

There were 79 responses to the consultation.

Question 4

Do you agree (or disagree) that reserves should be used to fund a shortfall in the Nottinghamshire funding formula this year?

Agree	Disagree	Not sure/don't know
37	28	14

Comments

- Not sure/don't know = If this is council reserves, it makes sense to use them for an emergency and to make sure services continue to be provided as needed and jobs preserved.
If this relates to a claw back of school reserves, I will have to disagree as funding is very tight now and the 3-year projection shows most of the reserves will be swallowed up anyway just paying staff salaries. There is also the cost implication of building repairs for which schools receive hardly any funding, with many buildings requiring extensive repair work.
- Not sure/don't know = Is this short-term fix going to be enough or are we going to face additional (similar) challenges financially in the future - you can only use reserves a few times before there are none left.
- Not sure/don't know = The question does not clearly specify whether the future implications on school funding are positive or negative. If negative, I would say disagree.
- Not sure/don't know = I am not qualified to make such a judgement, but I am incredibly concerned to find that we have been allowed to be in a £2m shortfall.
- Agree = If funding is not adequate for schools to maintain an uninterrupted service to pupils and staff, then the implication for future years is a greater risk. Currently, there is a risk that schools are unable to fulfil the basic role of academic teaching and support as the demands of schools become greater.
- Not sure/don't know = I am unsure as I do not have a full understanding or the details of what the implications for the future would be.
- Disagree = Schools must be clear that using reserves in this way could cause a drop in future funding.
- Agree = However, this continues to be a huge challenge and the impact to provision, and pupils is great. It is not appropriate for schools to be funding shortfalls within the LA.
- Disagree = It will only get worse if we do.
- Disagree = In the current economic climate it's important to ensure funding for future years. Also, we are witnessing the near bankruptcy of our neighbours in the city.
- Agree = If forecasts show that reserves would be required beyond 2024-25 then the use of reserves should be graduated out, rather than removed immediately, so schools have an opportunity to adapt over time rather than face larger short-term cuts.
- Agree = "In order to help the schools maintain staffing and a budget to support a high increase of children with SEND.
It is difficult to think long term, due to the pressures and challenges affecting school leaders e.g., recruitment and retention, staff well-being, pupil numbers and drop in the birth rate and the needs of the children."

- Not sure/don't know = The concerns I have is the impact on future years if reserves are used.
- Not sure/don't know = We are unsure as not fully aware of what impact using the reserves will have on future budgets.
- Agree = The impact of aligning to the NFF should be modelled and routes to resolving the affordability gap should be consulted upon
- Agree = Agree in principle the use of reserves in the short term to support unforeseen contingencies. The level of current reserves and the longer-term implications - not just impact on future baseline - must be considered. If there is a strong likely hood that the modelled £2m shortfall will continue - or increase - moving forward, then more caution is needed.
- Not sure/don't know = I would need more information to decide.

Question 5

If there is an unaffordable formula, please select one of the four models (Model 2, 3, 4 or 5)? Model 1 is not included as this assumes sufficient funding.

Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Not answered
20	8	34	13	4

Question 6

Do you have any additional comments about the models?

- Model 5 = Unless central government restore a realistic education budget, I feel that the burden needs to be spread across as many schools as possible, rather than impacting a lower number of individual schools.
- Model 4 = This shares the impact most widely across as many schools as possible.
- Model 4 = None of the models are sufficient to cover staff pay rises which have been approved and will ultimately impact on loss of personnel and thus provision within schools.
- Model 4 = Feel this is fair for everyone and sustainable.
- Model 2 = Model 2 based on the 0.5 minimum and higher amount overall without losing this. Difference to other option is minimal.
- Model 2 = Although, due to MPP, we are not directly affected. We believe that Model 2 is the fairest approach for all schools.
- Model 3 = The models clearly display that a great deal of thought has gone into the possible solution of a potential issue. The range of implications from each model is relatively small, particularly for non MFG/MPPL settings - although every penny counts. Model 3 - appears to marginally represent the fairest approach to spreading the shortfall, due to a reduction to lump sum - same impact for all - whilst protecting against relatively dramatic losses for settings in receipt of MFG.
Clarification around a rather binary 0.0% or 0.5% MFG would be helpful though - what impact 0.25% for example."
- Model 5 = We are a minimum per pupil funding school, so has little effect.
- Model 2 = This Model choice ensures those schools on MFG receive at least some funding increase above 0%
- Model 4 = Needs to be spread across the maximum number of schools

Question 7

asks if you are a maintained school.

Yes – maintained school	No – not a maintained school
56	23

Question 8

Do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2024 to 2025?

- Free schools' meals eligibility assessment?
- Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners?
- Contingency for crisis communications?
- Trade Union Facilities?
- School Improvement?

Of the 79 responses 56 were maintained schools

Free schools' meals eligibility assessment

Yes	No	Not Sure
36	9	11

Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners

Yes	No	Not Sure
30	12	14

Contingency for crisis communications

Yes	No	Not Sure
34	9	13

Trade Union Facilities

Yes	No	Not Sure
31	11	14

School Improvement

Yes	No	Not Sure
29	13	14

Question 9

Do you have any additional comments you would like to add about this consultation?

- It would be good to have indication of possible shortfall prior to Christmas, if this information comes through as you stated on 18th December 2023.
- I feel that the per pupil rate for school improvement is way too high, given the services received by schools who are not requiring a high level of support. It should not be higher than targeted de-delegation support for the earning of vulnerable groups.

- Communication regarding this consultation was not good (Emergency plans were put in place after it became apparent many heads did not know about the initial consultation webinar) and needs looking at before next year and a better system needs to be implemented, please.
- The reason our school is still an LA school is we like to have the autonomy over our budget. We are aware of the needs of our school and would be worried that funding would be diverted away, and we would have to join a long list of things that need to be done.
- It is difficult to judge the de-delegation amounts for 2024-25 without the 2023-24 amounts to compare to.
- Agree to the need for school improvement de-delegation however amount per pupil seems high.
- I think the current model of school improvement doesn't work because of all the cuts to the service. Even when in an Ofsted category the support was extremely patchy and inconsistent. I think the service needs reworking - not sure how! The personnel are spread too thin.
- I do not think enough information around de-delegation or use of reserves has been shared with headteachers particularly in the briefing earlier this week.
- The sum for trade union time is too high and needs to be decreased to be more in line with the public sector.
We are being asked about funding school improvement without a clear understanding of what the offer is. With greater clarity we can make a better judgement."