

SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM

SCHOOLS GROUP:

Maggie Waller (Chair), Julia Shepard (Vice-Chair), Barbara Clark, Gillian Coffey, John Constable, Harry Duffy, Martin Davis, Helen Huntley, Maureen Mallinson, Paul McAteer, Charlie McGeachie, Christine Mountford, Kevin O'Driscoll, Jon Reekie, Mary Sparrow, Maggie Stacey, Jo Rockall, Kate Webb, Virginia Barrett, Jean Cameron, Jo Matthews, Nicky Willis and Philip Gregory

OBSERVERS:

Lynda Bussley

ATTENDEES

Ruth Bagley, Chief Executive, Angela Mellish

LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

Robin Crofts, Michelle Perkins, Wendy Sagar and Roger Edwardson

DATE & TIME: WEDNESDAY, 24TH OCTOBER, 2012 AT 8.00 AM
BEECHWOOD RESEARCH AND CONFERENCE CENTRE, LONG
READINGS LANE, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE, SL2 1QE

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

The following papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting:
Item 5 was not available for publication with the rest of the agenda.

	<u>Page</u>
5. Proposed Arrangements for Schools Block 2013/14 including formula	(Pages 1 - 28)

This page is intentionally left blank

**SLOUGH SCHOOLS FORUM
24 October 2012**

School Funding Reform 2013-14

Schools Block, including 5-16 Schools Formula

(Director of Education & Children's Services)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consult Schools Forum on the proposed arrangements for the Schools Block for the financial year 2013-14.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Schools Forum notes the feedback from the Task and Finish Group and on the proposals for a compliant 5-16 formula.
- 2.2 That Schools Forum considers the proposals in paragraphs 5.6 to 5.37 and makes a recommendation to the Council on its preferred 5-16 formula framework , including compliant factors, datasets and funding distribution proportions to be used..
- 2.3 That if the Forum feels unable to reach a conclusion on one of the options relating to secondary school funding specified in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.27 and in Appendices C and D, that this element only is referred to the secondary heads for further consideration.
- 2.4 That Schools Forum approves in principle that funding for significant pupil growth be retained centrally, subject to the approval by Schools Forum of criteria at a future meeting;
- 2.5 That maintained members of Schools Forum representing each of the primary and secondary phases approve in principle the de-delegation of funding to be distributed in 2013-14 for the Outreach (former behaviour support) service to support the planned transfer of the management of the service to Littledown School and Haybrook College from 1 January 2013;
- 2.6 That maintained members of Schools Forum representing each of the primary and secondary phases approve in principle the de-delegation of funding to be distributed in 2013-14 for the trade union staff costs.
- 2.7 That Schools Forum approves the continuation of the Formula Task and Finish Group to undertake further work to ensure that the formula meets current and future needs.

- 2.8 That Schools Forum notes all other proposed arrangements for the notional Schools Block 2013-14.

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Schools Forum has a key role in the implementation and approval of the reformed funding arrangements.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 A variety of models demonstrating the different impact of factors and their weightings were considered by the Task and Finish Group.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 5.1 Members of Schools Forum will recall that in March 2012, the Department for Education (DfE) issued consultation on School Funding Reform: Next Steps towards a Fairer System and in June issued School Funding Reform: Final Arrangements 2013-14. As previously reported, the implementation of the new arrangements from 1 April 2013 will be challenging in view of the considerable changes required within tight timescales.
- 5.2 A key change is the requirement to create a new, simpler pre 16 schools funding formula. The Council is required to submit a pro-forma containing information about their simplified formula to the Education Funding Agency (EFA) no later than 31 October 2012. Legally, it is the responsibility of the local authority to decide what factors they wish to include in the new simplified primary and secondary formula from 2013-14.

Consulting on the new pre-16 funding formula

- 5.3 Regulations currently require only the Schools Forum to be consulted on the formula. The DfE believes that, in line with custom and practice in Slough, all maintained schools and Academies, including free schools, should be consulted on formula changes. Further, that any consultation should include a demonstration of the effect of modelling such changes (including and excluding MFG) on individual maintained schools and Academies. Following the endorsement of Schools Forum to proposals and consultation questions at their meeting on 12 September, a consultation document (including modelling) was issued to Chairs of Governors, Head teachers and Bursars on 13 September. The consultation ran for 4 weeks and closed on Thursday 11 October.
- 5.4 Attached at Appendix A is a table summarising responses. Although 21 responses were received, a number of duplicate responses were received from the same school or phase of schools. Members of the Forum should note that only one response from each school has been included in the analysis. The consultation demonstrates significant support for the proposal and the comments reflect the concern of schools at the turbulence and impact of change on individual schools.

