

## School Funding 2014/15 Consultation Results

64 responses

### Phase of School

	Frequency	Percent
Nursery school	2	3.3
Primary	47	77.0
Secondary Schools	9	14.8
Special	1	1.6
UTC & Free School	2	3.3
Total	61	100.0

### Q4 Is your school:

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total
An Academy	Count	0	4	3	1	2	10
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	4.9%	1.6%	3.3%	16.4%
Maintained by the Local Authority	Count	2	43	6	0	0	51
	% within phase	3.3%	70.5%	9.8%	.0%	.0%	83.6%
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Q5 What is your role at the school?

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total
Head teacher	Count	1	31	5	1	1	39
	% within phase	1.6%	50.8%	8.2%	1.6%	1.6%	63.9%
Business/ Office role	Count	1	11	3	0	1	16
	% within phase	1.6%	18.0%	4.9%	.0%	1.6%	26.2%
School Governor/ Governing body	Count	0	4	0	0	0	4
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.6%
Other	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
No answer	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Q6 How far do you agree or disagree that the base level for the 2014/15 AWPU rates should be set at the 2013/14 levels?

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	2	0	0	0	2	59%
	% within phase	.0%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
Agree	Count	1	27	4	1	1	34	55.7%
	% within phase	1.6%	44.3%	6.6%	1.6%	1.6%	55.7%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	12	2	0	1	15	25%
	% within phase	.0%	19.7%	3.3%	.0%	1.6%	24.6%	
Disagree	Count	0	4	1	0	0	5	15%
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
Strongly disagree	Count	1	1	2	0	0	4	6.6%
	% within phase	1.6%	1.6%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
No answer	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.37	2.78	4.00	3.00	3.25	

**Q6.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Although the figures quoted are a minimum figure, as opposed to the figures quoted later in the document) this potentially means a large reduction in funding for all schools and is not representative of current rates of inflation.
I think budget for 14/15 should reflect annual conditions
Last year's AWPU figures, coming at the same time as the withdrawal of disadvantage subsidies (£60,000), severely impacted upon the budget to the detriment of pupil-teacher ratios and support for pupils.
Overall costs have risen, therefore AWPU should reflect this.
They should increased at least 1% to off set against increase in salaries
This would not represent an increase in line with inflation since the cost of resourcing and staffing will rise over the coming year.
We cannot understand why this is not index linked. We point out that teacher salaries have increased by 1%.

**Q7 How has your school's deprivation funding been applied in 2013/14?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total
It has been absorbed within the overall budget	Count	1	32	6	1	1	41
	% within phase	1.6%	52.5%	9.8%	1.6%	1.6%	67.2%
It has supported deprived pupils in addition to the Pupil Premium	Count	0	12	3	0	1	16
	% within phase	.0%	19.7%	4.9%	.0%	1.6%	26.2%
No answer	Count	1	3	0	0	0	4
	% within phase	1.6%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.6%
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Q8 If you said 'It has supported deprived pupils in addition to the Pupil Premium', is the impact of this spend evaluated by the Governing Body?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total
Yes	Count	0	12	3	0	1	16
	% within phase	.0%	75.0%	18.8%	.0%	6.3%	100.0%
No answer	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Total	Count	0	12	3	0	1	16
	% within phase	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Q9 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to include Looked After Children as a factor in the funding formula?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	5	1	0	0	7	66%
	% within phase	1.6%	8.2%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	11.5%	
Agree	Count	1	24	6	1	1	33	25%
	% within phase	1.6%	39.3%	9.8%	1.6%	1.6%	54.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	13	1	0	1	15	10%
	% within phase	.0%	21.3%	1.6%	.0%	1.6%	24.6%	
Disagree	Count	0	5	1	0	0	6	
	% within phase	.0%	8.2%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	9.8%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.62	3.78	4.00	3.50	3.67	

**Q9.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

LAC children are well supported through other outside agencies as well as receiving Pupil Premium funding.
LAC pupils receive additional funding from external agencies. The funding would be better spent on increasing the basic entitlement to benefit a wider range of pupils.
Many schools do not have looked after children within their settings. These would also be likely to have been the schools who have seen reduction in budget due to changes to the overall budget factor and more money going to deprived areas.
They should be funded independently when the need arises
This should be kept a separate item to ensure that funding is targeted at those pupils

**Q10 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal not to distribute funding based on prior attainment?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	4	2	0	0	7	69%
	% within phase	1.6%	6.6%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	11.5%	
Agree	Count	1	28	5	1	0	35	57.4%
	% within phase	1.6%	45.9%	8.2%	1.6%	.0%	57.4%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	7	0	0	2	9	15%
	% within phase	.0%	11.5%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	14.8%	
Disagree	Count	0	5	0	0	0	5	15%
	% within phase	.0%	8.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	3	1	0	0	4	6.6%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
No answer	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.53	3.88	4.00	3.00	3.60	

