

Summary of consultation responses

*Question 1 – Do you agree with the proposal to target deprivation at an IDACI level of 30% and above?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 100% Yes

Further Comments: Range could be set at 27% and above as students with similar indices of poverty may miss out.

*Question 2 – Do you agree that there should be provision made for a Children Looked After factor?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 100% Yes

Further Comments: None

*Question 3 – Do you agree that there should not be a split site factor within the new formula?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 6 Yes. 2 No

Further Comments: Should not be an automatic right - but funding could target unavoidable costs.

Detailed response from Highfield Primary in favour of split site factor.

*Question 4 – Do you agree that there should be provision made for pupils who join a school not at the start of the academic year?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 100% Yes

Further Comments: None

*Question 5 – Do you agree that schools should make a contribution to the PFI affordability gap?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 100% No

Further Comments: No - This has been a City Council issue and should remain so.

No - unfair to expect other schools to pick up the cost of poor decisions made in the past

No - Grossly unfair to top slice money directly from students

*Question 6 – Do you agree with the proposal to scale back winners rather than limit all gains to a set percentage?*

Number of Responses: 8

Answers: 7 Yes. 1 No

Further Comments: No - seems unfair for schools to lose out on funding that they are due.