- 5.5 In addition to the formal consultation, three open consultation sessions were held where officers explained the proposals and answered questions. Over 50 Governors, Head teachers and bursars attended the sessions, representing 14 maintained primary schools, 5 Academy primary schools, 2 maintained secondary schools, 5 Academy secondary schools, 1 free school and 1 special school. This represents 65% of pre-16 schools (26 out of 40).

Formula Recommendations from Task and Finish Group

- 5.6 The Council is required to decide what factors they wish to include in the new simplified primary and secondary formula from 2013-14, taking into account the views of Schools Forum and responses to the consultation process.
- 5.7 During the summer term, detailed work was undertaken by finance officers to map the current formula to factors that are allowable in the new formula, in association with SSEF and Schools Forum colleagues. Members of Schools Forum should note that only datasets issued by the DfE, shown in Appendix B, can be used to distribute funding through the compliant factors. Issues arising from the dataset change are identified elsewhere within this report. The review of the current formula included the identification of factors that are not compliant with those allowed under the new system. A number of the consultation questions sought the views of all maintained schools and Academies on how to allocate funding through factors that are allowable.
- 5.8 On the basis of the detailed work undertaken over a number of years to develop the current formula to meet the identified needs within Slough schools, SSEF and Schools Forum have advised the Task and Finish Group to minimise turbulence for schools and to maintain the current primary / secondary ratio (1:1.43). Schools Forum should note that it is mathematically impossible to perfectly replicate the current formula using the compliant factors and datasets. Whilst the model recommended by the Task and Finish Group maintains the integrity of the current formula, it is recognised that it is flawed and that the impact on particular individual schools will be significant.
- 5.9 The following paragraphs describe the model and rationale recommended by the Task and Finish Group.
- 5.10 There are 12 allowable factors, of which two are mandatory (basic per-pupil entitlement and deprivation) and 10 are optional:
- Basic per-pupil entitlement, with a single unit for primary aged pupils and a single unit for each of key stage 3 and key stage 4 (these can be the same unit value);
 - Deprivation, measured by Free School Meals (FSM) and / or Income Deprivation Affecting Children (IDACI), with separate unit values for primary and secondary allowed;
 - Looked after children;
 - Prior attainment as a proxy measure for SEN (notional SEN budgets can also include funding allocated through other factors), with separate unit values for primary and secondary allowed;

- English as an additional language, for a maximum of 3 years after the pupil enters the statutory age school system, with separate unit values for primary and secondary allowed;
- Pupil mobility;
- Standard lump sum for each school, with an upper limit of £200,000;
- Split sites. Where used, the allocations must be based on objective criteria, both for the definition of a split site and for how much is allocated;
- Rates, which must be at actual cost;
- Private finance initiative (PFI) contracts;
- For the 5 local authorities who have some but not all of their schools within the London fringe area, an uplift to enable higher teacher pay scales in those schools to be reflected; and
- A per-pupil factor that continues funding for post-16 pupils up to the level provided in 2012-13, either through directly allocating per pupil funding, or indirectly through premises and other factors.

5.11 The last two optional factors are not applicable to Slough. In addition, the current models developed by the Task and Finish Group do not include a further two of the optional factors.

5.12 The Slough formula does not currently include a factor for Looked After Children (LAC). Although Slough has a corporate parent responsibility for these children, it is recognised that numbers are low (43 out of 20,812 pupils have ever been LAC). LAC pupils also currently attract a pupil premium that will be worth £900 in 2013-14. The current models do not, therefore, include a LAC factor.

