

Consultation Comments

Appendix 3

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary	FSM	£100k	Retain	IDACI doesn't reflect actual need in an area. We have FSM living in rented farm cottages but the postcode for this shows low poverty	As allowances can't be made for small schools they will need extra to stay afloat	The delegation of these would make it costly for small schools. We would prefer the bulk ability of the local authority	
Primary	IDACI	£100k	Retain	In Urchfont there is hidden deprivation which will be picked up on IDACI, but FSM parents have to apply and many are proud to do this.		For a small village school, it does not appear to be cost effective to purchase these services ourselves	We are concerned about the complex nature that is involved in trying to work out which model will benefit our school the best. We have concerns about the future of rural & smaller schools as funding will be an issue. The consultation letter & documents arrived in our school on Tuesday 2nd & meeting in Devizes was on the Wednesday. It was very short turn around & was impossible for any of us to attend
Primary	IDACI	£100k		Whichever way its hardly relevant to our area being predominately service children			
Primary	IDACI	£85k	Retain	We think it is a fairer way for all as it shows a true reflection of schools deprivation	For a primary this makes more sense	We wish all above services to be retained centrally	
Primary	FSM	£100k	Retain	FSM is more specific to the pupils in the individual school and therefore more relevant as a measure of need		Hidden cost to each school if these are delegated, in terms of providing the time & expertise required to exercise diligence in ensuring best value, compliance & appropriate provision. If delegated, we would have to look at group arrangements (eg cluster) but there would still be significant additional overheads. We are concerned that delegation would result in Wilts Council services shrinking or disappearing completely, forcing us to source them elsewhere, exacerbating the first point above. When sourcing from third party suppliers, sustainability can also be a cause for concern.	If the proposed delegation were to go ahead, there would be more contingency factors to take into account in our schools budget (eg cost of maternity leave). This would be difficult to accommodate, particularly if the 8% limit on rollovers is retained. The removal several years ago of fluctuating rolls as a justification for exceeding the 8% limit has already made long term budgeting more difficult for small schools, where a relatively small difference in pupil numbers from year to year impacts significantly on our budget, specifically our ability to maintain stable classes.
Primary	IDACI	£100k	Mixed		Would benefit smaller schools reducing dependance on pupil numbers	Its difficult to see how smaller primary schools could handle the items marked "retain"	
Primary	FSM	£85k	Mixed		The final figure works out the same in the budget for either as adjustments are made	The school budget would not be able to support these if delegated- please retain centrally For many primary schools the effect could be catastrophic unless funds are retained centrally. A single maternity could break the budget. Insurance premiums would be very high with a young female staff (or male with paternity costs).	
Primary	FSM	£100k	Mixed		Reduction of lump sum in a small school (if min fund guarantee is removed) which been huge reduction in income.	Could primary schools be divided into two groups. Those under 100. Those over 100n pupils?	
Primary	FSM	£85k	Mixed	Rural schools will lose out in IDACI as it will not pick up the rural poverty. Small tied farm cottages with same postcode as lord of the manor	Cost of administering services would be difficult to maintain as a small school	Some of these services would be very time consuming for small schools. Also would involve duplication of sourcing best prices	
Primary	IDACI	£85k	Retain	This seems fairer as children above fsm threshold but still living in deprived circumstances will attract funding	I think more money should be distributed per pupil	we could not afford to pay for the same level of service if it were not retained centrally	I realise all schools will choose the best option for their situation. I urge the decision makers to make the correct moral choice based on an as few schools as possible losing out.
Primary	FSM	£100k	Mixed	We are concerned that with IDACI being nationally comparative, even our very deprived housing area in Trowbridge does not register in the higher bands when compared with inner city housing in other parts of the country. Many of the pupils living in our deprived area, claim FSM and numbers are rising, so we feel this factor will be more sustainable for us in terms of future budget planning. We are very successful in getting families to claim for FSM eligibility	As a guaranteed lump sum there is more security in setting our budget, rather than having to rely on other factors to recoup the £15k difference	Our preferences above reflect our focus on delivering the best we can for each child on a personal basis. As high maintenance administration school - mainstream plus 2 resource bases with a total of 37 statements of Sen & 53% FSM, we need to ensure that administration issues support the child & family directly. We therefore prefer to delegate the mundane admin costs - which do not need reference to the context of each child to the local authority. The area we have expressed preference in delegating, are those where we wish to have more autonomy in choice of personnel deployed and the option to work more collaboratively within the cluster.	
Primary	FSM		Retain	Use of IDACI data is unclear. It seems inaccurate, less likely to change.		Provided that 'quality' services are sustained.	We would like clarity/information regarding future capping! There are concerns that EYFS is used as an indicator for SEN funding. We are an outstanding school that achieves very good progress and outcomes and will therefore secure less funding than a school that performs less well.
Secondary	IDACI	£100k		It is not clear how up to date the IDACI is, but it seems more appropriate to cohort.	This sum is not preferred only the best of 2 very unfair options		Our governors are very concerned about the changes in lump sum/flat rate allocations to secondary schools. This will disadvantage our college considerably and many other schools (secondary) in Salisbury.