**Q10.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Additional funding could be used to support those pupils are below their peer group
Baseline assessment on entry clearly shows that pupils are not performing at the level expected, therefore it is only right that pupils should benefit from extra funding to enable their receiving schools to provide the much needed support necessary to bring them up to and in line with national expectations.
For pupils who do not attain a GLD there are so many factors involved that additional funding to mitigate these factors and action preventative/intervention approaches for these children involves money and resources to improve their chances for KS1.
Funding should be independent of cohort achievement
Funding should reflect the needs of the children, if children are not making progress in line with their peers funding should be directed to enable schools to provide additional support for these children
I believe funding should follow the child to support the current school.
Some funding may be need to support pupils whose previous attainment was below that of their peer group. This cohort may need additional resources which may be hard to fund from the school budget.

**Q11 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to exclude English as an Additional Language (EAL) as a factor in the funding formula?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	3	3	0	0	7	48%
	% within phase	1.6%	4.9%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	11.5%	
Agree	Count	1	18	3	0	0	22	36.1%
	% within phase	1.6%	29.5%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	36.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	14	2	1	1	18	30%
	% within phase	.0%	23.0%	3.3%	1.6%	1.6%	29.5%	
Disagree	Count	0	11	0	0	1	12	23%
	% within phase	.0%	18.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	19.7%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.23	3.78	3.00	2.50	3.33	

**Q11.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

As more people migrate to the UK, English is not always a first language therefore more resources are required to assist pupils and therefore should be part of the funding formula but as a extra part.
Further support often required
Many children with EAL need extra help with literacy. They may live in an area where there is no deprivation and therefore the school receives no funding to support them.
Our school has a significant number of EFL/EAL children and budget is diverted to support these pupils. Additional funding would greatly support all pupils within our school.
Specialist support is beneficial to support children in settling and to support their learning - this often has to be bought in.
and/or arrive in larger numbers

**Q12 How far do you agree or disagree with the continuation of one lump sum of £120,000?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	13	2	0	1	16	77%
	% within phase	.0%	21.3%	3.3%	.0%	1.6%	26.2%	
Agree	Count	2	23	5	1	0	31	8%
	% within phase	3.3%	37.7%	8.2%	1.6%	.0%	50.8%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	4	0	0	1	5	15%
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	8.2%	
Disagree	Count	0	6	2	0	0	8	15%
	% within phase	.0%	9.8%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	13.1%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.00	3.87	3.78	4.00	4.00	3.87	

**Q12.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Because factors in each school are so different and may not apply to each situation
Continually rising costs necessitate a review of this lump sum commensurate with inflation.
I agree with the continuation of one lump sum, but it should be weighted according to the size of the school.
I believe that it is unfair for the same lump sum to be applied regardless of the size of school. I think that there should be a mechanism for applying a smaller lump sum to tiny schools with few pupils and a greater sum to very large schools.
I believe the lump sum should be increased.
Inflation and rising costs have not been taken into account
Needs to be higher, current funding does not allow for school maintenance let alone improvements.
Should move towards £150,000
The lump sum as it is currently puts a considerable burden on small schools because it fails to make any compensation for smaller pupil numbers. A lump sum of £150,000 would go some way to redressing the balance.

**Q13 How far do you agree or disagree with the continuation of funding schools through a split site factor?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	3	0	0	0	3	33%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%	
Agree	Count	1	9	5	0	2	17	57%
	% within phase	1.6%	14.8%	8.2%	.0%	3.3%	27.9%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	1	30	3	1	0	35	10%
	% within phase	1.6%	49.2%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	57.4%	
Disagree	Count	0	4	1	0	0	5	100%
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	100%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		3.50	3.19	3.44	3.00	4.00	3.26	

**Q13.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Additional costs would not be doubled
Additional lump sum too much.
Not required. Council should not allocate money to this because the school staffing structure will be reflected by the size of schools.
£120k seems excessive. If there needs to be on this should be on a per pupil basis at both schools. Often it is only the Head who would go between both sites and this cost is small.
The schools know and need to budget for this as they have other costs shared.
This needs further discussion

