SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES OCTOBER 2015

	Category of Provider/Responder	First/		Nur Fi	demy sery/ rst/ mary	Maintained Middle		Academy Middle		Maintained Secondary/ High		Academy Secondary/High		Free School		Total Schools		Other	
	Number of All Providers	153		2	23	14		6		5		24		1		226		0	
	Number of Responses	16		0		6		0		3		12		0		37		1	
	% of Responses to Number of All Providers	10		0		43		0		60		50		0		16		N/A	
		Υ	N	Υ	N	Υ	N	Υ	N	Y	N	Υ	N	Υ	N	Υ	N	Υ	N
Q1	Do you support, subject to DSG availability, increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local schools formula to support a reduction in the amount needed to be contributed by the 7 relevant schools?	2	14	ļ.		2	4			1	2		12			5	32		1
Q2	Do you support the proposed change in the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17?	12	3	3		6				3		7	2			28	5		1
Q3	Do you support the arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed in the consultation document for 2015-16 to continue in 2016-17?	15	1			6				3						24	1	1	
Q4	Do you support the arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed in the consultation document for 2015-16 to continue in 2016-17?	16				6				3		8	4			33	4	1	
Q5	Please indicate your preferred for the future of the Falling Rolls Fund (FRF)																		
	Option 1 – No longer operate a FRF and include the current budget in the local schools funding formula for the benefit of all schools	5				2				3		9				19			
	Option 2 – Continue to operate a FRF on the revised criteria as detailed Other – Continue to operate a FRF but not on the revised criteria proposed	7 3				3						3				13 3		1	

Note - Some schools did not respond to all the questions.

Summaries of main issues from the consultation responses on stability for the local schools funding formula 2016-17, these consultation questions and other issues are detailed in Appendices 3 and 4.