Consultation Comments

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary	IDACI	£85k		The IDACI scores provide for different degrees of deprivation and are independently assessed, unlike the free school meals data which is dependent on parental response.	We accept that a single lump value for all schools creates significant problems for the Wiltshire scheme. The higher lump sum gives primary schools an unjustifiable increase of 25%. Either value creates a large reduction for secondary schools, but, in terms of overall budgets, a reduction to £85,000 or £100,000 is less significant.		
Secondary	IDACI	£100k	Mixed	Section A: Deprivation Funding. The factor that should be used is IDACI (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index). For clarity the school requires clear deprivation factors and therefore any combination (FSM and IDACI) would be seen as most unwelcome. The key separation between the two factors, given that our school has no service families is that FSM has no differentiation of funding based on differing levels of deprivation. Therefore it is viewed by us that IDACI would offer local level of banding and these would help a county such as Wiltshire where local levels of deprivation can and should be recognised. It was felt that FSM as a factor would not offer this level flexibility.	Lump Sum Allowance (Upper Limit). In Wiltshire it is clear that differentiation exists between phases for good reason and in the context of the Trafalgar School at Downton the current level of 2.01 Basic Flat Rate fee received is £346,973. It is clear that this proposal will have a significant impact (reduction) in the funding made available to our school (a small secondary school). The view that this can be reduced in order to be fairer to the levels suggested is viewed as impractical by the school and its governing body. Clearly the options provided in this consultation only offer two figures £100,000 or £85,000. The school naturally will select £100,000 as offering the smallest reduction yet still delivering a very significant reduction in income. The school fails to recognise the rationale for this decision and why no variation between phases has been retained under these proposals despite the obvious merits of creating such a hierarchy. This option is far from being a preferred option by the school.	The school would be a supporter of acquiring central services where these would be marketed by the local authority and those that remains closely aligned to typical market costs or cheaper.	The change in funding in the supplied financial models supplied appear to be consistent, in that they each show a further reduction in the funding made available to our school of around £28,000 per annum in 2013/14. The school recognises the potential value of national funding formula reviews but yet again we are hugely disappointed in the lack of any improved National Funding Formula. Wiltshire's clear and long standing disadvantage in funding terms against our colleagues and schools nationally will remain. These proposals will clearly not deliver against their title of a "fairer system". As a consequence the children attending its school's will continue to receive a poorer deal nationally compared to others, hardly a fair deal.
Primary		£100k	Retain	We are unable to select either factor as neither fairly reflects the actual high level of deprivation associated with this school. At least 90% of children are from families on benefits. FSM: On average over 90% of the children attending the Lypiatt school are on FSM. However if the number for deprivation purposes is to be based on an arbitrary census taken in October this will not represent a true figure on which to calculate deprivation funding. Numbers at the school fluctuate hugely and unpredictably. On census day figures may be only four but two weeks later may be thirty, a 700% increase. If FSM is to be the platform on which deprivation funding is calculated for the Lypiatt school account must be taken of the high turbulence by either basing the numbers on a guaranteed minimum of twenty children (as previously agreed for the Schools Standards Grant SSG) or greater if that is the case on the census day or in the provision of compensatory funding. IDACI: We understand that IDACI is based on an area of post codes. Under this system the Lypiatt school is hugely disadvantaged as it lies within a reasonably affluent area but all the children are from a single post code which is the Services Cotswold Centre. Over 90% are from deprived families. This is not reflected in the 'impact statements' which registers the school with nil children in the category. This is clearly wrong and if this system were to be used, either special recognition and compensatory funding for the school would have to be put in place or the IDACI would have to be based on a single specific post code.	Whilst we have selected the £100k option neither amount will enable the school to remain viable in the longer term without continued support from the MFG of between 43-50%. Whilst we understand that pupil funding will be adjusted dependent on the lump sum; it is hardly relevant in our case if the numbers are based on a census day return for the reasons explained under FSM above.	The Lypiatt school is too small to manage these smaller budgets in a cost effective manner. This may change in future as greater integration of clusters takes place.	severely penalise this small but special school, with its unique role of providing education to single parent and often vulnerable Service children. As such the school does not fall within any of the general categories and we believe that it has to be considered as an individual and special case. As explained in the consultation response form removal of certain factors from the original formula will make the school financially unviable requiring continued support from the MFG. With this in mind we would much appreciate a visit from Liz Williams and Phil Cooch to discuss the implications. The Lypiatt school is recognised as a unique setting within the country. If it is to continue to provide education to the mostly vulnerable or single parent Service families resident at the Services Cotswold Centre, its unique role has to be reflected in the funding formula on which the school budget is calculated. Without this recognition the school cannot remain financially viable. Particular issues are as follows: The Service Factor: 100% of the children attending the Lypiatt School are from Service families. Removal of this factor from the 'formula' will have a major impact. Turbulence: The school runs well in excess of 100% turbulence per annum. Removal of this factor will again have a major impact. Deprivation: Our detailed comments are included above but the level of deprivation associated with the children at this school will not be truly reflected by either the FSM or IDACI. School Numbers: Despite the Lypiatt school's high turbulence and unpredictable numbers it has always had the financial security provided by the Small Schools Curriculum Protection funding based on 35 children. In recognition of these unique schools specific issues; further safety, to enable budgetary continuity and stability, is guaranteed by the Schools Standards Grant which is based on a minimum of 20 or greater if is the case on census day. If as we believe these 2 elements of the funding formula are to be replaced by a one off census day calculation the Lypiatt school will be severely penalised, it will have a major impact on our As a small school, St George's is vulnerable to any financial change. Of particular concern is the SEN budget which has a large impact on a small school.
Primary		£85k			We would prefer to keep the lump sum at the lower amount which is in line with what we currently receive on the basis that we will then receive a higher per pupil amount.		We refer to lines 3.08 & 3.09 Is there any consultation now or in the future regarding the delegation of SEN and Miscellaneous funding? In addition, can you please provide further clarification on the Miscellaneous line.

