

**Sample responses to the Consultation questions for financial year 2016/17
ESCC Funding Formula**

School	CHAILEY SCHOOL
Date	02/09/2015

1	Do you agree that the lump sum in East Sussex should be reduced from £147,000 to £142,000 for the Primary phase and from £150,000 to £145,000 for the Secondary phase for financial year 2016/17?	No
	Any further comments- <i>We are hit both by the reduction in lump sum and the fact that we are too large for the sparsity factor.</i>	
2	Do you agree that the Sparsity funding factor be introduced with an allocation of £5,000 for each qualifying school / academy for financial year 2016/17?	Yes
	Any further comments- <i>600 is too small for secondary phase. Move to 700.</i>	
3	Do you agree to reduce the capping percentage applied to the permitted increase in per pupil funding from 3% to 1.5% for financial year 2016/17?	Yes
	Any further comments- <i>But, if the formula allows for 3% where is the other 1.5% going?</i>	

School	Etchingham C E School
Date	03/09/2015

1	<p>Do you agree that the lump sum in East Sussex should be reduced from £147,000 to £142,000 for the Primary phase and from £150,000 to £145,000 for the Secondary phase for financial year 2016/17?</p>	Yes / No
	<p>Any further comments-</p> <p>I am fundamentally against this proposal.</p> <p>East Sussex states very clearly in many documents that it is <u>committed to Small Schools and Supporting them.</u></p> <p>This proposal hits the smallest schools the hardest (except the few that benefit from proposal 2). A typical school with 100 pupils will lose around £ 3,000 of funding or around 0.7% of total funding – or around £ 30 per pupil. Yet the gainers, for instance a typical 2 form entry Primary with 420 pupils will only gain around £1,500 (0.1%). That is 0.1% or £4 per pupil.</p> <p>What is the School Forum hoping to gain from this? Small Schools will experience enough of a drop in funding to have to make a painful cut somewhere (potentially detrimental to the educational outcomes and standards of the pupils in the school) whereas the typical larger school will gain such a small percentage or per pupil amount, it will make little discernable difference or impact on standards of teaching and learning.</p> <p>The Schools Forum needs to remember that the typical rural small primary school generally has lower levels of deprivation (FSM and Pupil Premium) and Prior Attainment Funding than most larger urban primary schools. Smaller Schools are already at a disadvantage in terms of funding. Yes, they can have a greater per pupil cost to run, because each School still has to run a building and grounds, pay finance, office, caretaking and cleaning support staff etc. They do not benefit from such an economy of scale as larger schools – and that is the purpose of the lump sum – to enable schools to meet these necessary costs.</p> <p>I urge the Lead Member for Schools and Learning Effectiveness not to approve this proposal. It is detrimental to the Educational Outcomes to our rural pupils in East Sussex, without any potential for significant outcome improvement in larger schools. In short, it is rather pointless.</p> <p>In the fullness of time (maybe another 3-5 years), when most small rural primary schools are in Federations of 3 or 4 schools under one Executive Headteacher and one Business Manager, (such as the Woodlands Federation)</p>	

	and have had time to set up the most efficient staffing and procurement patterns to save money, this could be revisited. At present it does not make any practical sense or positive impact on any learning outcomes for pupils in any size school.	
2	Do you agree that the Sparsity funding factor be introduced with an allocation of £5,000 for each qualifying school / academy for financial year 2016/17?	Yes / No
	<p>Any further comments-</p> <p>The DfE “Fairer Funding for Schools 2015-16” document states:</p> <p>“In June last year, we introduced a new sparsity factor for local authorities to use in their local formulae for school funding in 2014-15. The purpose of this factor is to enable local authorities to provide an additional sum to small schools serving sparsely populated areas where those schools may not be able to operate on the basis of per pupil funding alone.”</p> <p>Taking the last part of this quotation “where these schools may not be able to operate on the basis of per pupil funding alone”, I am not convinced that many of these Schools require this extra funding. <u>Has the School’s Forum investigated the need for it?</u></p> <p>Do Small Schools such as Alfriston, Brede, Ditchling, East Hoathly, Firle, Laughton, Netherfield, Nutley, Little Horsted, Peasmarsch & Ticehurst really need an additional £5,000 just because they are over 2 miles away from another School? Looking at School Balances data from 2013-14:</p> <p>Alfriston £ 65,774 14.7% Brede £ 6,636 1.6% Catsfield £ 49,463 10.7% East Hoathly £ 38,184 8.4% Firle £ 73,123 15.5% Laughton £ 27,943 4.7% Little Horsted £ 22,826 4.2% Netherfield £ 33,836 5.9% Nutley £ 42,681 9.4% Peasmarsch £ 17,223 3.4% Ticehurst £ 53,250 7.4%</p> <p>Only Brede had a low balance of 1.6%. Most of these Schools are well into surplus and 5 of them held balances in excess of 8%. Whatever the purpose of the balance, it does prove these Schools were not in dire financial straits.</p> <p>What evidence is there that these Schools need additional funding? What extra costs do they face?</p> <p>I challenge the Schools Forum to prove the need for this. You need to show that these schools “cannot operate on the basis of per pupil funding alone”. Otherwise you have just created “winners and losers”</p>	

	<p>amongst small schools which is not in the spirit of the “fairer funding” for Schools the DfE is trying to achieve.</p> <p>I can see that in remote areas in Cumbria, Devon, Durham and so on, that this factor is necessary due to lack of pupil numbers and significant distances between settlements let alone schools. East Sussex does not have that demography – it is not a County with truly remote schools.</p> <p>On that basis, I cannot agree with this proposal.</p>	
3	<p>Do you agree to reduce the capping percentage applied to the permitted increase in per pupil funding from 3% to 1.5% for financial year 2016/17?</p>	Yes / No
	<p>Any further comments-</p> <p>This makes sense as it aligns schools with funding increases with the 1.5% MFG Protection for Schools with decreasing funding.</p>	