5.13 The current Slough formula does not include a factor for English as an Additional Language (EAL). EAL is a major issue in Slough schools. The DfE dataset is calculated using the National Pupil Database and provides data for pupils who have been in the statutory age system for up to 1 year (EAL1), 2 years (EAL2) and 3 years (EAL3). The Task and Finish Group has concluded that the dataset provided by the DfE does not enable the formula to target need in Slough. For example, Slough currently has three infant and junior schools, each of which has a unique school number. The dataset does not currently recognise the transfer of pupils to junior schools, thereby understating need in junior schools. Although Slough will take advantage of opportunities to lobby the DfE for change, the Task and Finish Group recommends that this optional factor is not used as a result of flaws in the dataset.

5.14 The Task and Finish Group recommends that all other factors are included in the Slough formula.

5.15 The Group was concerned about the balance in funding achieved between selective and non-selective secondary schools and have developed two options for further consideration. This affects the balance between Basic per pupil entitlement and Deprivation factors.

5.16 Appendices C and D show the framework for the modelled formula, including the datasets to be applied and the proportion of funding recommended for distribution

through each factor, on the DfE proforma. Appendix C illustrates variant 1 for secondary schools and Appendix D illustrates variant 2 for secondary schools.

Basic per-pupil entitlement

- 5.17 The Task and Finish Group recommends that 72% of funding should be distributed through the basic per-pupil entitlement to primary schools. The Task and Finish Group further recommends consideration of two options (72% and 73%) for the distribution of funding through the basic per-pupil entitlement to secondary schools. This affects the balance between selective and non-selective schools.
- 5.18 Members of Schools Forum will recall that the DfE intend that most of the funding should be distributed through the basic per-pupil entitlement and was inclined to set a minimum threshold for the basic entitlement in March 2012. An option on which the DfE consulted was to set a minimum threshold of 60% for the basic entitlement only. The recommended proportion of delegated schools budgets distributed through the basic per-pupil entitlement in Slough would be significantly above such a minimum threshold.
- 5.19 Within a compliant formula, it is open to authorities to determine whether to include separate unit values for key stage 3 (KS3) and key stage 4 (KS4). The recommended model, mapped from the current model, includes separate KS3 and KS 4 unit values in order to continue to recognise the additional costs in secondary schools associated with practical work and preparing and entering pupils for key stage 4 examinations.

Deprivation

- 5.20 The Task and Finish Group recommends that 13% of funding should be distributed through a deprivation factor in order to continue to target and support pupils with additional needs.
- 5.21 The DfE recognises that there are many different ways to identify deprived pupils and that, at present, local authorities use a range of measures. Under the new, simpler arrangements, only a free school meals (FSM) indicator and / or an IDACI rating can be used to distribute funding for deprived pupils. FSM targets funding at specific pupils who come from deprived families, whereas IDACI ensures that funding is distributed to schools that have pupils living in the most deprived areas who might not be eligible for, or take up, FSM.
- 5.22 Since the current Slough formula uses both FSM and the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), the Task and Finish Group recommends the use of both FSM and IDACI in a new formula. Under the Task and Finish group recommended model, deprivation funding would be distributed on the basis of 51% FSM and 49% IDACI.
- 5.23 The issues with recording FSM eligibility in secondary schools are well documented and, as a result, the model uses the number of pupils who have been eligible for FSM at any time in the last 6 years. Use of Ever6 FSM will

target funding at 24% of primary pupils and 25% of secondary pupils. The DfE have used a straightforward 'banding' system for IDACI in order to keep the arrangements as simple as possible. The current model includes unit values for bands 3 to 6 inclusive that target funding at 30% of primary pupils and 32% secondary pupils.

Low cost, high incidence SEN

- 5.24 The DfE believe that, if used appropriately, prior attainment can provide a good proxy for many SEN pupils not identified through a deprivation measure. Since low attainment is used in the current formula, the Task and Finish Group recommends that it is also used in the new, compliant formula.
- 5.25 For primary schools, there is a choice between two Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) scores. Funding can be targeted to either all pupils who achieved fewer than 78 points or all pupils who achieved fewer than 73 points on the EYFSP. The current model uses EYFSP to target additional funding at the 22.1% of Slough children who do not achieve 73 points.
- 5.26 The Task and Finish Group recommends that 8.9% of funding should be distributed through a low attainment factor to primary schools.
- 5.27 Schools Forum should note that the selective schools will receive no funding through this factor. The Task and Finish Group further recommends that Schools Forum considers options of 8.9% and 8.4% of funding that should be distributed through the low attainment factor to secondary schools. This affects the balance between selective and non-selective schools.
- 5.28 The Forum should note the different unit values allocated to primary and secondary school pupils. The Task and Finish Group had concerns that the limited definition of SEN in this factor did not accurately represent the level of, demands of and reporting of SEN pupils in secondary schools and this meant that many pupils at secondary level would not be captured. The imbalance of value is intended to address the limitations of the factor and also to reflect the present apportionment of funding between primary and secondary schools.

