

There were 88 responses to the consultation, 7 were duplicate submissions therefore eligible responses 81.

- The 81 are broken down as follows: - 70 Primary, 6 Secondary, 4 Special and 1 Trust

Question 1

If it is not affordable to fund all schools and academies at National Funding Formula levels, how should mitigation be actioned. Please select one of the two models.

Model 1 - Illustrates a shortfall of £2m with 0% Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG), with allowable decrease to both pupil factors and lump sum to make formula affordable.

Model 2 - Illustrates a shortfall of £2m with 0% Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG), introducing a gains cap set at the required level to make formula affordable.

Model 1	Model 2
42	39

Comments

- Spreads the load amongst the most schools (Model 1)
- The impact to our school budget is less and more affordable without making considerable changes to staffing (Model 1)
- Does this not depend on whether you are a small or large school to which one you pick? (Model 2)
- The spread of the un-affordability of model 1 is much fairer and, although it impacts more schools, the significance of the impact is reduced for the maximum loss (Model 1)
- It would be my preference to keep factors as close to the national funding formula as possible and that any move away from the national funding formula is spread as evenly as possible between schools (Model 1)
- It is surprising that each small school in the Kite Primary Federation is benefitted by a different funding model (Model 1)
- Neither is an ideal situation for the education of our children in Nottinghamshire (Model 1)
- Major impacts on funding directly linked to under funding for SEND pupils in receipt of funding (Model 1)
- I will always try to ensure the school has the most money to spend (Model 1)

Are you a maintained school?

Yes – maintained school	No – not a maintained school
42	39

Question 2

Do you agree to the de-delegation of the following in 2025 to 2026?

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

Free schools' meals eligibility assessment

Yes	No	Not Sure
27	4	11

Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners

Yes	No	Not Sure
24	6	12

Contingency for crisis communications

Yes	No	Not Sure
20	10	12

Trade Union Facilities

Yes	No	Not Sure
19	12	11

School Improvement

Yes	No	Not Sure
25	6	11

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

- All necessary
- I feel a model of a gains cap is unfair, particularly for schools who have made attempts to move out from a deficit budget.
- Information regarding SEND funding for the year would be very useful as we currently have a significant number of children with Additional needs and have been declined HLN funding, this means that we are supporting children via the school budget - this is unsustainable.
- This was discussed and agreed at the Governors Committee meeting on 26.11.2024.
- It would be our preference to keep factors as close to the national funding formula as possible and that any move away from the national funding formula is spread as evenly as possible between schools.
- "SEND is clearly impacting on our school and many others, with more children requiring 1:1 for their own needs and the (safety) of other children and staff. A huge consideration going forwards is the investment in IT - I don't just mean Hardware but all the cybersafe / filtering & monitoring / extra costs. We have calculated the £25k year on year investment would manage our whole school IT requirements going forwards (hardware and wraparound support). A huge fear is that more and more schools could be susceptible to cyber-attacks & virus, etc without investment ring-fenced for IT.