









Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

School Funding Arrangements 2021-22




1. Which best describes the organisation you are representing in your consultation response?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Individual maintained school		56.25%	45
2	Individual academy school		22.50%	18
3	Academy Trust or other (please specify):		21.25%	17

2. Which of the following best describes your position/role?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Headteacher		62.50%	50
2	Governor		17.50%	14
3	CEO		1.25%	1
4	Finance staff		11.25%	9
5	Parent		0.00%	0
6	Other (please specify):		7.50%	6




5. Do you agree that the Cambridgeshire funding formula unit values for 2021-22 should be aligned with the national funding formula rates?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		91.25%	73
2	No		1.25%	1
3	Not Sure		7.50%	6

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

1	I believe that that our LA funding should be in excess of the NFF to support historic underfunding. You only need to visit schools in other counties to see the difference.
2	Movement to the national funding formula should be made as soon as possible
3	Yes move to National funding as soon as possible
4	Yes and the move to this formula should happen as soon as possible.
5	It makes sense to me to continue the trend especially if, as you say, there is a likelihood in due course that schools will be hard-aligned to the NFF figure

6. Do you support the transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to support the increasing pressures within this area?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		30.00%	24
2	No		62.50%	50
3	Not Sure		7.50%	6

If you do not agree, please explain why: (49)

1	Historic underfunding of the High Needs block in Cambridgeshire should not be subsidised by a transfer from our historically underfunded mainstream schools. This masks the underfunding issue for the High Needs block which is a national picture. This year particularly, schools leaders will have to work hard to ensure that school budgets remain positive, especially those like us, who run their own wrap around care and preschool. Things are incredibly precarious.
2	xxxxxx 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. Therefore, we would welcome a more imaginative response to the reduction in the high needs deficit with the virement of funds from other non-education 'pots' held by CCC in line with the precedent set by other Local Authorities (LA) in this position.
3	Not if the combination of the government funding formula for the year, and the transfer means that certain schools end up with less money coming in than they did the previous year. A simple reduction in budget across the board will have a greater impact on some schools than others and it seems that there is no capacity to take the impact on individual schools into consideration.
4	xxxxxx 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. Therefore, we would welcome a more imaginative response to the reduction in the high needs deficit with the virement of funds from other non-education 'pots' held by CCC in line with the precedent set by other Local Authorities (LA) in this position.
5	Central government should be properly and effectively funding children with Higher Needs across this country. Moving money from the Central Schools Block masks the true shortfall across the nation. All LAs should be requesting additional support from the DfE so that they have a full understanding of the plight that faces this sector.
6	If we pay this however small it will not make a huge difference and central Gov will see that we are softening! We didn't pay it last year to make a point to central Gov.
7	High Needs should be correctly and fully funded nationally. It is not right that there should be a Top Slicing from main stream school funding.
8	We have welcomed statements from CCC in the past re direct financial resources to where educational need is higher. We would welcome a more imaginative response to the reduction in the high needs deficit with the funds from other non-education ""pots"" held by CCC in line with the precedent set by other LAs in this position.
9	We believe that HN Funding should be funded appropriately by central government. Any transfer from the Schools Block will barely make a dint in the vacuum of funding, will put individual schools under more funding pressure and will 'hide' the true extent of the funding gap.
10	In transferring from the Schools Block we are failing to address the root cause of the problem. We need to live within our means from the budget as it stands. More centrally though, the single biggest issue for me is the unintended consequence of the transfer in that it will be directed solely towards the schools serving the most disadvantaged areas of the county. It is these areas which are struggling financially and where recruitment is more challenging and facilities worse. I would support an even share of the costs when partnered with a clear plan to reduce spending in the medium term. I understand the LA view that the money has to come from somewhere and that they are unable to pull the rabbit from the hat. However, this model effectively places some schools in a position of needing to further cut services which will mean an increase in the gap between less and more advantaged localities, reflected in growing PP divergence.
11	I do believe, however, that the government should have given more money to this pot originally. Clearly this area of education has historically been grossly underfunded.

6. Do you support the transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to support the increasing pressures within this area?