Pupil Mobility

- 5.29 The recommended model maps the current turbulence factor to the new, compliant mobility factor. The proportion of funding that would be distributed through this factor is 0.3% which will target 10.9% of pupils in primary schools and 3% of pupils in secondary schools.

Standard Lump Sum

- 5.30 Under the new arrangements, the formula can only include a single lump sum for each school in Slough. The lump sum is predominantly aimed at supporting efficient, small schools where they are genuinely needed, predominantly in rural areas. Although the upper limit for the standard lump sum is £200,000, the DfE aim is that most of the funding is distributed to follow the pupil. The current

model distributes 2.2% of funding through the lump sum, which has been set at £55,000 in line with both the current primary and secondary lump sums.

Split Sites

- 5.31 Schools that operate on split sites often face higher running costs as a result of, for example, the cost of travel between sites and the care and maintenance of two sites. Since September, Claycots primary school has been operating on split sites. The consultation feedback on the principle of a split site factor was mixed and no representation has been made by Claycots. The recommended model includes a split site factor with a unit value of £25,000. The unit value is based on the estimated cost of an additional site manager. The definition of a split site and confirmation of the unit value will need to be confirmed prior to submission of the final proforma in January.

Rates and PFI

- 5.32 The current formula factors for rates and PFI are replicated in the recommended model.

Requesting Exceptional Factors

- 5.33 There is a process by which authorities can request the inclusion of additional factors in their formula for exceptional circumstances. The regulations restrict the additional factors to cases where the nature of the school premises gives rise to a significant additional cost greater than 1% of a school's total budget, and where such costs affect fewer than 5% of the schools (including Academies) in the authority. There are no exceptional premises issues in Slough.

Notional SEN Budget

- 5.34 Attached at Appendix E is a draft briefing note explaining the new arrangements for funding pupils with SEN.

In-year adjustments

- 5.35 Some formula factors (for example rates and PFI) will be based on actual costs and these costs can change after budgets have been determined. In these situations, any adjustments relating to that year would be made retrospectively to the following year's budget rather than changing the budgets once they were issued.

Protection

- 5.36 All schools will continue to be protected by the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) which has been set at minus 1.5% per pupil in 2013-14 and 2014-15. The calculation of the MFG has been substantially simplified and the only factors which are automatically excluded from the calculation are (i) post-16 funding from the EFA; (ii) allocations from the High Needs Block (resource unit places and all SEN top-ups); (iii) lump sum; (iv) rates; and (v) early years single funding formula

calculation. In order to fund this, the current model applies a cap of 5% on gains. As school budgets will, in future, be based on the October pupil count, the MFG has been rebased using the October 2011 pupil numbers. The model recommended by the Task and Finish Group includes a cap of 5% on overall gains to support funding the significant amounts of protection required.

- 5.37 Appendix F and Appendix G illustrate the pre and post MFG school budget shares for individual schools for the variant models.