**Q14 How far do you agree or disagree with the continuation of funding rates on an actual basis?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	17	6	0	1	25	84%
	% within phase	1.6%	27.9%	9.8%	.0%	1.6%	41.0%	
Agree	Count	1	21	3	1	0	26	13%
	% within phase	1.6%	34.4%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	42.6%	
Neither agree or disagree	Count	0	7	0	0	1	8	3%
	% within phase	.0%	11.5%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	13.1%	
Disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	4.11	4.67	4.00	4.00	4.20	

**Q14.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Disagree only as actual amounts cannot be altered until end of financial year, leaving schools out of pocket.
---

**Q15 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to continue with excluding a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) factor from the funding formula for 2014/15?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	4	2	0	0	7	51%
	% within phase	1.6%	6.6%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	11.5%	
Agree	Count	1	21	2	0	0	24	46%
	% within phase	1.6%	34.4%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	39.3%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	21	5	0	2	28	3%
	% within phase	.0%	34.4%	8.2%	.0%	3.3%	45.9%	
Disagree	Count	0	1	0	1	0	2	3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	3.3%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	3%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.60	3.67	2.00	3.00	3.59	

**Q15.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

No comments

**Q16 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to continue excluding pupil mobility as a factor from the funding formula for 2014/15?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	2	1	0	0	4	43%
	% within phase	1.6%	3.3%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
Agree	Count	1	17	4	0	0	22	38%
	% within phase	1.6%	27.9%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	36.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	17	3	1	2	23	20%
	% within phase	.0%	27.9%	4.9%	1.6%	3.3%	37.7%	
Disagree	Count	0	8	0	0	0	8	20%
	% within phase	.0%	13.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.1%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	3	1	0	0	4	6.6%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.15	3.44	3.00	3.00	3.23	

**Q16.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

As our town experiences a lot of mobility, I think each school should be assessed and if it is shown to have a high rate of mobility, this should be reflected accordingly.
<b>High Mobility</b>
If pupils have accessibility problems schools will need as much money as possible to help them, and ensure continued funding for school changes. Especially in light of reduced capital funding
in a growth area more children arrive outside the funding window, than leave, so the school is out of pocket for the rest of the year. In several cases highly mobile children arrive and leave outside the census and so the school support them, without any funding at all.
Our school had 34 new starters with us over one year, all of whom started after the beginning of September. This needs to be taken into consideration with regards to our funding.
Pupil mobility can have a big effect on needs especially when the children arriving at a school have significant educational difficulties or behaviour.
Pupil mobility continues to increase in the Dunstable area, with the result that parents move their children seemingly at will. A protocol has been devised at Streetfield to help pupils through the induction period, integrate them fully and monitor their progress. Last year, for example, some 24 pupils left Year 8 who did not start in Year 5. All this movement makes it difficult to set meaningful targets and reach them as the pupil cohort can vary significantly throughout the year. It is disappointing to note that pupil mobility is not considered an issue when it is clearly a factor in securing pupil progress and achievement.
Schools losing out on funding when traveller children switch schools mid year.

**Q17 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to continue funding the joint use arrangement?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1	28%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Agree	Count	1	11	3	0	1	16	69%
	% within phase	1.6%	18.0%	4.9%	.0%	1.6%	26.2%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	1	35	4	1	1	42	%
	% within phase	1.6%	57.4%	6.6%	1.6%	1.6%	68.9%	
Disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
No answer	Count	0	1	1	0	0	2	%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		3.50	3.24	3.63	3.00	3.50	3.31	

**Q17.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

No comments
-------------

**Q18 How far do you agree or disagree with a new rent factor for six CBC schools?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	2	0	0	0	2	34%
	% within phase	.0%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
Agree	Count	1	16	2	0	0	19	59%
	% within phase	1.6%	26.2%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	31.1%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	1	27	6	1	1	36	2%
	% within phase	1.6%	44.3%	9.8%	1.6%	1.6%	59.0%	
Disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
No answer	Count	0	1	1	0	1	3	4.9%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	1.6%	4.9%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		3.50	3.39	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.36	

**Q18.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

No comments

**Q19 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal not to include a new sparsity factor for 2014/15?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	54%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Agree	Count	2	24	4	1	1	32	34%
	% within phase	3.3%	39.3%	6.6%	1.6%	1.6%	52.5%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	17	3	0	1	21	10%
	% within phase	.0%	27.9%	4.9%	.0%	1.6%	34.4%	
Disagree	Count	0	3	1	0	0	4	3.3%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	1	0	0	2	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
No answer	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.00	3.46	3.11	4.00	3.50	3.43	

**Q19.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Many of our pupils travel some distance to attend this school.

Small rural schools have already been negatively affected by lost of small school funding, many may be just outside of the 'measure' but many parents still chose to send their child to a school a further distance than 2 miles

There are times when village schools have low numbers for a number of years and then increase for all sorts of reasons especially if on the county boundary. Schools could disappear and then be needed again.