		Response Percent	Response Total
12	Schools already have had additional financial burdens with Covid 19. Plus our school has a high number of EHCP children which is not fully funded. The amount that will be paid off is not significant enough to warrant the transfer.		
13	While the High Needs deficit is regrettable, the reality is that budgets continue to be tight. The projected rise in per-pupil income will be almost entirely offset by the mandatory pay rises for staff (which we fully support). As a school we have a (relative to our size) large number of SEND pupils who are not classified as EHCP and so additional provision for them to benefit fully from the curriculum eats further into our budget. Furthermore, early baselining at our school suggests that there are substantial gaps in pupil's progress due to COVID lockdowns and the £120 per pupil provided to bridge that gap will not be sufficient - this also adds pressure to our budget.		
14	<p>We believe that a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block will simply result in issues occurring elsewhere in the education system in time and not resolve the issue beyond the very short term. Although we do agree that the current deficit position is an issue, we suggest increasing pressure should be placed on the DfE to update the data being used to generate the HNB funding allocation.</p> <p>We also propose that those schools and academies with relatively significant carry forward balances (e.g. assessed using c/f as a percentage of annual expenditure), should be reviewed and in cases where the carry forward is deemed excessive then this should be reclaimed and used to contribute to the HNB deficit.</p> <p>If due to consensus, or through an overriding decision by the LA this transfer from SB to HNB does go ahead, we would like to note that 0.5% should be the limit of the transfer.</p>		
15	I have 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. Therefore, we would welcome a more imaginative response to the reduction in the high needs deficit with the virement of funds from other non-education 'pots' held by CCC in line with the precedent set by other Local Authorities (LA) in this position.		
16	Unsustainable model. Masks issues around SEN funding		
17	The funding required for this block has been predictable changes to the CoP in 2014 presumably led to the increased cost in funding plans to age 25. Schools are already hard pressed due to being in a low funded authority with too few special schools of our own to meet needs.		
18	As last year, I think suitable funding streams need to be set up by central government, transferring money masks the issues. I don't see how individual schools will benefit from this transfer.		
19	<p>xxxxxx supports a very challenging group of pupils, with high underlying SEND levels and high EAL. In particular, we believe that our school supports a number of Children with challenging SEND needs but who do not have EHCPs and so no additional funding is received. We are preventing a number of children needing to go into special provision, and it is a key part of our ethos to support this children as part of the community. But being a small school we do not have the capacity to drive EHCPs and therefore funding that some bigger schools have, and we have a disproportionate amount of lower-level SEND need. Cherry Hinton therefore requires as much general funding as possible through the formula, as that is enabling us to continue to support our SEND children, even those without an EHCP, as part of the local community. If general funding is transferred to the high needs block, our budget will stand still. We are unlikely to see much of that back in additional EHCP funding and therefore it would severely jeopardise our ability to maintain the level of SEND support that we pride ourselves on, and that is of great benefit to the school system of the county.</p> <p>This is compounded by high levels of EAL in this school, which drives up cost and is only funded through the normal formula funding – anything removed from the budget to the high needs block will reduce our capacity to meet the needs of EAL pupils.</p> <p>There is also not a clear plan to address the whole high needs deficit, without which any transfer from the schools block would be wasted.</p>		
20	Additional funding should be sought from the DfE rather than taken from the schools block as we are also under significant pressure at individual school level.		
21	Our small school's budget plan is pared down as much as possible already and we cannot afford less funding		
22	This will adversely affect the school budget position which is already tight.		

6. Do you support the transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to support the increasing pressures within this area?