Consultation Comments

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary		£100k	Mixed		As we are a small school we feel this will protect us more from fluctuations in pupil numbers.	We have selected for a number of things to be retained centrally, as being a small school we do not have the staff resources to carry out the additional roles required. If money was delegated to us it would be such a small amount we would be unable to access the support to meet the increasing needs of the children.	
Primary			Mixed			Provided that insurance will still be available through the right choice scheme	
Primary							Just to say that the governors and I have been impressed with the way this has been handled by County. Information coming down to the schools has been clear and as succinct as possible under the circumstances and the information sessions were well run and informative. It was also a big help to have various options as to dates and venues. Thank you.
Primary	FSM			The difficulty with FSM is getting parents to claim. However the models would suggest that this is the best approach compared with IDACI model. Our IDACI area would probably not provide as much funding due to the socio-economic feature of the area.			
Primary	FSM	£100k	Retain	Although seems to make little difference	It seems that this option initially favours smaller schools	This would favour us as admin hours to source these services, should they be delegated out to schools, would need to increase therefore increasing costs	Given the time frame and snapshot budget, it has been impossible to assess the long term impact of the changes
Primary	FSM	£100k		FSM data will give a more accurate reflection of deprivation in this schools area, as there are significant small volume pockets of deprivation in what is otherwise a relatively affluent area	As a small rural school we are adversely affected by fluctuations in pupil numbers as a percentage of total budget. For this reason a higher level of lump sum will afford some additional protection/ stability		
Primary	FSM	£100k	Retain	Although seems to make little difference	It seems that this option initially favours smaller schools	This would favour us as admin hours to source these services, should they be delegated out to schools, would need to increase therefore increasing costs	
Secondary Academy	IDACI	£100k		Wiltshire contains many areas where there are educationally impoverished homes who do not always qualify for FSM.			Concerned about the aggregation of the opinions - secondary schools represent larger numbers of pupils than primary schools. This should not be aggregated on a one school one vote system, rather that each school represents a number of pupils and that weights the response in order to give due consideration to secondary schools which are by and large, bigger than the county's primary schools.
Primary	FSM	£85k	Retain	Although this is a fixed rate paid via the pupil premium, we anticipate our school would attract more funding via this factor than the IDACI	This seems a very unfair system to have one rate for both primary & secondary schools, and will have the biggest impact on school budgets, however this option is better for us in terms of providing greater per pupil funding as we have a steadily increasing NOR	With the inevitable resulting financial instability caused by the funding reforms, we would NOT be happy at the current time to see these budgets delegated, at the very least until the DfE have decided on the new national formula, which could impact in the not too distant future. Also some existing costs, such as licences for example, would go up as a direct result of this, which is not 'best value'! If the LA can continue to make an overall saving by purchasing under one umbrella, then we think they should continue to do so. Keeping these budget centralised will help to alleviate the financial pressures on schools during this period of transition, particularly when the true costs to schools has not really been quantified and the additional burden on administration has not been calculated.	
Primary			Mixed			Although, as a school we have had no need to call for support from EMAS, Traveller Service etc, we are concerned that, should the funding be delegated, the services would cease to be viable. We are looking at it as an insurance should the need arise.	We have tried to consider the proposals as broadly as possible and consider the wider and longer term impact of the funding reforms. However, in reality, it is difficult for governors not to be driven by the bottom line of the impact statements - break even or shortfall of £5000+? The impact statements were, however, invaluable in clarifying the effects of the different formulae and I would like to thank you all for the hard work and time that has been devoted to this consultation.
Primary		£85k	Mixed		Our NOR has increased so £85,000 gives preferable per pupil funding, but MFG seems to even it out. I'm struggling to work out which would be best for us with our increased NOR!	Undecided about Behaviour Support as I highly value the staff that work within that service, yet it is very stretched and therefore it may be value for money to delegate and buy in own services, appreciating that we will have to pay more, but we will have the service we want, when we want it.	
Secondary	FSM			IDACI indicator doesn't seem to reflect the true deprivation in our area. FSM entitlement is measured against family income, not postcode, which seems a more accurate measure of deprivation.			
Primary		£85k			Want a guaranteed lump sum up front in a time of uncertainty		If Reception NOR falls from October to January, will there be a clawback?

