










Appendix 3 – Cambridgeshire Mainstream School Funding Arrangements 2022-23 - Consultation Responses




1. Which best describes the organisation you are representing in your consultation response?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Individual maintained school		76.60%	36
2	Individual academy school		6.38%	3
3	Academy Trust or other (please specify):		17.02%	8
			answered	47
			skipped	0

2. Which of the following best describes your position/role?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Headteacher		63.83%	30
2	Governor		10.64%	5
3	CEO		0.00%	0
4	Finance staff		14.89%	7
5	Parent		0.00%	0
6	Other (please specify):		10.64%	5
			answered	47
			skipped	0

3. Schools Funding Formula

5. Do you agree that the Cambridgeshire funding formula unit values for 2022-23 should be aligned with the national funding formula rates?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		91.49%	43
2	No		0.00%	0
3	Not Sure		8.51%	4
			answered	47
			skipped	0
If you do not agree, please explain why: (1)				
1	Movement to national funding formula should be made as soon as possible			

6. Do you support the proposal to apply the distance taper to the sparsity factor to maximise the number of schools who qualify for additional funding?




Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		78.72%	37
2	No		10.64%	5
3	Not Sure		10.64%	5
			answered	47
			skipped	0

If you do not agree, please explain why: (4)

- 1 I do not believe that such schools require the additional financial support - what is the financial rational for the additional payments?
- 2 Schools in more affluent suburbs are set to benefit at the detriment of the more deprived area schools.
- 3 Schools in more affluent suburbs are set to benefit at the detriment of the more deprived area schools.
- 4 This would just create an additional reduction in funds available to all schools via the other formula factors by using this taper

4. High Needs Block

7. Do you support the proposed transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for the purpose of invest to save projects to reduce the continuing increasing pressures within this area?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		51.06%	24
2	No		36.17%	17
3	Not Sure		12.77%	6
			answered	47
			skipped	0

If you do not agree, please explain why: (18)



- 1 It is the role of councillors to secure the funding from government that the county needs and not for schools to financial support the counties financial position.
- 2 I also feel that if the steps taken begin to result in a higher % of students with EHCPs remaining in mainstream provision, a higher transfer than 0.5% should be considered going forward.
- 3 I believe that by transferring funds from the Schools to HNB, the government get the wrong impression and believe that they are providing enough funds for this area.
- 4 Need a true reflection of how much this block is costing. Whilst it is so difficult to get a special school place this is increasing costs to school which is being taken from us - government need to act and pay more into this block.
- 5 The [REDACTED] has welcomed statements made by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) over recent times with regards to the necessity to direct financial resources to where the educational need is greatest. We notice that [REDACTED] along with the other areas in the highest areas of

7. Do you support the proposed transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block for the purpose of invest to save projects to reduce the continuing increasing pressures within this area?

- | | |
|----|---|
| | deprivation in Cambridgeshire whereas the schools in the more affluent areas are again contributing least to this. Reducing the MFG would be a fairer method to fund this. |
| 6 | I feel strongly that the DfE will not fully appreciate the gravitas of this situation if we use schools funding to support the high needs block. School budgets are not stretching to support the notional SEND elements. School support is impossible at the moment. Using catch up moneys and covid grants is jsut smoke and mirrors- sorry you asked! |
| 7 | Feel the impact on schools block will be negative for all. Also want the DfE to acknowledge the level of funding for high needs in Cambs is inadequate and this won't happen if schools block helps to meet the need. |
| 8 | We would have supported a 0.5% transfer if some part of it was to offset the HN Budget deficit. This project seems to require a substantial amount of funding and, despite having listened to the presentation, we fail to see that pushing more work to the schools and expecting additional workloads for Senco's is conducive to also forfeiting some of our budget. |
| 9 | It is an insufficient amount to make significant inroads to the deficit/increasing costs. Requires a more structured and appropriate response to tackle the problem as has been proposed. |
| 10 | It will benefit us financially if we do not, but I understand as a County we need to meet need. I am sure you will continue to try and recoup some of the deficit through government. If money is being transferred, it must be used to effectively meet need and the improvements promised in the recent briefings must happen swiftly and aaspirationally. |
| 11 | Although this would helps support the introduction of a more efficient way of providing support to SEN pupils, it would reduce the budget available to our school by £5k which is almost equivalent to the £6k initial costs that schools are required to fund for new EHCPS. |
| 12 | it would reduce the budget available to our school by £5,000. This is almost equivalent to the £6,000 initial cost to a school for the funding of a new EHCP. |
| 13 | We welcome the transformation plan being proposed and support the principle of "spend to save". However we are opposed to a transfer out of the Schools Block as we do not believe there is sufficient money within the Schools Block to support this. |
| 14 | The [REDACTED] has welcomed statements made by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) over recent times with regards to the necessity to direct financial resources to where the educational need is greatest. We notice that [REDACTED] along with the other areas in the highest areas of deprivation in Cambridgeshire whereas the schools in the more affluent areas are again contributing least to this. Reducing the MFG would be a fairer method to fund this. |
| 15 | The current model is not supportive enough as it is and adding more funding to a failing model is not the answer |
| 16 | Any transfer of funds will simply masks the real issues of inadequate funding and could give the impression that schools have 'excess funding' which could be redirected without impacting on provision for all children |
| 17 | There doesn't not appear to be a clear management strategy to manage this deficit as there has been considerable increase in High Needs funding to LAs in recent years and regular transfer of funds to support the high needs block, plus an increase in funding from central government. The most deprived areas would be impacted negatively the most by this proposal and thus further disadvantaging the children living in these areas. |
| 18 | Concerns over the impact this may have on small schools. |