Primary / Secondary Ratio

- 5.38 A significant factor in differences in funding levels of individual schools across the country is the ratio between funding for primary and secondary pupils. Secondary pupils tend to attract more funding than primary pupils and the average ratio nationally is around 1:1.27. Across the country this ratio spans from 1:1.1 to 1:1.5. The current Slough ratio is 1:1.43 and is at the upper end of the range. The DfE are not, at this stage, prescribing constraints on the primary / secondary ratio, but did suggest in March that an appropriate range would be 1:1.27 to 1:1.35. The DfE has advised authorities that they should be aware of where they are within the range.
- 5.39 The Task and Finish Group, following the guidance of SSEF and the Schools Forum, has been very clear that the existing ratio should be maintained. The Council has concerns about this approach and fears it will be challenged for the following reasons:
- It is a considerable departure from the national average and the DfE guidance and there is no obvious explanation why Slough should be different;
 - The explicit rationale is to maintain the status quo, although it is understood that the various representative bodies believe this to reflect accurately circumstances in the borough;
 - It may not be sustainable in the long term and in any case the ratio will change as the balance of school population shifts;
 - The pressures of smaller scale, greater churn and the recent experience of greater risk to the viability and success of primary schools would suggest primary rather than secondary should be favoured.
- 5.40 Council officers therefore wish to warn of a risk that the DfE could ask for the proposed formula to be revisited. EFA will inform authorities if they are at the extreme ends of the range of the ratio once all the draft proformas have been submitted. At this stage it is not clear what constraints may be set in the future but there is a risk that the ratio is limited from 2014-15. By maintaining the current ratio, Slough could be forced to implement further change for 2014-15.
- 5.41 Before reaching a conclusion on the formula factors the Forum is asked to consider this risk and, if confirmed in their view give guidance to the Council on why it is important that the ratio be maintained. Officers further urge that there is a commitment from the Forum that, before the weighting is confirmed in January, a fuller debate about the imbalance is undertaken.

New Delegation

- 5.42 Several budget items that can currently be retained centrally will have to be delegated through the formula from 2013-14. For each of these, the views of all schools and Academies were sought on proposals as part of the consultation process. With the exception of Outreach there is wide support for distributing funding through the basic per-pupil entitlement.
- 5.43 The model includes the distribution of all new delegated funding through the basic per-pupil entitlement, with the exception of Outreach which has been distributed through the low attainment factor.

De-Delegation

- 5.44 There are some services where maintained schools will be able to decide that some funding should be taken out of their pre-16 formula budgets before they receive them and moved to central funding. These are (i) contingencies; (ii) staff costs – supply cover and (iii) behaviour support services. For each of these, schools forum members in the relevant phase need to decide whether each service should be retained centrally. The decision would apply to all maintained schools in that phase and would mean that the funding for the services would be removed before school budgets were issued.
- 5.45 The consultation demonstrated wide support for the de-delegation of behaviour support services and, to a lesser extent, trade union costs. Academies would, of course, be free to buy back into the services.
- 5.46 De – delegation of the budget for behaviour support services would enable not only the smooth transfer of SSB to the new SEBD outreach services managed by Haybrook and Littledown but also ensure that Slough schools are able to continue to benefit from flexible and high quality support. Over the last few years this has ensured that pupil exclusion rates in the Borough compare very favourably with national averages and that local pupils are able to stay in education, employment or training within their home community.

Reception Uplift

- 5.47 The DfE has recognised that in moving to an October pupil count for the purposes of distributing the DSG and distributing funding to schools an issue is created for schools which operate on 2 points of entry (September and January). In recognition, the DfE will provide authorities with a Reception uplift to adjust the schools block funding. This will be the net difference in numbers on roll in Reception between the October and January census. Local authorities have the choice to apply the uplift to all of their schools or to none of their schools. The data demonstrates that this is not an issue in Slough schools and the formula will not include a reception uplift.

Growth Fund

- 5.48 In compliance with the current regulations, Slough has formula factors for new, reorganised and closing schools. In the reformed system, such additional funding will not form part of the formula because these situations are infrequent and best calculated on a case-by-case basis.
- 5.49 With the agreement of Schools Forum, local authorities can hold a growth fund. The consultation demonstrates support for the retention of a Growth Fund to support expansion. Further work is required to agree clear criteria.