Consultation Comments

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary	IDACI	£100k	Retain	For us, this seems to be a more advantageous judge of deprivation than the Ever6 data.	As we have fairly low numbers, the £100,000 flat rate works slightly better for us with a slightly lower pupil weighting. Saying that, the final difference in our budget is not much different with the £85,000 or £100,000.	Many of these services may be cheaper in 'bulk'. I anticipate some of these things costing schools more if funding is delegated to schools. Coming from Swindon, I have seen services disappear and/or become more expensive when budgets are delegated to schools.	
Primary	FSM			We, along with a number of local schools, do have an issue with parents not choosing to come forward, even if eligible for FSM.			
Primary	FSM		Retain	FSM is a real measure of deprivation		Delegation short term gain, long term loss	
Primary	IDACI	£85k		FSM is dependant on families registering their entitlement to FSM. IDACI data provides for fairer allocation of funding between schools by reflecting the level of social deprivation within catchments. For schools located in areas of high deprivation, the additional funding that would be generated would allow schools to provide necessary support to those pupils who come from families who don't register/ fall short of meeting the criteria for FSM (and hence pupil premium funding) but who clearly need the extra support in school.		FSM/SIMS/HCSS/COPY - We currently received a very satisfactory level of service from the LA and whilst they are able to achieve significant economies of scale on behalf of schools it makes sense to retain these services centrally. It also removes any administrative burden/ costs that would be placed on schools should they have to procure these services themselves. Cont./TU/Matern./Travel - Retaining these budgets centrally provides for stability in budgeting as these relate to unforeseen circumstances which are beyond the control of the schools. PBSS - The current service is very good and it would be difficult to find/procure a similar level of professional support. EMAS support could be found externally if required.	
Primary	FSM	£85k		Number of pupils with 10+ hours support will require £9500 to support which exceeds the SEN allocation. IDACI is too crude a measure (population groups of 1500) and based on dated census data.	This is wrong as a principle. It is government lead & political.		EYFS how will this be measured post Jan 2013 when the profile scores change?
Primary			Mixed			Staff & governors believe that the targeted services should be retained for the benefit of all children in Wiltshire. We do not for example, ever use the Traveller Education Service but are very willing to give our share of this budget to those schools who need that support	
Secondary		£100k			The college will have a reduction of £213,000 compared to 2012/13 and the fact that this is added to the AWPU as a small secondary school the college is set to gain less as a result. In addition to the above the college has lost funding for two specialisms, one of the SSG grants has been removed, 1-2-1 tuition funding has been removed. The closures of school Sports Partnership and Extended Schools has had a devastating effect on the college's finances. The college also recognises to this point that Service Factor has not been mentioned and therefore we have to assume that we no longer get funding for this factor. Is this correct?		The college would like to know exactly how service factor is being applied whether by redistributing to AWPU or whether it will be treated as an exceptional formula factor.
Primary		£100k			Some protection for secondary schools who will suffer most from withdrawal of current flat rate.		
Primary		£100k	Mixed	Unfair to comment as Larkhill not affected - 95% military	Although a very small percentage difference in our case, we would receive £250 more this way	With the removal of 'Service Factor' from school budget and the decision that the 'Pupil Mobility Factor' is not fit for purpose we must not just bury our head in the sand and not support schools who have to deal with military mobility - it costs time, manpower and energy!	
Primary	FSM	£85k		FSM Ever6 is easier to understand, but we don't seem to come out particularly badly under IDACI, and it would seem to be more directed at deprivation so if we could understand it better we would have voted for that.	The smaller lump sum suits us best but we don't really mind, and would be quite content with £100,000.		
Primary	IDACI		Retain	This is a more sophisticated measure and therefore more effective in targeting resource to need than FSM.		For primary schools, economies of scale mean that it is preferred that central budgets are retained centrally.	
Primary	IDACI			There would be no advantage in getting a higher payment if we had more FSM children. For same reason, the IDACI basis produces a smaller deduction when the cap is applied (£41 deduction, compared with a £6,586 deduction using the FSM basis). The IDACI basis is also less likely to vary than the FSM basis which could reduce by £8,722 if we had no FSM children.			