		Response Percent	Response Total
23	We should press for adequate funding from central Government, and we should reflect HN funding on the basis of the budget set.		
24	We should lobby the central government for sustainable funding matched to actual need. High Needs funding should reflect the set budget and the deficit will then demonstrate the actual position and chronic need for better funding.		
25	This problem is common to many LAs, because the national funding for High Needs is not adequate. Using funding from the Schools' Block will only mask these inadequacies temporarily, and put even more pressure on already very tight individual schools' budgets.		
26	This would have a detrimental impact on the already tight but balanced budget for our small school, to the detriment of our pupils.		
27	This would have a significant impact on the overall budget of the school 2021-22 and being able to provide the high quality educational provision within school.		
28	Any transfer from the schools block to the high needs block is really an exercise in re-arranging deckchairs. It is unlikely that the government will approve a transfer of over 0.5% and, even if it were to do so, it is only when there is a fundamental and realistic increase in high needs funding that the overspend in the high needs block will be resolved.		
29	We do not feel able to answer this question as all scenarios are equal in our context		
30	The schools block cannot sustain further dilution which reduce the overall funding which is being impacted upon by increases in min per pupil funding levels and the dilution this has on deprivation and prior attainment funding elements		
31	The schools block cannot sustain further dilution which reduce the overall funding which is being impacted upon by increases in min per pupil funding levels and the dilution this has on deprivation and prior attainment funding elements		
32	schools will be hit twice if the LA also reduce top up funding for EHCPs by 10%. I know of schools who already do not have enough TAs to manage individual needs safely - transferring more from schools may reduce the deficit but does not really reduce the problem of high needs expenditure - it masks it in fact.		
33	As per last year my feeling is that we should press for adequate funding from central government for this area.		
34	I think there is a great deal of wastage in the system and that the structure needs looking at.		
35	The schools' block cannot sustain further dilution which reduce the overall funding.		
36	the schools block cannot sustain further dilution which reduces the overall funding which is being impacted upon by increases in min per pupil funding levels and the dilution this has on deprivation and prior attainment funding elements		
37	As last year, we find it impossible to ask current and future children to sacrifice their current learning because of decisions made in the past. We also feel it is rather cheap for the government, if you are correct in your notes, to change the rules about where deficits can be made up from well after the incurring of such deficits. In the same vein, we do not believe that the deficit should be (partly) made up from the reduction of the top-up levels for EHCPs - that would hit small schools hard who may have a greater proportion of EHCPs as they are seen as schools where individual students may get more personalised care		
38	Although I feel the money is needed in the High Needs Blocks, schools are still having to support high needs children who should be within that provision but there is no provision or support for these children in their current settings. Therefore we need the funding to support those children who do not meet the high criteria or provision is simply not there. If you could provide evidence that the High Needs Block can meet the needs of the High Needs children that are still in mainstream schools, I would be happy to support the transfer of funding. However, I feel the funding, if removed from schools funding, will only clear the deficit and not provide additional provision or support for those who still require it and continue to remain in mainstream education.		
39	The schools block cannot sustain further dilution which reduce the overall funding which is being impacted upon by increases in min per pupil funding levels and the dilution this has on deprivation and prior attainment funding elements		


6. Do you support the transfer of funding from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to support the increasing pressures within this area?

		Response Percent	Response Total
40	Because this will be to the detriment of the schools'. The reduction in funding combined with escalating costs, and the prospect of reduced high needs top-up funding, will prove unmanageable for our schools. As it is, the high needs top-up funding that is equivalent to £11.66 per hour already fails to cover the cost to the school of a Teaching Assistant on the lowest point on the support staff pay scale (including on-costs). For schools with high numbers of SEN and EHCPs, there is already no way to deliver a balanced budget and provide the number of hours of support prescribed in the EHCP.		
41	I cannot support any reduced funding to my school as that would have a devastating impact on the school. As a small school we already do not have enough money to cover our costs. As money attached to EHCPs is going to be cut regardless of any transfer of funding, I cannot operate on a lower budget.		
42	1) As last year, I think that transferring money in this way disguises the scale of the underfunding of high needs nationally and locally. This needs to be laid bare to support a proper campaign for this to be funded adequately. 2) Transferring money risks redundancies in schools which are most likely to be support staff and therefore most likely to hit children with higher needs most directly. 3) There seems little point transferring a ""compromise"" amount that leaves everyone still facing significant difficulties. Better to stick to the principal of the decision made last year, especially given that nothing has changed (beyond covid etc). 4) Some schools are hit extraordinarily hard by the proposed transfers. While the hit is to their increase in per pupil funding, that increase will be essential to meet other rising costs. 5) I am aware that a number of schools in my area have falling rolls given that a lot of children have left the country. This may be true in other areas too. This also is not yet captured in the modelled figures which were based on last year's census. That also needs to be examined.		
43	Small schools are struggling to provide for the needs of an ECHP child set by the Statutory Team from a basic schools budget.		
44	We should reflect High Needs Funding on the basis of the budget set and press for adequate central funding.		
45	There is a real danger that any transfer masks the degree to which inadequate funding for SEND is impacting on schools and our most vulnerable children. Any transfer could not be used to improve services for these pupils but go directly back to the government to address the growing deficit .		
46	It is better for schools to receive the funds and be able to use them to respond to local need.		
47	Although I sympathise greatly with the immense pressures on the High Needs Block, the school has been advised that the best scenario is for the full amount of the 'Per Pupil' figure to be awarded to the school. I feel the Government has a duty of care to all children, especially all vulnerable, PP and High Needs groups. Early interventions and solutions to the needs of these groups are very cost effective and should help alleviate later costs of Social Services, NHS, Police and Welfare services and many more. The support that is required for all children should be funded at the appropriate level, as investment in children is an investment in the future. Therefore, I would support the LA in their efforts to bridge the HNB deficit by lobbying the Government directly.		
48	The transfer amount is such a small amount in comparison to overspend a more radical solution is required. Given cuts that will be needed - reduction in EHCP etc. school budgets will require the maximum amount. COVID-19 also makes additional pressures on school budgets.		
49	The impact on xxxxx would make it unmanageable for us to budget going forwards. The loss in income would have a significant impact on the xxxxx regardless of which model is applied.		