Conclusion and Next Steps

- 5.50 The model developed by the Task and Finish Group, although flawed, maintains the integrity of the current formula. It maps the current formula factors and distributes funding through the new compliant factors using the datasets prescribed by the DfE.
- 5.51 Members of Schools Forum on the Task and Finish Group have contributed a huge effort to develop this current model. However, the Task and Finish Group also recognises that the model distributes funding to meet needs that have been identified in the past. Further work is required to review whether the model is meeting current and known future needs. Subject to establishing the timetable and progress towards a national funding formula which may render further work necessary or unnecessary, it is recommended that a more fundamental review be undertaken.
- 5.52 It is clear that the prescribed datasets do not support the targeting of funding to meet the needs of Slough pupils. Every opportunity will, therefore, be taken by the Council, Schools Forum and schools to lobby for changes to the datasets.
- 5.53 The recommendation and views of Schools Forum on the factors to be included in a compliant 5-16 model will inform the delegated decision to be made by the Chief Executive in order to submit the draft proforma to the DfE by 31 October.
- 5.54 Once the proforma has been submitted by 31 October 2012, the EFA will undertake a check for compliance with the regulations. There may then need to be a further dialogue between Slough and the EFA. Slough will need to send any changes to the EFA by 18 January 2013 once the October 2012 pupil numbers are confirmed and the DSG settlement announced. The only changes between the provisional and final versions should be for the unit values, not the factors used.
- 5.55 The proforma will also contain additional information including details of how split site and PFI allocations have been calculated, and the methods used for de-delegation or additional delegation of services.
- 5.56 These deadlines (31 October and 18 January) are critical to achieving the advantages of issuing earlier budgets. To ensure a speedy approval process in January, it would be helpful to include approval for the principles to be used to balance the budget if pupil numbers turn out differently to the estimates currently being used. The current model implies that the current phase funding split is

maintained, with factor values being scaled back or increased depending on the movement in the datasets and any final MFG adjustment being made to basic per-pupil entitlement.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions are contained within the main body of this report.

Section 151 Officer – Strategic Director of Resources

- 6.2 The financial implications of the proposed changes will be managed within the Dedicated Schools Grant funding envelope. The specific financial implications for the local authority, maintained schools and Academies are being kept under review and will be reported to Schools Forum as appropriate.

Access Implications

- 6.3 There are no access implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 All schools, Academies and Free Schools.
Schools Forum Task and Finish Group.

Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Formal consultation document circulated by e-mail.
Open consultation sessions.

Representations Received

- 7.3 21 consultation responses.

Background Papers

DfE School Funding Reform: Next steps towards a fairer system (March 2012)
DfE School Funding Reform: Final Arrangements 2013-14 (June 2012)
Schools Forum papers – April to July 12 (including Schools Budget 2012-13;
School Funding Reform - various)
DfE 2013-14 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Guidance for Local
Authorities (June 2012)
DfE Modelling Tool
Consultation Document and models, issued to all schools (September 2012)

Contact for further information

Wendy Sagar, Interim Strategic Education Finance Partner (Education & Children's Services) (01753 875627) wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk

Appendix A

	Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
1	Do you agree in principle that the formula should now include a split site factor?	9	2	6	More information about what constitutes a "split site school" and the potential costs are needed before deciding about this factor; We would need more information about what the additional costs of running a split site school were before deciding whether it was worth using this factor
Page 13 2	Do you agree that the funding for factors in the current formula which are no longer compliant under the new arrangements should be distributed through the basic per-pupil entitlement?				There are currently elements within the Teacher Pay Grant and the Catering allocations which are lump sums and these should be transferred to that funding stream. We recognise that the other factors are very much Slough specific and were designed to be responsive to local circumstances so there is no simple way of distributing them through the prescribed factors. It would be simplest to map them to the Basic Per Pupil entitlement. However, new school funding could contribute to the school Growth Fund proposed as it was intended to support similar situations.
a	- Teachers Pay Grant	17	0	0	The teachers pay grant is particularly important as this recognises those schools which have stable, experienced, high performing staff which can only benefit students they teach.
b	- Small School Protection	15	1	1	
c	- Catering	16	1	0	
d	- New Schools	15	0	2	
e	- Partial Class Size	17	0	0	

Appendix A

Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
<p>Do you agree that the funding for the former mainstream grants, which is also no longer a compliant factor under the new arrangements, should be distributed through a combination of (a) Basic per-pupil entitlement; (b) Deprivation; and © Low cost, high incidence SEN (low attainment)?</p>				<p>I haven't ticked any boxes here. There should be clear distinction between and understanding of the intended use of the original grants and any new funding formula; where they were meant for deprivation they should be distributed accordingly. Where they were meant for all pupils in the school, then they should be distributed through basic entitlement. This is an important area where strict attention needs to be given to how these funds were originally distributed in order to prevent unnecessary turbulence. The distribution should reflect the current model as far as possible; Where these grants were originally for the purpose of addressing low attainment or pupils in deprivation they should be distributed through the relevant factor. However if the grants were originally for all pupils they should be distributed through basic entitlement. The original purposes need to be investigated further eg. standards fund originally comprised a number of smaller grants, until this is fully understood the proportions of the combination cannot be determined.</p>
3				

