes - AND Primary and Special phases - surely there are the same challenges.	If however, this means that stability of budgets is maintained through transition years, then it would seem to make sense - has this been agreed by mainstream group?	What figures are being referred to?	no - Our understanding is that levels of mobility in Portsmouth are high so this would be a factor	yes	yes - As a means of mathematical modelling it, however, is not really within the principle of banding. So OK for transition year(s). We will need to look at which cohort year is banded through	yes	no - Agreed that there should be a local agreement which is a disincentive to PX, and ensures that the right level of funding follows the learner to meet need. This should be more than what is captured (page 18) and more than an AP place top up.	no - Concerned regarding those which are not de-delegated i.e. Behaviour Support Services which could lead to a 'post code' lottery of support available for vulnerable learners across Portsmouth. This should also be decided for 14/15 by agreement each educational phases i.e. special, primary, secondary.
12	yes	yes	yes	yes	no - Does this mean we are not going to fund Primary pupils with EAL at a high rate, only secondary pupils?	yes	no - No, Where PFI schools leave the LA, I do not agree that they should continue to receive funding.	yes	no - I do recognise the difficulty in adjusting budgets, but I think 1.5% is too low a cap to restrict gains. Suggest 2.5% would allow those school, who would effectively be being under funded, to catch up in a reasonable length of time.	yes	yes	no - I suggest there needs to be further explanation and safeguards as currently the proposal seems to be we agree to have the money de-delegated back to the LA to fund the Harbour School and that we pay (a very large amount) if we need to use the facility. This appears to be paying twice.	yes

	Q14 – Do you have any further suggestions which may help us improve the proposed funding formula?
1	no - but much more detailed dialog is required around qu 12
2	no
3	yes - Funding mentions £4k per child however the current example indicates £3.2k per child, will the formula for 2013/14 address this? Kitchen schools used to receive extra funding in their budget share for catering/energy/refuse etc this is not longer the case. Therefore is PCC going to review the need for SLAs between kitchen schools and the schools they provide a catering for
4	yes - In calculating the capped value per pupil that we can receive in 13/14, the amount currently received per pupil should be based on our Jan 11 census NOR (291), as this is what we are currently being funded for. By basing it as if we are currently being funded on our Oct 11 NOR (296) disadvantages us by £50 per pupil. With a current NOR of 297 this unfairly reduces our budget allocation by £15,000, an amount sufficient to fund a badly needed additional teaching assistant in the school. The current method will disadvantage any school with decreasing NOR between October 11 and January 12. We have consistently had to cope with lags in funding as our NOR fluctuates but overall increases, but the proposed method of assuming current funding is based on October NOR is gest that the adding to this pressure. We suggest that the capped funding be calculated based on January 11 NOR, or if this is not possible, that schools affected are financially compensated through some other funding source.
5	yes
6	Pupil mobility in my school is high – please can you explain why you decided not to use it as part of the formula?
7	no
8	no
9	No Answer
10	No Answer
11	Concerned that this proposed funding formula may disadvantage Portsmouth's most vulnerable learners requiring outreach support and/or specialist provision. What are (page 18) additional transport costs? For transparency costs of services in table 3 need to be declared.
12	yes