## School Funding Arrangements 2018-19 and 2019-20 Consultation Responses

Appendix B

	0 0		Options				· · · ·
School Number	School Name	NOR (Jan17)	In line with NFF			No Option Selected	Comments
		200					
1 2	Albrighton Primary School Barrow Primary School	200 84	1				
3	Baschurch Primary School Bishop Hooper Primary	166 86	1				
5	Bishops Castle Primary Scho		1				
6	Bomere Heath Primary Brown Clee Primary School	118 95	1				
8	Buntingsdale Primary Schoo	73	1				
9	Claverley Primary School	117	1				This is subject to Shropshire Council campaigning to have the annual 'cap' lifted for all schools with less that 100 pupils on
10	Clive Primary School	45	1				roll for 2019-20 Although the governing body of The Blue Hills Federation has responded yes, there are some areas of concern that we would like the Local Authority to be aware of and take into considertion. They are as follows: 1. The amount of time taken for small rural schools that are struggling the most to meet ever greatening financial pressures. We would urge the Local Authority to try to find a solution to ensure that these schools receive the full amount at a similar time to those other larger schools. 2. There are a large percentage of schools carrying an in-year deficit as stated by Gwyneth Evans at the Funding Meeting on October 11th. Again the implementation of the funding formula at a sooner point may well relieve those schools, particularly small schools, from surviving on dwindling reserves. 3. The vast majority of the schools that will not receive the NFF (fully implemented) until 2020-21 at the earliest (it was intimated by Gwyneth that some schools may not even receive it by then) are the small rural schools and many of them are in the south of the county. This has a massive implication on the education for children in that area, as if some of the schools are not going to survive the next few years, there will be massive transport costs and risks of transporting children to the next school; the welfare of the children may well suffer from extra time travelling; the impact on the local areas will be significant and over all, and most importantly, we believe that the well-being of children, their social groups and friendships may be greatly affected. It appears that the Local Authority policy, as shown by the way they are implementing this formula, is not to support education provided in small rural schools. This is the second response to this consultation from The Blue Hills Federation following the further information sent to
12	Newcastle Primary School	26	1				the schools on 24.10.17. Please could this be attached to the first response which was sent 20.10.17. With regards to the two models sent through to further consider, it is obvious that model A is completely out of the question for any small schools in the county as they will suffer further (due to small numbers at their schools) and these are the schools that cannot afford to see any further cuts to their budgets. This is a model only suitable for the larger primary schools and one that should not be implemented if we as a county are to consider all the children in all areas and not just those who live in highly populated urban areas and attend large primary schools. Model B is far fairer for all schools as there is an even amount given to each and if we had to choose from one of these further options, that is the one we would support. However, if the county is considering this option, it was felt that we should just move immediately to the NFF rather than phase it in over a number of years.
13 14	St Mary's Primary, Bucknell Cockshutt Primary School	47	1				
15	Coleham Primary School	414	1	1			
16	Criftins Primary sChool	97	1				Following the consultation question raised re model for distribution of notional additional funding our opinion would be:
17	Greenfields Primary School	345		1			Model A where the additional funding is allocated by increasing the basic per pupil element is the only fair option and should therefore be the process undertaken. Each pupil is bringing a small percentage of the funding, seems the only option as far as we would be concerned. Model B would appear to increase the percentage of the notional funding unfairly as fewer pupils are receiving an identical amount of money to the many larger schools.
18 19	Harlescott Junior Hinstock Primary	353 103	1				
20	John Wilkinson Primary Sch		1				
21 22	Kinnerley Primary School Long Mountain Primary Scho	77 87	1				
22	Ludlow Junior School	244	1				
24	Market Drayton Infant	265				1	Can't answer at moment would like to see an alternative. Last year we talked about 65% of our children being in schools that are worse off under NFF. Whilst no schools are worse off larger schools only get approx 1% increase overall. Why would we want to push our children through a funding formula we deemed unfair a year ago? Whilst we have to move to it in the end why rush towards it. However understand the pressure to move towards it. The new NFF places our school at a disadvantage with a 1% increase that in real terms is far below inflation and risng running costs (for example, the recent 2% pay rise). The figures given out last night show that in 2020 a pupil in a tiny village school will benefit from over £11,000 of funding compared to a pupil in Market Drayton who will attract
25	Market Drayton Junior	353		1			less than £4000. In the next two years there is funding available to compensate for this that is being directed into smaller, and in some cases unviable, schools. Whatever happens in two years I do not support placing two additional year groups at a financial (and hence staffing) disadvantage to phase in a budget drop. If we are heading towards a cliff I see no advantage in accelerating towards it. My alternative arrangements would be to use the additional funding the government is providing over the next two years to increase basic per pupil funding and hold the lump sum per school allowance at existing levels. The additional funding would then allow the schools who host the majority of Shropshire pupils to accumulate enough funds to deal with the coming staffing issues over a longer period of time. I'd also like to echo one of the views expressed last night that given the huge disparity in funding when you look at it on a per pupil basis as stated above we shouldn't have to pay £3500 for our adviser when a smaller school is only paying £170. I'd like to see some sort of minimum lump sum built into top slice formulas.
26	Meadows Primary school	278	1				
27 28	Minsterley Primary School Norton in Hales Primary	142 81	1				
29	Oxon Primary school	417	1				02.11 Dang to shange approver to No and wanter Mandal A
30 31	Radbrook Primary Rushbury Primary School	318 51	1	1			03.11 - Rang to change answer to No and wants Model A
32 33	Shifnal Primary School St Andrew's Primary, Shifna	261	1				
34	St George's Junior School	352	1				
35 36	St Giles CE Primary School	316	1				
36	St John the Baptist Primary St John's Bridgnorth	216	1		1		The extra funding appears to be biased towards smaller schools in the NFF. The Shropshire Formula has always had the interests of our smaller school in their considerations. Our Governors met yesterday 6 November and were unanimous in their opinion that the Shropshire Formula should be used. Their preference would be for the Lump Sum element to be used which still looks after our smaller schools, but provides others with a reasonable amount of money. We are aware of the possible consequences in 2019-2020.
38 39	St Lawrence Primary, CS St Mary's Shawbury	274 175	1 1				
40	Stoke on Tern Primary	111			1		In light of the additional modelling information in connection with the NFF, the Governors and headteacher have agreed that they want to vote for Model B
41	Stottesdon Primary School	94	1				
42 43	Sundorne Infant Trinity Primary School	270 147	1				
43	Weston Rhyn Primary Schoo	137	1				
45 46	Whitchurch Infants Woore Primary School	258 59	1				
47	Belvidere School	817	1				
48 49	Community College	423 673	1				
49 50	Corbet School Grove School	673 899	1				
51	Idsall School	1309	1			-	Abstaining as a result of insufficient information to make a decision. FS&GP Governors Committee Meeting 20.310.2017
52 53	Lakelands School Ludlow CE School	519 630	1		L	1	nostanning as a result of insufficient information to make a decision. FS&GP Governors Committee Meeting 20.310.2017
54	Meole Brace School	1215	1				
55 56	Priory School Thomas Adams School	844 1282	1				
57	Shrewsbury Academy	834	1				
58 59	Grange Primary Longlands Primary	248 192	1				
60	Beckbury	55	1				
61 62	Worfield St Mary's Bluecoat	194 133	1				
	Total	18472	55	3	2	2	

Breakdown by number of pupils 16345 1016 327 784