

Question 1

Model 1 assumes there is no funding shortfall. If there is a funding shortfall which Model, do you prefer?

- Model 2 and 3 reduces the factors.
- Model 4 and 5 introduces a gains cap.

Model 1	Model 2 & 3	Model 4 & 5	Not Answered
1	41	3	0

Note: - where schools have responded just with a single model the response as been included in the relevant group i.e., Preference model 3 is included in relevant group model 2 & 3.

Comments

- Model 1 preferred model 2 & 3 if necessary – keeping % loss low and across more schools seems fairer.
- Models 2 and 3 better reflect the aspiration of the national funding formula, which is to ensure funding is distributed fairly and consistently to all schools. Due to the funding pressures faced by schools as a result of the nationally agreed pay awards and rising cost of inflation, we would encourage Schools Forum to use the DSG reserve to cover any shortfall to ensure schools receive funding in line with the factors in National Funding Formula.
- Models 2 & 3 is fair across all schools, 4 & 5 shouldn't even be considered

Question 2

To continue with the principle to mirror the National Funding Formula (in keeping with the acceptable minimum and maximum values) for each factor as detailed in Table 1

Are you in agreement with this proposal?

Yes	No	Not Answered
42	0	3

Question 3

Local authorities have the freedom to set the Minimum Funding Guarantee in their local formulae between 0.0% and +0.5% per pupil.

Are you in agreement with aiming to set the MFG at +0.5%?

Yes	No	Not Sure
34	1	10

Comments

- MFG protects schools which historically received additional funding through factors which no longer exist. These should be being phased out
- Not sure what the impact of this would be either for the LA or for schools.

- The amount should be a minimum of +0.5%
- Only agree if this is affordable and not a detriment to any school

Question 4

Modelling shows reducing pupil factors impacts more schools but by a lesser amount. In comparison a gains cap impacts fewer schools by a greater amount. Are you in agreement that if the formula is not affordable the preferred and first option to make this affordable is to reduce pupil factors e.g., the £2 and £4 reductions in the models (in keeping with the acceptable minimum and maximum values)?

Yes	No	Not Sure	Not Answered
35	3	6	1

Comments

- Comments in response to Question 1
- £2 yes, £4 not sure. Reduction per pupil is too high at £4 per pupil but £2 is more acceptable
- Would prefer NOT to have model 5
- Small schools need to be protected. Larger schools with larger budgets will be able to cope with the shortfall of a maximum of £18,364. However, a small school cannot lose 14.2% of their budget without the education of children being significantly affected. If this were to be selected, I would want to know what the proposals are to protect small schools
- A gains cap should not be considered, sparsity is now a compulsory part of the NSFF it wasn't in 2022/2023 technically this was paid out but clawed back after the 6.6% gains cap put in last year.
- This has a much lesser impact on small schools and is a much fairer way to deal with any shortfall

Question 5

Please provide any additional comments on the Models.

- The current model for National School funding is unsustainable. All models will impact our ability to provide the best education for children.
- It goes without saying that spreading potential un-affordability between 262 schools is far more acceptable than expecting 43 or 17 schools to absorb any shortfall. Small schools play an incredibly important role in our society. It would be seriously unjust if we were financially penalised again. I also believe that it is extremely important that schools whose budgets would not be significantly affected by choice of funding model should be encouraged to respond to this consultation. There should be no apathy regarding this consultation, as surely no Head Teacher or School Business Leader would believe that it is appropriate for small schools to be forced into a redundancy situation, or worse still closure, when we are all already facing the cost-of-living crisis and supporting teacher and support staff pay rises without additional funding.
- I think the model that minimises funding losses for as many schools as possible is the fairest and preferable, it should be split equally over all schools.
- It has been difficult for us to see specifically what the models mean to our school due to the fluctuation in our pupil numbers. Our pupil numbers have grown from 66 to 90 for the Oct. 22 census and have "suffered" significantly this year. The lag in the funding allocation has meant we are hugely underfunded, then impacted by the gains cap on the sparsity and effectively the further taking of funds from the MFG meaning for us approx -£35,000

- As a school who was allocated sparsity funding under new government guidelines for the first-time last year, only to have it immediately removed due to a gains cap. It is my understanding that models 4 and 5 are in place to remove this additional funding to support small schools. If this is the case, models 4 and 5 are unethical as it would be removing money that schools are entitled to for them to provide the same opportunities. Model 1 is unrealistic. Models 2 and 3 are fair.
- Small schools struggle at the best of times, so cutting their budgets would be a terrible thing right now. Larger secondary schools can afford to have a small percentage cut- that seems to be the best option. Primary schools work on very limited number of TLR staff whereas secondary schools have a high percentage on TLRs- this could be something to look at in future.
- For many small schools, any impact on our budget has massive consequences on staffing and resourcing.
- I suggest you all read the DFE consultation on sparsity. There is a reason that this has been done and made a compulsory part of the NSFF. This is not just in Notts but all over the country schools have been added. This is for the children and to give children in rural areas the same opportunities. Not for authorities to pay in one hand and take in the other calling it a gains cap. This is monies that these schools should be paid. It would be interesting to see what the DFE thinks of this approach to pay then claw back sparsity funding under the name of gains cap and use these monies to fund a funding shortfall! So not really paying it.

Question 6 (to be answered by maintained schools only)

Do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2023-24?

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

Of the 45 responses 29 were maintained schools

Free schools' meals eligibility assessment

Yes	No	Not Sure
28	1	0

Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners

Yes	No	Not Sure
29	0	0

Contingency for crisis communications

Yes	No	Not Sure
28	0	1

Trade Union Facilities

Yes	No	Not Sure
25	3	1

Question 7 (to be answered by maintained schools only)

Do you agree to the de-delegation of the School Improvement Service in 2023-24?

Of the 45 responses 29 were maintained schools

Yes	No	Not Sure	Not Answered
21	2	5	1

Please rank the rates in order of preference (1 being the most preferred and 3 the least). Please note the service offer varies dependent on the rate.

Option	Service Offer	Funding to be raised via de-delegation	£ per pupil de-delegation
1	No direct interventions	£130k	£3.47
2	Half of current offer interventions	£230k	£6.13
3	Service offer- full interventions	£300k	£8.79

One school that had responded with not sure to the first part did not insert ranking for options

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1st Choice	11	1	16
2nd Choice	4	22	2
3rd Choice	13	5	10

Additional comments

- Anything other than full interventions would render the service useless to good and outstanding schools and will accelerate the move to academy status.
- We have found the support from the LA very important particularly as QA for the recent inspection. With budgets being difficult the subsidised support, training and courses has been welcomed. I consider that other schools similar in size to us would also benefit from this.
- The service should continue to be provided.