5. Overall Affordability




8. If overall affordability allows do you support the approach of scaling up the NFF unit values by applying a weighting of between 1 and 1.01284 to balance to the available Schools Block distribution total?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		57.45%	27
2	No		0.00%	0
3	Not Sure		42.55%	20
			answered	47
			skipped	0

If you do not agree, please explain why: (5)

- 1 More info and illustration please
- 2 There is a lack of clarity regarding the calculation - in financial terms what is the mismatch between the required / actual funding to be received that requires the alteration of the weighing factor.
- 3 The imbalance created by the High Needs and Sparsity Factor adjustments needs to be addressed first.
- 4 This depends on the impact on our school and on all other schools.
- 5 Yes, but the imbalance created by the High Needs and Sparsity Factor adjustments needs to be addressed first.

9. If there are overall affordability issues due to growth, cost of protection or agreed block transfers do you support the use of a funding cap and/or the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) being set at lower than the maximum allowable 2.0%?(note the funding cap restricts the amount of any funding gains of those schools above the level at which the funding cap is set)

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		44.68%	21
2	No		19.15%	9
3	Not Sure		36.17%	17
			answered	47
			skipped	0

If you do not agree, please explain why: (9)

- 1 Reducing the MFG to bring schools more in line with the NFF is the fairest method. We do not agree that a funding cap should be used to balance the cost of the formula. The funding cap applied in previous years has already placed a cumulative and aggregate disadvantage on schools with disadvantaged cohorts and therefore there is a double (or triple disadvantage.)
- 2 NFF is designed to provide funding for those schools that most need it and a funding cap would restrict some schools from receiving the funding they deserve. Happy for lower maximum level to MFG.
- 3 This depends on the impact on our school and on all other schools.
- 4 We do not support the MFG being set lower than the maximum allowable 2.0%. However, we would not be adverse to the use of a funding cap.

9. If there are overall affordability issues due to growth, cost of protection or agreed block transfers do you support the use of a funding cap and/or the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) being set at lower than the maximum allowable 2.0%?(note the funding cap restricts the amount of any funding gains of those schools above the level at which the funding cap is set)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 5 | We do support the use of a funding cap but we do not support the MFG being set any lower. |
| 6 | I do not support the MFG being set lower than the maximum allowable 2.0% but the use of a funding cap would be acceptable. |
| 7 | Reducing the MFG to bring schools more in line with the NFF is the fairest method. We do not agree that a funding cap should be used to balance the cost of the formula. The funding cap applied in previous years has already placed a cumulative and aggregate disadvantage on schools with disadvantaged cohorts and therefore there is a double (or triple disadvantage.) |
| 8 | There should not be a reduction in the funding cap. This will impact negatively on schools in deprived areas and therefore children who live in these areas. |
| 9 | Small schools would struggle even further than they already are. |

6. De-delegations - Maintained Primary Schools Only

10. Maintained schools are asked to show their support for the continuation of the following de-delegation arrangements:

Answer Choices	Yes	No	Not Sure	Response Total
Primary Contingency Scheme	79.49% 31	2.56% 1	17.95% 7	39
Free School Meal Eligibility	89.74% 35	2.56% 1	7.69% 3	39
Maternity Cover	84.62% 33	2.56% 1	12.82% 5	39
Trade Union Facilities Time	66.67% 26	7.69% 3	25.64% 10	39
			answered	39
			skipped	8