

**National Funding Formula – consultation – ends 30 September 2021.**

Name              Southampton City Council

**3.1 National Funding Formula**

Question 1: Do you agree that our aim should be that the directly applied NFF should include all pupil-led and school-led funding factors and that all funding distributed by the NFF should be allocated to schools on the basis of the hard formula, without further local adjustment through local formulae?

**YES – for consistent treatment across all schools.**

**3.2 Premises factors**

Question 2: Do you have any comments on how we could reform premises funding during the transition to the directly applied NFF.

**NO**

Note - the PFI factor is being looked at as a separate exercise and not expected to impact until 2024-25.

**3.3 Growth and Falling Rolls**

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to use national, standardised criteria to allocate all aspects of growth and falling rolls funding?

**YES**

Question 4: Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to growth and falling rolls funding?

**NO**

**3.4 Transition to the NFF.**

Question 5: Do you agree that, in 2023-24, each LA should be required to use each of the NFF factors (with the exception of any significantly reformed factors) in its local formulae?

**YES – to be consistent across LA's**

Question 6: Do you agree that all LA formulae, except those that already ‘mirroring’ the NFF, should be required to move closer to the NFF from 2023-24, in order to smooth the transition to the hard NFF for schools?

**YES**

Question 7: Do you agree that LA formulae factor values should move 10% closer to the NFF, compared with their distance from the NFF in 2022-23? If you do not agree, can you please explain why?

**No comment.**

Question 8: As we would not require LAs to move closer to the NFF if their local formulae were already very close to the NFF, do you have any comments on the appropriate threshold level?

**NO as SCC is already close to the NFF and is therefore minimally affected.**

3.4 English as an additional language factor.

Question 9: Do you agree that the additional flexibility for LAs in the EAL factor, relating to how many years a pupil has been in the school system, should be removed from 2023-24?

**YES**

Question 10: Do you agree that the additional flexibilities relating to the sparsity factor should remain in place for 2023-24?

**No comment – not applicable to SCC**

4.1 and 4.2 Central schools services block and historic commitments

Question 11: are there any comments you wish to make on the proposals we have made regarding ongoing central school services, including on whether in the future central school services funding could move to LGFS?

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposal for a legacy grant to replace funding for unavoidable termination of employment and prudential borrowing costs?

**NO**

4.5 Consistent funding year.

Question 13: How strongly do you feel that we should further investigate the possibility of moving maintained schools to being funded on an academic year basis?

**No strong views on this.**

Question 14: Are there any advantages or drawbacks to moving maintained schools to being funded on an academic year basis that you feel we should be aware of?

**A key factor is that schools know in advance what their funding will be in order to plan successfully, especially for staff posts. A change to an academic year should not affect the DfE timetable.**

END