

## Autumn Term 2017 Consultations on 2018/19 Arrangements - Combined Responses Analysis

### Primary & Secondary Schools Block

Question	Strongly Agree	On Balance Agree	Strongly Disagree	Total No. of Responses to this Question	% Strongly Agree	% On Balance Agree	% Strongly Disagree
1. Do you agree with the proposal to 'move to National Funding Formula' at April 2018 *	17	3	2	22	77%	14%	9%
2. Do you agree with earmarking Schools Block funding on a phase-specific basis?	19	2	0	21	90%	10%	0%
3. Do you agree with the proposal to set the Minimum Funding Guarantee at 0% in 2018/19, subject to final affordability?	20	1	1	22	91%	5%	5%
4. Do you agree with the proposal to set the Ceiling at + 3% per pupil in 2018/19, subject to final affordability?	18	2	1	21	86%	10%	5%
5. Do you agree with the proposal to seek to fully implement the DfE's minimum per pupil funding floors in 2018/19, subject to final affordability?	15	4	1	20	75%	20%	5%
6. Do you agree with the proposal, currently in outline, to earmark unallocated primary phase Schools Block monies to support SEND costs in primary schools and academies (by enhancing the SEN Floor), understanding that this will require the transfer of these monies to the High Needs Block?	3	17	0	20	15%	85%	0%
8: Do you agree with the proposal to continue with our current definition of notional SEN where we move to National Funding Formula?	13	5	2	20	65%	25%	10%
9: Do you agree with the proposal to protect SEN Floor allocations for individual schools and academies in 2018/19 at least at their 2017/18 values?	16	4	0	20	80%	20%	0%
10. Do you agree with the proposal to continue the approaches to the factors currently outside the scope of the National Funding Formula as set out (split sites, pupil mobility, business rates, Growth Funding, BSF DSG affordability gap)?	17	3	0	20	85%	15%	0%
12. Do you agree with the proposed criteria and methodology for the allocation of the growth funding to schools and academies in 2018/19?	14	5	1	20	70%	25%	5%
13. Do you agree with the centrally managed funds, and their criteria, that are proposed to be held in the DSG in 2018/19?	12	6	1	19	63%	32%	5%

\* please note this analysis includes the joint response from the Bradford East One Partnership as 1 score of 'strongly disagree'

### Responses to Question 11 - Should we continue to de-delegate for the following purposes:

	YES	NO
FSM Eligibility Assessments	18	
Fischer Family Trust - School Licences	16	2
School Maternity / Paternity 'insurance'	16	3
Trade Union Facilities Time	17	1
Trade Union Health and Safety Rep Time	17	2
School Staff Public Duties and Suspensions Fund	18	1

### Early Years Single Funding Formula

Question	Strongly Agree	On Balance Agree	Strongly Disagree	Total No. of Responses to this Question	% Strongly Agree	% On Balance Agree	% Strongly Disagree
1. Do you agree with the proposal to retain the single funding rate value for all providers for the 2 year old entitlement set at the value the DfE funds Bradford's Early Years Block (which in 2017/18 was £5.20 per hour)?	8	2	0	10	80%	20%	0%
2. Do you agree with the proposal to move to a monthly 'starters and leavers' based counting arrangement from 1 April 2018 for all entitlements?	1	7	4	12	8%	58%	33%
3. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the calculation of monthly payments, and adjustments, as set out in this Technical Statement?	4	5	3	12	33%	42%	25%
5. Do you agree with the proposal to seek to retain the universal base rate funding values in 2018/19 that were published in the Authority's consultation in autumn 2016, incorporating the allocation of some Early Years Block DSG reserves?	8	0	2	10	80%	0%	20%
7. Do you agree with the proposal to seek to hold Early Years Block reserve so that we can retain the base rate funding value in 2019/20 that was published in the Authority's consultation in autumn 2016 (£4.11), rather than allocate all reserve into the 2018/9 EYSFF?	7	3	1	11	64%	27%	9%
8. Do you agree with the proposal to continue our current Deprivation and SEN supplement factor in 2018/19 set to allocate 9.5% of the EYSFF?	10	1	0	11	91%	9%	0%
9. Do you agree with the proposal not to add any further supplements into the Early Years Single Funding Formula in 2018/19?	3	6	0	9	33%	67%	0%

**High Needs**

Question	Strongly Agree	On Balance Agree	Strongly Disagree	Total No. of Responses to this Question	% Strongly Agree	% On Balance Agree	% Strongly Disagree
1. Would you support a reduction, up to a maximum of 1.5%, in the values of the Plus Funding rates, as part of the suite of measures implemented to balance the High Needs Block spending in 2018/19?	1	6	0	7	14%	86%	0%
3. Do you agree with the proposal to continue to use the existing Ranges Model framework (as shown in Appendix 1) as the basis for the calculation of the pupil-led need 'Plus' funding element for the 2018/19 financial year?	0	5	1	6	0%	83%	17%
4. Do you agree with the proposal to allow the increase in NFF Additional Educational Needs allocations to uplift the value of 'notional SEN' funding identified for individual schools and academies?	2	3	2	7	29%	43%	29%
5. Do you agree with the proposal to protect in 2018/19 the values of SEN Floor allocations for schools and academies currently in receipt of this funding at their 2017/18 levels?	1	4	0	5	20%	80%	0%
6. Do you agree with the proposal to cease, from September 2018, the HNB's double funding of the cost of the placement of pupils in alternative provision settings without EHCPs that remain on the roll of the mainstream school?	2	3	1	6	33%	50%	17%
7. Do you agree with the proposal to fully implement Bradford's Place-Plus model for the funding of Early Years resourced provisions from April 2018?	0	1	0	1	0%	100%	0%