Schools and Early Years Block Consultation 2016-17

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

How to respond to this consultation

The consultation document outlines the proposed application of the funding factors that are required & permitted within the local funding formula for 2016-17. Please answer each of the questions below in conjunction with the description of each proposal outlined in the consultation document. Any additional comments you wish to make should also be included.

If you have a query regarding the consultation document please contact:
- Sue Summerscales 0115 977 3468   sue.summerscales@nottscc.gov.uk
- Toni Gardner   0115 977 3487   toni.gardner@nottscc.gov.uk.

Please send your completed consultation response form by e-mail to toni.gardner@nottscc.gov.uk or post to:

Schools Finance (Floor 4)
Finance and Procurement Division
County Hall
West Bridgford
NG2 7QP

The closing date for this consultation is 9th October 2015 – your response must reach us by that date.

The responses to the consultation will be collated and reported to the Schools Forum on 22 October 2015 for their consideration. The proposed local funding formula for 2016-17 as agreed by the Forum will then be submitted to the Education Funding Agency on 30 October 2015 and a final decision will be taken by the County Council's Policy Committee in November.

Thank you for responding to this consultation.

<div align="center">**CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM**</div>

Name	
Position	
School / Academy Name / Early Years Provider	

1. Early Years Funding

Base Hourly Rate for 2 year Olds (paragraphs 3.5.1 to 3.5.2)

Question 1
Do you agree that if the government increase the per pupil funding following the November spending review that this should be passed on to child care providers?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 2
Do you agree that the base hourly rate for 2 year olds child care should be equivalent to the amount of grant funding that is received by the authority, currently £4.88 per hour?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

3 – 4 Year Old Base Hourly Rate (paragraphs 3.6.1 to 3.6.6)

Question 3
Do you agree that the per pupil unit of funding for 3-4 year olds should be increased to £2,223 per annum?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 4
If you answered yes to question 3 do you agree that the increase should be funded on a temporary basis from the Schools (Non ISB) Reserve?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Deprivation Supplement (paragraph 3.7.1)

Question 5
Do you agree that the deprivation supplement is reduced from £0.55 per hour to £0.05p per hour for eligible children only?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Meal Allowance (paragraph 3.8.1)

Question 6
Do you agree with ceasing the meal allowance factor?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Sustainability Supplement (paragraph 3.9.1)

Question 7
Do you agree with ceasing the sustainability factor?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

2. School Funding 2016-17: Consultation with Schools on the local funding formula

Primary to Secondary Funding Ratio (paragraph 4.11)

Question 1
Do you agree that the primary to secondary ratio should be maintained at 1:1.265 for the 2016-17 financial year?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Basic Entitlement – Age Weighted Pupil Unit (paragraph 4.12)

Question 2
Do you agree that the 2014-15 AWPU rates should be proportionally adjusted in order to maintain the overall primary to secondary funding ratio of 1: 1.265 for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Deprivation and the treatment of the Pupil Premium (paragraph 4.13)

Question 3
Do you agree that the same percentage of total funding, deprivation indicators and weightings should be used to allocate deprivation funding in 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Low Cost, High Incidence SEN (paragraph 4.14)

Question 4
Do you agree with retaining the Prior Attainment factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 5
If the factor continues to be included, do you agree to retaining the current proportion of funding, & method for distributing that funding?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Looked after Children (paragraph 4.15)

Question 6
Do you agree with retaining the Looked After Children factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 7
If the factor continues to be included, do you agree that a fixed unit value of £3,000 should continue to be used to allocate this funding in 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

English as an Additional Language (paragraph 4.16)
Question 8
Do you agree with retaining the EAL factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 9
If the factor is retained, do you agree that the same percentage of total funding should be allocated through the EAL factor with a single unit value in 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Pupil Mobility (paragraph 4.17)

Question 10
Do you agree with retaining the Pupil Mobility factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 11
Do you agree that the same percentage of total funding should be allocated through the Pupil Mobility factor in 2016-17, with a single unit value?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Sparsity (paragraph 4.18)

Question 12
Do you agree with the proposal not to adopt a Sparsity factor for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Lump Sum (paragraph 4.19)

Question 13
Do you agree with retaining the lump sum factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 14
Do you agree with the proposal to increase the lump sum for the primary phase?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 15
If you answered yes to question 14 what value do you think the primary lump sum should be set at?

	£110,000	£120,000	Other
Comments:			

Question 16
Do you agree with the proposal to keep the lump sum value at £100,000 in 2016/17 for the secondary phase?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 17
Do you agree that Nottinghamshire should not apply for an exceptional factor in order to pay a further allowance to amalgamating schools in the second year after amalgamation?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Split Sites (paragraph 4.20)

Question 18
Do you agree with retaining the Split Site factor in the Nottinghamshire formula for 2016-17?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 19
Do you agree to continue with the current methodology and funding for split site schools?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Rates (paragraph 4.21)

Question 20
Do you agree to continue with the current arrangement to pay rates centrally?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Exceptional factors (paragraph 4.22)

Question 21
Do you agree to continue with the exceptional factors for joint use and rental?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Growth Fund (paragraph 4.23)

Question 22
Do you agree that the growth fund should continue?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Question 23
Do you agree that the growth fund should remain at £1.0m as it was for 2015-16?

Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

De-delegation (paragraph 4.24)

Question 24
As a representative of either a maintained primary or secondary school, do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2016-17:
  a) Contingencies for pre-agreed amalgamation transitional support?
  b) Free school meals eligibility assessment?
  c) Staff costs / supply cover (trade union facility time)?
  d) Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners?
  e) Contingency for crisis communications?

a) Yes	No	Not Sure
b) Yes	No	Not Sure
c) Yes	No	Not Sure
d) Yes	No	Not Sure
e) Yes	No	Not Sure
Comments:		

Additional comments

Please add any additional comments you have regarding the consultation below:

Thank you for responding to this consultation.