

A total of 16 schools responded to the consultation

Options	Number of schools that stated "Yes"	No of schools that stated "No"	No of schools that stated neither "Yes" or "No"
Reduce lump sum to £115,000 and add funding released into Basic Entitlement	15	1	0
Do you have any other comments in respect of the mainstream funding formula?	2	14	0
Change Growth fund criteria and use Staffordshire Model	14	0	2

Comments on funding proposals:

School 2 -

"Consideration should be given to Schools Forum agreeing to a 3 year plan detailing the intended movement of the lump sum and the implications."

"Should the funding formula be adapted from Secondary Schools to phase out the lump sum?"

School 13 -

"We are one of the schools to lose £15,000. Governors do not feel they have much influence over this."

School 15 -

"Unfortunately we are unable to agree the decision to reduce the lump sum to £115K as we are trying extremely hard to save for a new playground, along with remodelling space to accommodate curriculum activities, i.e. library, sports, dance, cooking. At the present costs required for refurbishment it is likely we will have to save for 5 to 10 years to accrue suitable finances to pay for these works. We have seen a decrease in lump sum from over the past 2 years for amalgamated schools. We have no capacity to amalgamate so it has no benefit for us as a school. Unfortunately we appreciate this is quite a selfish decision but we have to think of our pupils here first."

School 16 -

"We agree with the proposal to reduce the lump sum in order to increase the KS2/3 AWPU. This helps to improve the financial stability to schools who are considering amalgamation with the Key Stages or in the case of our school, changing the age range altogether and become an all-through school.

By increasing the AWPU, we are able to direct funding where it would not have been received previously and allows for focus to be made on the educational benefits of amalgamation rather than basing decisions on budgets and the financial position."

Any additional comments on mainstream funding formula:

School 8 -

"While accepting the need for changes Governors did express some concern that reducing the lump sum would impact heavily on primary schools and recognised that funding primary schools well is critical if children are going to get the best start to their education. It was felt that all schools should equally share the burden of any cuts."

School 13 -

"New arrivals with English as a second language – we don't agree with the funding we are proposed to receive and we have contacted EMAS for clarity on the data provided"

Any other comments in respect of the growth fund:

School 2 -

"Agree with the principles however need to consider the flat rate agreed is based on 7/12ths costs. For an Academy it is a whole years costs that should be reflected in this amount."

School 7 -

"It is essential to support the growth of schools through expansion as the costs are significant and this money will go some way to supporting the investment needed but certainly will not cover the costs involved especially for SEN."

School 9 -

"Benefits more schools than the old model does"

School 13 -

"Yes and no is the answer,

Staffordshire model is our preferred option.

Would also like to point out that each year as a school we have been growing (by 15 places) and there doesn't appear to be any plans to backdate monies."