7. If "Yes", at what level do you think the transfer should be:

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	0.5% (£1.9m)	<div></div>	52.94%	18
2	1.0% (£3.8m)	<div></div>	17.65%	6

7. If "Yes", at what level do you think the transfer should be:

			Response Percent	Response Total
3	Other (please specify):		29.41%	10

8. If there are overall affordability issues due to growth, cost of protection or agreed block transfers do you support the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) being set at lower than the maximum allowable 2.0%?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		41.25%	33
2	No		40.00%	32
3	Not Sure		18.75%	15

If you do not agree, please explain why: (29)

1	The figures provided do not show a projection for the future e.g. what is the impact of growth on funding - here at xxxxx we are growing rapidly but the figures on the impact on funding has not been described.
2	As a growing school, I understand the needs here but under the current pandemic circumstances I believe that there will be lower numbers of school moves across the county and therefore the need to fund new and growing schools will be minimal this year.
3	Should a transfer need to be made from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, we do not agree that this transfer should happen, then the Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to the NFF as soon as possible.
4	Should a transfer need to be made from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, we do not agree that this transfer should happen, then the Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to the NFF as soon as possible.
5	Because this school is subject to the Mandatory MPPL, any reduction would not impact on this school. It is therefore inappropriate to indicate a YES to this question.
6	should a transfer need to be made from the schools block to the high needs block we do not agree the transfer should happen, then the Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to NFF as soon as possible.
7	There are too many pressures on the school budget due to Covid, increased salaries etc.
8	We believe it is illogical to penalise stable or falling-roll schools in order to support infrastructural investment for growing schools. Given the geographical nature of the region, it would make more sense to maintain funding broadly at the minimum levels and encourage or incentivise growing schools to work with those that are stable so that the pre-invested benefits can be shared across a broader group of children.
9	I do not agree that this transfer should happen. The Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to the NFF as soon as possible.
10	School budgets already impacted by loss of income streams relating to Covid
11	Central Governments need to see the impact of failing to fund a growing region. Financially impairing everyone else to support this is an unfair solution.
12	Schools cannot improve and develop with less than the minimum funding guarantee.
13	xxxxxx is above the minimum per pupil level, and so without MFG at 2% it is not clear that the school will see even an inflationary increase.
14	Our small school needs maximum protection




8. If there are overall affordability issues due to growth, cost of protection or agreed block transfers do you support the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) being set at lower than the maximum allowable 2.0%?

		Response Percent	Response Total
15	This will adversely affect the school budget position which is already tight.		
16	If it means slightly spreading the cost/burden more evenly.		
17	As a small school and as we have lower than expected numbers going forward next financial year, we need this minimum increase in funding. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/901889/FINAL_2021-22_NFF_Policy_Document_MB.pdf ""Additional funding for small and remote schools will increase in 2021-22, with primary schools attracting up to £45,000, compared to £26,000 previously, as a first step towards expanding the support the NFF provides for such schools from 2022-23""		
18	Schools suffering from reductions as a result of reducing deprivation and prior attainment funding need as much protection of pupil led funding as possible		
19	Schools suffering from reductions as a result of reducing deprivation and prior attainment funding need as much protection of pupil led funding as possible		
20	Schools are suffering from reduction as a result of reducing deprivation and prior attainment funding need and therefore needs as much protection of pupil led funding as possible.		
21	Schools suffering from reduction as a result of reducing deprivation and prior attainment funding need as much protection of pupil led funding as possible		
22	As above, small schools need to make their case for increases to be as large as possible especially when rolls are falling. However, we would thoroughly support a more tailored response where MFGs were reduced for schools with large surpluses carried over or reduced for secondary schools or larger primaries where the annual increase through the MFG may be less significant in the overall budget		
23	Budget restraints and additional capital costs to maintain an older building. To enable to continual development and progress of the school to ensure we are a good school and begin to move beyond that.		
24	Schools suffering from reductions as a result of reducing deprivation and prior attainment funding need as much protection of pupil led funding as possible		
25	It has been challenging to set balanced budgets in 20/21. With rising costs and the challenges of supporting children with SEN, families experiencing unprecedented hardship, absorbing the costs (and loss of income) relating to Covid-19 (including supporting students to catch-up) and implementing the Government approved staff pay increases, this will be even more of an issue in 21/22.		
26	This is almost certainly going to be necessary, but I would want to see detailed modelling based on current October census to see what level the MFG should be and how it interacts with a possible funding cap.		
27	This is necessary to cover fixed/inflexible costs.		
28	Growth has a real consequence to schools and this needs to be recognised - it will not help school place availability if there are not the resources.		
29	As costs are rising exponentially and Teacher retention is a great problem, I feel that an annual increase of 2% in a school budget is the absolute minimum that can be considered at this time. School staff feel underpaid, undervalued and are struggling with diminishing resources compared to rising expectations and standards. They are almost without exception dedicated to the pupils and need the appropriate finance to ensure the best outcomes for them as well as for their own wellbeing.		