**Q20 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to cap those schools that gain in order to fund the Minimum Funding Guarantee?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	1	6	4	1	0	12	77%
	% within phase	1.6%	9.8%	6.6%	1.6%	.0%	19.7%	
Agree	Count	1	30	4	0	0	35	57.4%
	% within phase	1.6%	49.2%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	57.4%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	7	0	0	2	9	15%
	% within phase	.0%	11.5%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	14.8%	
Disagree	Count	0	3	0	0	0	3	8%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.3%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.50	3.79	4.11	5.00	3.00	3.85	

**Q20.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Each school should manage its own finance.
How as 1.5% been arrived at? Last year it was 4.2%. Smaller schools benefit more and the bigger schools often located in larger towns and urban areas with a far different mix of children are disadvantaged.

**Q21 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to de-delegate Facilities Time?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	34%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Agree	Count	0	16	4	1	0	21	34.4%
	% within phase	.0%	26.2%	6.6%	1.6%	.0%	34.4%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	29	4	0	2	35	57%
	% within phase	.0%	47.5%	6.6%	.0%	3.3%	57.4%	
Disagree	Count	2	2	1	0	0	5	8.2%
	% within phase	3.3%	3.3%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		2.00	3.30	3.33	4.00	3.00	3.26	

**Q21.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

As we have no very 'active' union members to support
I'd rather be in control of all allocated funding
Union representation should be paid within HR services on an ad hoc basis. Some school may only be interested in this if they carry out bad HR practice in school resulting in disputes regularly
Unsure of what services this cover and if amount is justified



**Q22 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to de-delegate School Contingency?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	3	0	0	0	3	39%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%	
Agree	Count	1	16	4	0	0	21	34.4%
	% within phase	1.6%	26.2%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	34.4%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	25	3	0	2	30	49%
	% within phase	.0%	41.0%	4.9%	.0%	3.3%	49.2%	
Disagree	Count	1	2	2	1	0	6	11%
	% within phase	1.6%	3.3%	3.3%	1.6%	.0%	9.8%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		3.00	3.38	3.22	2.00	3.00	3.31	

**Q22.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

As we have no very 'active' union members,
I'd rather be in control of all allocated funding.
Unsure of what services this cover and if amount is justified
Schools Forum/LA should be able to use discretion on contingency

**Q23 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to retain centrally £1,000,000 for the purpose of the Growth Fund?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	4	0	0	0	4	62%
	% within phase	.0%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
Agree	Count	2	26	6	0	0	34	55.7%
	% within phase	3.3%	42.6%	9.8%	.0%	.0%	55.7%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	0	8	1	1	2	12	20%
	% within phase	.0%	13.1%	1.6%	1.6%	3.3%	19.7%	
Disagree	Count	0	5	1	0	0	6	11%
	% within phase	.0%	8.2%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	9.8%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.6%
	% within phase	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	
No answer	Count	0	3	1	0	0	4	6.6%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		4.00	3.61	3.63	3.00	3.00	3.60	

**Q23.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

Agree in principal with the need for the growth fund but feel £1,000,000 is excessive
Because of the adverse impact on the other schools centrally held funds belong in school budgets
We need the money now!

**Q24 How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal not to retain central funding for the purpose of Falling Rolls?**

		Nursery school	Primary	Secondary	Special	UTC and Free School	Total	Total Combined %
Strongly agree	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	41%
	% within phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	
Agree	Count	0	21	4	0	0	25	31%
	% within phase	.0%	34.4%	6.6%	.0%	.0%	41.0%	
Neither agree nor disagree	Count	1	16	1	0	1	19	20%
	% within phase	1.6%	26.2%	1.6%	.0%	1.6%	31.1%	
Disagree	Count	1	5	1	1	0	8	20%
	% within phase	1.6%	8.2%	1.6%	1.6%	.0%	13.1%	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	2	2	0	0	4	5
	% within phase	.0%	3.3%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	
No answer	Count	0	3	1	0	1	5	8.2%
	% within phase	.0%	4.9%	1.6%	.0%	1.6%	8.2%	
Total	Count	2	47	9	1	2	61	100.0%
	% within phase	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Mean score:		2.50	3.27	2.88	2.00	3.00	3.16	

**Q24.a If you disagree with this proposal please explain why.**

As this is always a possibility there should be central funding available should help in the short-term
Development of good staff is lost if redundancies have to be made.
Falling roles should be managed within a 3 year budget plan by all schools
Falling rolls is a concern for some schools and this should be addressed in funding reforms.
Funding should be retained to assist schools with falling rolls. However, it should only be used to help high performing schools.
Small rural schools often suffer from very small cohorts which affect future funding based on falling numbers
Support should be identified centrally and used in consultation with area/school
The destabilising impact of changing age ranges in the Dunstable area will have a detrimental effect upon many schools resulting in a budget shortfall - not of their making.
We always need to think to the future 25% extra primary places required in the next two years?