Consultation Comments

Appendix 3

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary	FSM			Given that IDACI doesn't recognise service family accommodation and that almost 50% of our pupils are from service families, the IDACI would not fully recognise the deprivation requirements of some pupils.			
Primary			Mixed			Traveller education service needs to be maintained centrally to ensure continuity for children moving between schools.	
Secondary			Delegate			We would prefer delegation with the option to buy back particularly: licences/subscriptions, insurance, FSM, maternity costs.	
Secondary Academy		£100k			The huge reduction in lump sum funding will have a profound effect on our budget in both the short and the long term. We inevitably wish to go for the highest lump sum possible.		
Primary			Mixed			Insurances and licenses probably benefit from economies of scale through bulk purchasing. If not, then they should be delegated. Primary Behaviour Support benefits by having external moderation. Expertise from outside the school can provide guidance as to how well an individual school is managing behaviour by comparison with other schools. If the fair access protocol is adopted by primary schools, then all schools can expect a share of challenging pupils and will probably want to draw on the expertise of the BSS.	
Primary	IDACI	£85k	Retain	Governors believe this data gives a truer representation of the catchment area	Governors would prefer higher AWPU	Giving the highest priority to maternity costs for retention	Governors are very concerned that the Resource base will be stretched financially under the Government proposals. They recognise this is a Government initiative, not LA, but would like to stress the proposals may lead them to reconsider the situation of the resource base at the school
Primary	FSM	£85k	Mixed	This is a very difficult formula either way when you are in a school which hovers around 170 pupil mark		It is not clear to me from the form, how HR Support is funded at present, and whether the new funding formula will affect this costing	
Primary	FSM	£85k	Mixed	FSM is live (is a current situation based on verifiable numbers) The use of IDACU data may rely on old data from the 2001 census as we are not sure that 2011 data has yet been incorporated into current deprivation models. We understand that the data is updated periodically using information from credit reference agencies but we are not convinced that this is accurately reflects deprivation levels as the segment would be more likely to be cash dependent and would be relatively less likely to appear on credit reference reports.	We feel this is fairer method as all schools would share the burden of a general reduction. Also as it leaves a larger pot of funds to be divided up on a per pupil basis, it is more congruent with the ethos of pupil-led funding which has long characterised school funding and generally accepted to be a fairer distribution mechanism.	Generic items which the majority of schools need should be retained centrally so that procurement economies can be achieved. Items which are likely to apply to schools more selectively should be delegated so that schools can individually pursue best value. This supports the culture for schools to become increasingly autonomous.	Please could these documents have been sent electronically rather than in hard copy? Communication with stakeholders, and collating the response, within such a tight timescale has been very difficult and involved a lot of typing!!
Primary							hugely useful roadshows
Primary							As a service school with 49% NOR from service families we are extremely concerned that the service factor is not being replaced in any way. This will mean a loss of £11,000 pa ans will have a detrimental impact on the quantity of our provision. If the allowance formula for pupil motability is really not fit for purpose, there being no cap allowed, the LA needs to address this with the DfE. It is a retrograde step and needs to be addressed urgently.
Primary	FSM	£100k		This funding factor is not ideal but information on IDACI is also hard to apply to specific schools	Has a minimally improved effect on school	Elements of the budget which are far better retained centrally. Those are crucial to a small school to be accessed through central funding are: Licences - particularly SIMS & HCSS. Staff costs - maternity cover My preferences still stand but the above are crucial for a small primary to be centrally funded.	