9. If "Yes", what is the minimum the MFG should be set at?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	0.5%		23.81%	10
2	1.0%		14.29%	6

9. If "Yes", what is the minimum the MFG should be set at?

			Response Percent	Response Total
3	1.5%		16.67%	7
4	Not Sure		23.81%	10
5	Other % (please specify):		21.43%	9
Other % (please specify): (9)				
1	Should a transfer need to be made from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, we do not agree that this transfer should happen, then the Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to the NFF as soon as possible.			
2	Difficult to say without knowing the impact of these differing rates			
3	see question 4			
4	0%			
5	see question above			
6	The figure which results in the most even share of the financial pain			
7	Not applicable.			
8	Minimum increase should be linked to inflation			
9	See question 4			

10. 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?(note the funding cap restricts the amount of any funding gains of those schools above the level at which the funding cap is set)

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		52.50%	42
2	No		27.50%	22
3	Not Sure		20.00%	16
If you do not agree, please explain why: (24)				
1	This is due to the information not being available			
2	<p>We do not agree that a funding cap should be used to balance the cost of the formula. If a funding cap must be used then this should be as large as possible and certainly no lower than the amount provided by the government in its allocation to CCC.</p> <p>In order to ensure that funding is directed towards the need of the most vulnerable students in the county it is important that CCC should match the NFF as soon as possible.</p> <p>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.) The measured cumulative impact on xxxxxx over the last three years has been over £500k per year, a total of £1.5m. This is set to continue at the same level next year.</p>			
3	Should a transfer need to be made from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, we do not agree that this transfer should happen, then the Minimum Funding Guarantee should be set as low as is necessary to balance the budget. This will start to redress the historic inequities in schools funding and will allow for the movement to the NFF as soon as possible.			
4	In the past I have seen small schools who stood to gain significantly under the introduction of the NFF disadvantaged through the use of growth funding caps. For small schools relatively small amounts of money can represent significant percentages - yet in real terms the saving achieved by the application of the cap is relatively small.			

10. 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?(note the funding cap restricts the amount of any funding gains of those schools above the level at which the funding cap is set)