**Q25 Do you have any other comments about the proposals for sc...**

<p>An OFSTED outstanding rural school should be properly funded to ensure that all pupils within its area receive the best possible resources and ensure the best outcomes for our children. Schools should not be any more financially worse off than academies.</p>
<p>By 'replacing' deprivation funding with Pupil Premium, the funding is not being directed where it is needed most. Having lost £125,000 last year with the changes in deprivation calculations, our pupil numbers are set to increase even more over the course of the next four years, meaning that an additional teacher will need to be paid for in September 2014. Assuming that an NQT costs the school £27,529 and, according to the financial model supplied by CBC, our budget will be reduced by £19,576, this actually represents a total reduction of £47,105. While the Financial Model shows us as 1.4% reduction year on year, in reality my figures calculate us at 9.3%</p>
<p>Deprivation? If a school area has no deprivation at all according to IDACI and therefore receives no funding for this but does have children who are in this category they receive no help at all especially if they do not qualify for Free School Meals as is usual. SEN? IDACI and Pupil Premium do not help fund a school that has high levels of special needs but is not in an area of deprivation especially when parents choose the school because of high standards for SEN. Support for LAC? We have a child who has arrived from another county who was funded as LAC and FSM. They are now living with a relative who works so the child suddenly receives no extra funding what-so-ever LAC or Pupil Premium despite having significant behavioural and educational needs. We will not even receive any funding for 2 terms as the child started in September.</p>
<p>Growth fund is important for schools expanding and having to change their management structure to maintain performance. It should not be used by schools who have opted to change their structure.</p>
<p>Having prepared a balanced budget for the next 2 years it is going to be exceedingly difficult with just six months until the start of the next financial year to manage (for the second successive year) the massive drop in the anticipated budget allocation. Schools affected by these changes should be advised and supported to effectively manage this reduction without unduly impacting on their pupils' education. It cannot be right that the changes set in motion by other schools should be allowed to have such a detrimental impact. Once again pupils' life chances are being treated in a cavalier fashion.</p>
<p>I think it is imperative (and right) that schools that have changed their age range should receive funding for their new year groups during the year in which they start i.e. removing the lagged funding process. This would ensure that all of the children in Central Bedfordshire receive the best possible education as a result of appropriate staffing, resources etc. This would also support schools to maintain/improve standards. It would be unfair for identified groups of children to be educationally disadvantaged simply because they had remained at their school or moved to an alternative school.</p>
<p>I think that in the exceptional premises factors there should be some recognition of schools that have exceptional site costs for listed buildings.</p>
<p>Lancot's Governing Body are concerned about the level of funding for it's Specialist Provision. If the ring-fenced funding is AWPU based the concern is that funding levels will be reduced year-on-year. Any reduction in funding will negatively impact on staffing levels possibly resulting in a reduction of available pupil places. In 2015 when the national formula is introduced, will Provision funding be reduced further?</p>
<p>Much confusion remains over SEN/ Statementing/ High Needs Block funding</p>
<p>Must be a greater emphasis on disadvantaged children and those with behavioural needs as this has a huge impact on staffing and support in the classroom. It is so difficult to obtain a statement for really needy children but no financial support is given to schools. Our staff are really stretched when so many pupils can only function 1:1</p>
<p>My main purpose in responding to this consultation is to support the proposal for a rent factor, the lack of which has had an excessive effect on our budget at this school, and which is very unfair on us and our pupils. Attempting to compensate for this has also created a lot of work this financial year which I would hope not to have to repeat.</p>
<p>Section 17 states that schools will be expected to fund the first £6000 for high needs pupils. Is this for the total annual amount a school spends or for each child per year? This is not acceptable and should be changed. If a small school has more than one child with a statement this would have a serious impact on the schools budget.</p>
<p>Sufficient thought needs to be given to schools with rising rolls or age range changes so that they can provide for their pupils</p>
<p>The criteria for growth funding should be opened to include schools that are in areas of growth, but have improved and are growing due to parental preference.</p>
<p>This is a very small school and we obviously have concerns that if our roll decreases we will not be able to maintain staffing levels which would impact on standards. We believe that small schools have an important place in the community and supporting the children within it.</p>