Primary	FSM	£100k		The size of area covered by an IDACI is too large to make the calculation meaningful	The larger lump sum is more beneficial for a small school		
Primary	FSM	£100k	Retain	Although the impact statements models demonstrate that at present we would gain more from the IDACI model we feel that due to the lack of transparency from the DfE with this model we would be better able to plan for funding distributed via FSM as we will know which children are eligible	Although initially the increase would be capped this higher basic level would make us less susceptible to changes in numbers on roll eg when Lyneham Airbase closed we lost 8 children which resulted in us losing funding through AWPU last year.	We feel very strongly that as a small rural primary although we may not access all of the above there may be times that we will need to and we do not believe that the gains in monies (which is relatively small) would outweigh the cost in time & experience necessary to provide support for example to a Traveller family should they join the school. We do appreciate that there may be a tipping point at which the LA can no longer qualify for discounts/economies of scale however we would want these areas retained centrally.	
Primary	IDACI	£100k		IDACI results in a higher final figure than FSM for my school	The higher lump sum results in a higher final figure for my school		A question arose from discussion with a governor. If elements of the new formula are intended to focus resources on areas of greater need, does using capping to fund MFG reduce the effectiveness, hence defeating an original purpose?

Consultation Comments

Appendix 3

Type of School	FSM or IDACI	£85k or £100k	Delegated or retained	S1 - FSM or IDACI	S2 - £85k or £100k	S3 - Delegated or Retained	General
Primary			Mixed			Behaviour support can be needed in an emergency which can not always be planned	The different budgets were very helpful
Primary			Retain			As a small school we are not equipped to take on these aspects and the funding suggested would not cover the cost incurred	
Primary							To be honest we looked at all the options and in every case our school will be losing 33k+ of its budget under the proposals so we concluded that it really wasn't worth spending time which relates to more money on responding to the document
Primary							Apologies - am new to post and know nothing! - Headteacher
Primary			Retain			We are a small school and feel these services are essential. If all these services are delegated surely the costs will be higher! Economies of scale!	
Primary	IDACI			We feel the IDACI method has greater sensitivity in identifying deprivation			
Primary	FSM			Concern that the IDACI data may not accurately reflect the changing socio-economic status of our community. The majority of housing in the postcode is owned by MOD and was occupied by employed Service personnel. With the closure of RAF Lyneham, a large number of houses have become vacant and are being let to families who may or may not be employed/above the threshold for benefits.			As a majority service school with a high degree of turbulence, especially during the closure of RAF Lyneham. We very much regret the loss of the service school budget & protection factors. These have helped us maintain the standards and provide much needed emotional and learning support to our children over the recent, very challenging years, without going too far into deficit.
Secondary Academy							I did not respond because there is little that I can contribute! As I understand it we are looking at a 1.5% cut in funding year on year, the removal of the split site allowance (due to the qualifying criteria being re-written, not because our sites are suddenly merged) and a bit of transitional funding to soften the blow. We get no access to any other source of funding (SEN, Pupil premium etc) and have to rely on our parents to under write our budget to the tune of 3100k a year as it is... How could things look any more bleak? Oh yes, the sixth form funding cuts to come in 2014-15. I trust that you understand why I felt a response was somewhat futile?