

Schools Consultation November 2019 - Comments from email responses

Q1			Q2			Q3		
Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments
1			1		If any school is significantly below the NFF it should be treated as a special case to bring funding in line as soon as possible. We need to recognise that each school caters for students so a statistical exercise need to records schools are organisations not just a datum point.	1		Capping of gains need to be minimised for those schools below the NFF to bring them into line as quickly as possible. This is not covered by the wording which states 'take them below'. If a school is significantly above the NFF now they have had several years of notice that this is to end and so capping gains to continue this reduction to NFF should be absolutely minimal to enable other schools to meet the NFF as soon as possible.
1		The minimum per pupil funding per the NFF should be used with other factors being scaled in the remainder of the formula	1		NFF criteria have been widely known for a number of years and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF was valid, but is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due affordability. The aim of the NFF is undermined by not implementing it fully.	1		As with question 2, the principles of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it ensures that schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due to a capping mechanism to fund other schools' MFG. To continue to maintain caps for so long continues to penalise previously underfunded schools, who have greatly suffered by not receiving the full NFF levels over the last three years.
1			1			1		This is the fairest outcome for all schools
1		As we understand it, the DfE expects LAs to use the national minimum per pupil funding levels in their own formulae. So yes, we strongly agree that the minimum funding level per pupil should be adopted and that other factors should be scaled for the rest of the formula.	1		We are several years in to to the use of the NFF. We have all had time to prepare and plan for this and a number of schools have been underfunded for a long time. The NFF needs to be fully implemented in line with DfE expectations referred to above.	1		We have known about the NFF and MFG for a number of years. Schools which gain from the NFF should not lose out for even longer still because of capping of their gains. Those schools which have lost out previously because the NFF has not been fully implemented will miss out further and this is not acceptable.

Schools Consultation November 2019 - Comments from email responses								
Q1			Q2			Q3		
Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments
1		The latest DFE guidance here states:"As a first step towards hardening the formula, from 2020-21 we will make it compulsory for local authorities to use the national minimum per pupil funding levels in their own funding formulae." Therefore YES - the minimum per pupil funding per the NFF should be used with other factors being scaled in the remainder of the formula.			The principles of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due affordability. The principle of the National Funding Formula is undermined by not implementing it fully.		1	As with question 2, the principles of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The rgument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due to a capping echanism to fund other schools' MFG. To maintain caps after a long period of time to adjust pending penalises previously underfunded schools, who have compromised on the full implementation of the NFF over the last three years.

Schools Consultation November 2019 - Comments from email responses								
Q1			Q2			Q3		
Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments
1		As the wording suggests, the requirement is that “minimum per-pupil funding rates will rise from £3,500 to £3,750 at primary level and from £4,800 to £5,000 at secondary. The primary funding rate will then rise again to £4,000 in 2021-22.” There is no discretion for Bucks to not adopt the MPPF rates (there has been a consultation on some of the technical aspects of this, eg for schools with both primary and secondary aged year groups, but no consultation on the principle). The scaling of the other factors is necessary if the money received by Bucks is less than the NFF allocations for all schools. To understand the effect of this you really need to see indicative allocations to individual schools. The DfE guidance says:11. However, local authorities must continue to engage in open and transparent consultation with all maintained schools and academies in their area, as well as with their schools forums, about any proposed changes to the local funding formula including the principles adopted and any movement of funds between blocks. 12. Any consultation should include a demonstration of the effect of modelling such changes on individual maintained schools and academies. Bucks should have had the indicative allocations in October.	1		Cautious agreement – the phrase in bold suggests there is discretion about what level to apply for the MFG, so some narrative is needed here to understand the possibilities. Note that the guidance says: “ <i>Local authorities will have the freedom to set the MFG in local formulae between +0.5% and +1.84% per pupil</i> ”.	1		Yes, what alternatives are there and what does the modelling show us?
	1	It does not cost the same to educate all pupils and there should be more towards those with the highest need		1	Should be as per the principle minimum funding guarantee to protect from excessive year on year changes	1		See comments on b about the costs related to need
1			1		It is vital that small schools are protected and remain viable. No school should receive less than they did last financial year and indeed we expect to benefit from any increased funding that may arise following the election.	1		With the two tier education system caused by Grammar schools in Bucks, funding should be capped as they are shown to have the capacity to generate large sums from parents and grant funding by dint of them having resources to employ highly qualified fund raisers.

Schools Consultation November 2019 - Comments from email responses									
Q1			Q2			Q3			
Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	
1		For far too long some schools in Buckinghamshire have been left severely underfunded and a minimum per pupil funding is essential to redress this.	1		If this (use of MFG) is compulsory then agree that this is the fairest way to do it. If it is not compulsory then I would argue that at some point the balance must be properly redressed and consistently applying MFG only prolongs the difficulty which has been faced for many years by underfunded schools.		1	As above. Apply the formula without favour and scale for affordability.	
1		The per pupil funding level is the most important factor	1		With no minimum funding guarantee the reductions can be too difficult for schools to cope with	1		Need to cap if you want a minimum funding guarantee	
1		The latest DfE guidance states: "As a first step towards hardening the formula, from 2020-21 we will make it compulsory for local authorities to use the national minimum per pupil funding levels in their own funding formulae." We strongly believe that this should be the case so that the minimum per pupil funding per the NFF is used with other factors being scaled in the remainder of the formula.	1		The principles and concept of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded. The principle of the National Funding Formula is undermined through the failure, after many years of forewarning, to fully implement it.	1		As with question 2, the principles of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due to a capping mechanism to fund other schools' MFG. We should not accept further prevarication.	
1		Agree in line with DfE guidance document	1		The debate re NFF has been in all schools' minds for some time now. Several schools have been massively underfunded and have been waiting for the implementation of the NFF to put right this wrong. We were happy to go with the MFG in previous years, but now wish to have our own budget protected	1		As per the answer to Q3, it is unfair on previously particularly underfunded schools to continue to compromise on the full implementation of the NFF	

Schools Consultation November 2019 - Comments from email responses								
Q1			Q2			Q3		
Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments	Agree	Disagree	Comments
1		The latest DFE guidance states: "As a first step towards hardening the formula, from 2020-21 we will make it compulsory for local authorities to use the national minimum per pupil funding levels in their own funding formulae." Therefore YES - the minimum per pupil funding per the NFF should be used with other factors being scaled in the remainder of the formula.			The principles of the national funding formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. As schools have had significant time to prepare for changes, the argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is no longer as relevant. This is particularly important if schools that have been underfunded for years, continue to be underfunded due affordability. The principle of the National Funding Formula is undermined			As with question 2, the principles of the National Funding Formula have been known for many years now and schools should have been planning their budgets based on the published factors. as schools have had significant time to prepare for changes. The argument of having a MFG in the early years of the introduction of the NFF is therefore no longer as relevant. This is particularly important if it prevents schools that have been underfunded for years, continuing to be underfunded due to a capping mechanism to fund other schools' MFG. To maintain caps would continue to penalise previously underfunded schools, who have had to compromise over the last three years.
			1		by not implementing it fully.		1	