

Appendix 1 School Responses to Consultation.

Question Number				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Question				Do you agree we should equalise the values of the prior attainment factor due to the change in secondary eligibility?	Do you agree that we should increase the proportion of funding distributed through the basic entitlement?	Do you think we should delete any of the deprivation or AEN factors we use or change its relative weighting? If so please describe in the comments box	If you agree with 2 do you have a preferred model?	If not what percentage of funding should go through the Basic Entitlement?	We propose to further narrow the gap in per-pupil funding between the primary and secondary sectors by reducing the secondary lump sum and the difference in the basic entitlement. Do you agree with this approach? If not what would you recommend?	Should we have a single split site allocation?
School	Phase	E/W								
1	Belmont Infants	P	E	Yes	No	No				Yes
2	Coleridge	P	W	Yes	Yes	No	3		Yes	Yes
3	Crowland	P	E	No	No	No	1 if change is agreed			
4	Earlsmead	P	E	No	No	No	1 if change is agreed			
5	Rokesly Infants	P	W	No	No	Yes but only to further support this group better but not to move money into the basic entitlement		68%. It seems morally wrong to move money from supporting the most deprived areas of society to more well off families	Yes	No
6	St Gildas	P	W	Yes	Yes	Yes. FSM is over weighted.	3		Yes	No
7	St John Vianny	P	E	Yes		It is a mistake to assume deprivation will be met through PP. Agreeing to reduce these areas will diminish funding which is correctly assessed on factors other than eligibility for FSM.			Yes	Yes
8	South Harringay Junior	P	E	Yes	No	No		Perhaps a minimal increase to soften the negative impact that some schools in the west have felt	Yes	Yes
9	Tetherdown	P	W	Yes	Yes	Yes Formula should be simpler	3		Yes	Yes
10	Tiverton	P	E	No	No	No	1 if change is agreed		Yes	Yes
11	Alexandra Park School	S	W	Yes	Yes	Don't know enough to comment	2 or 3		Yes, but concerned if it narrowed further as there are unique reasons for the Haringey differential	Yes
12	Fortismere	S	W	Yes	Yes	More information needed	2 or 3		For 14-15 in first instance	Yes
13	Gladesmore	S	E	No	No	No	1 if change is agreed		No, prefer no change at moment as any notable change will affect class sizes. This would be more viable if secondary class sizes were 30.	
14	Hornsey	S	W	Many primary pupils require further assistance as below expected level, costs in secondary schools much greater	There are substantial additional costs for secondary schools in educating vulnerable children with additional needs.			Retain the current level.	Retain the current rates. It does not make sense to reduce the lump sum given the different size and costs between these sectors.	
15	Park View	S	E	No. Prior attainment is still a significant issue. On average 50% of our students arrive without level 4 in both English and maths. A lot of resources go into closing the gap.	No	No	1 if change is agreed	Same as 13-14	Yes	
				8 Yes	5 Yes	2 Yes	3 x 3 2 x 2/3		8 Yes	8 Yes
				7 No	9 No	8 No	5 x 1 (if change agreed)		2 No	2 No
					?					