		Response Percent	Response Total
	I would advocate that schools with a certain number of pupils and/or particularly small budgets are excluded from any gains cap, so that they receive the money they need to remain viable.		
5	Because this school is subject to MPPL, it seems inappropriate to vote YES to this question.		
6	<p>we do not agree that a funding cap should be used to balance the cost of the formula. If a funding cap must be used then this should be as large as possible and certainly no lower than the amount provided by the Government in its allocation to CCC. In order to ensure that funding is directed towards the need of the most vulnerable students in the county it is important that CCC should match the NFF as soon as possible.</p> <p>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). The measured cumulative impact on TCA over the last three years has been over £500k per year a total of £1.5m. This is set to continue the same level next year.</p>		
7	As it allows the continued funding of schools above the allowance calculated by the NFF at the expense of schools who should be receiving greater amounts under the NFF - completely undermines the NFF		
8	Again this should be planned in a way that the impact of the cap results in the pain being shared between all schools		
9	In general we would say no with the same argument as below - growth should not penalise stable schools that are balancing their budgets. However, if there is no other option, then we appreciate this may be necessary.		
10	<p>I do not agree that a funding cap should be used to balance the cost of the formula.</p> <p>If a funding cap must be used then this should be as large as possible and certainly no lower than the amount provided by the government in its allocation to CCC.</p> <p>In order to ensure that funding is directed towards the need of the most vulnerable students in the county it is important that CCC should match the NFF as soon as possible.</p> <p>The funding cap applied in previous years has already placed a cumulative and aggregate disadvantage on schools with disadvantaged cohorts.</p>		
11	We have been capped for some time		
12	I don't think any school in Cambs can afford to take a hit		
13	<p>Similar to above - this school needs to see a funding increase to even stand still, and due to being above the minimum per pupil level (for good reason), if funding gains are capped to address growth etc then that will be jeopardised.</p> <p>Our preference is a disapplication request to reduce the minimum funding levels. It is clearly these that are producing the perverse outcomes of the indicative budgets, rewarding larger schools often in less deprived areas at the expense of smaller schools with higher needs.</p> <p>We should also continue to look at schools sitting on large carry-forward balances, and remove excessive balances to the schools block if possible in an equitable way across the maintained and academy sector.</p>		
14	Those schools who are affected by the cap are not receiving the full benefit of the move to a national funding formula and we need that increase to meet the needs of our children.		
15	All schools should be treated in the same way.		
16	Funding gains need to be looked at in context.		
17	All schools should be treated in the same way		
18	We understand that a cap has been in place for a while. It is the size and the application of the cap where we would again welcome some differentiation due to overall budget circumstances.		
19	It would depend on how long a funding gap would be in place. Short term solution could be supported.		




10. 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?(note the funding cap restricts the amount of any funding gains of those schools above the level at which the funding cap is set)

		Response Percent	Response Total
20	Because this is likely to most affect those schools with high levels of deprivation.		
21	The same as my response to question 8. I would want to see how a funding cap interacts with possible MFG adjustments, modelled according to the 2020 October Census rather than the 2019 census, before feeling I could make a judgement on this matter.		
22	This has a detrimental effect on small schools		
23	All schools should be treated in the same way.		
24	Don't want to agree to any funding cap but not sure how else to manage affordability issues		

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



	Yes	No	Not Sure	Response Total
Primary Contingency Scheme	81.6% (40)	4.1% (2)	14.3% (7)	49
Free School Meal Eligibility	89.8% (44)	0.0% (0)	10.2% (5)	49
Insurance	83.7% (41)	6.1% (3)	10.2% (5)	49
Maternity Cover	89.6% (43)	0.0% (0)	10.4% (5)	48
Trade Union Facilities Time	73.5% (36)	6.1% (3)	20.4% (10)	49
			answered	49
			skipped	31



11.1. Primary Contingency Scheme




			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		81.6%	40
2	No		4.1%	2
3	Not Sure		14.3%	7

11.2. Free School Meal Eligibility




			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		89.8%	44
2	No		0.0%	0
3	Not Sure		10.2%	5

11.3. Insurance			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		83.7%	41
2	No		6.1%	3
3	Not Sure		10.2%	5

11.4. Maternity Cover			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		89.6%	43
2	No		0.0%	0
3	Not Sure		10.4%	5

11.5. Trade Union Facilities Time			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		73.5%	36
2	No		6.1%	3
3	Not Sure		20.4%	10

12. Maintained Schools are asked for their views as to whether they would be content for insurance to continue to be provided as part of the LA scheme?

			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		87.76%	43
2	No		6.12%	3
3	Not Sure		6.12%	3

If no, please explain why: (4)

1	RPA is cheaper.
2	<p>The current LA scheme does not cover all our requirements: The LA scheme does not presently list CSoC as a beneficiary under the policy. We believe that there would be no obligation, in the event of major damage to the school, for the insurance proceeds to be used to rebuild the current school. The LA would be free to redistribute the children to other schools or build a new school on an alternative site (most likely not as a church school).</p> <p>Secondly the policy does not provide cover or indemnity for the Trust/trustees in the event of a 3rd party claim – for example if a child was injured as a result of a building related problem/failure.</p>
3	We should not vote for RPA without knowing what the additional cost might be. However the price differential suggested at £3+ per pupil is quite high - 16% more on the old RPA price (33% on last year's LA figure). Can the LA insurance figure not come down a bit further?
4	Cover by the LA scheme is less comprehensive, more costly and appears not to reflect the status and ownership of Aided schools