Appendix A

Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
<p>Do you agree that the funding for the former mainstream grants, which is also no longer a compliant factor under the new arrangements, should be distributed through a combination of (a) Basic per-pupil entitlement; (b) Deprivation; and © Low cost, high incidence SEN (low attainment)?</p>	12	0	0	<p>There also needs to be assurance that the grants which came into each phase remain with that phase rather than being combined and distributed across phases. Overall distribution needs to replicate the current model as far as possible; The proposed distributions seem generally appropriate. However, we would expect the EMAG funding would have some correlation to the number of EAL pupils within a school as well as low attainment and therefore further modeling should be considered; But this needs to be looked at carefully so that there is no significant loser (beyond the MFG); minimising turbulence is a good thing; Yes, a combination but proportions are not right as the loss to schools is too high. A balance has to be made to be more in tune with current distribution. The swing between 2012-13 and 2013-14 is too high.</p>

Appendix A

	Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
Page 164	Do you support the central retention of a Growth Fund for funding significant pre-16 pupil growth in primary schools, secondary schools and Academies?	16	0	1	For academies financed from September, to use a previous October Census figures could be a disadvantage if there was a growth of pupils numbers between October and August. At what point in the year would a growth number be triggered? What number of pupils would trigger a growth? There does need to be an in-year trigger. If the growth fund in Q4 relates to a further provision of an additional class size of pupils then the retention of the growth fund would be ok; Given the significant increases in pupil numbers a growth fund should be established. Consideration should also be given to how this will support the on-going increases in pupil numbers once the initial form of entry has been admitted. Similarly, consideration should be given to how this will support new schools that open in the area; If this is the only way of securing funding for growth
5	Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the Growth Fund?	17	0	0	The proposal only offers support in the initial year and schools taking on new forms of entry are likely to face increased costs annually until the new form has worked it's way through the school. Many secondary schools do not currently have Planned Admission Numbers which equate to 30 pupils per class and the funding should ensure that the additional amount allocated reflect this. For example, Wexham Secondary has a PAN of 165 so may increase its PAN to 180 pupils rather than 195. Care should be taken to ensure that new schools are not inappropriately excluded from this potential funding: but could some be allowed for in-year growth as well?

Appendix A

	Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
6	Do you agree that specific contingency funding previously held centrally is transferred into a Growth Fund?	16	0	1	Not unless the growth fund includes significant in-year growth Slough's Children & Young People Plan has a number of priorities including providing a high quality and effective education which seeks to reduce the attainment gap between pupils that traditionally do less well than the national average and their peers including those at KS2 and KS4. It would therefore be appropriate that the balances held be distributed on prior attainment or on social deprivation as priorities within the authority. Funding for trade union supply cover and public service are relatively small amounts and should be distributed on a per pupil basis. However, consideration should be given to the costs incurred by individual schools as a result of them employing trade union officers where they have no alternative; Trade Union supply cover should go to the relevant school
7	Do you agree that the newly delegated funding for the services below, previously held centrally or distributed to Academies through LACSEG, should be distributed to all maintained schools and Academies using the basic per-pupil entitlement factor?				
a	Balance of centrally held contingency funding	16	0	1	
b	Staff costs supply cover: trade union	12	3	2	
c	Staff costs supply cover: public service	14	0	2	
8	Do you agree that the newly delegated funding previously held centrally or distributed to Academies through LACSEG for Outreach (former Behaviour Support Services) should be distributed to all schools and Academies using the low cost, high incidence SEN (low attainment) factor?	15	0	1	Yes, but with the understanding that the schools who would receive no funding because it is going out through this factors would still have an entitlement to the Outreach service as they do currently; Crucial if the service is going to continue as part of the outreach offered by Haybrook and Littledown. Grammar schools would need some form of guarantee that they can access the service despite the fact that they will receive little funding through this.

Appendix A

		Basic per-pupil	Deprivation	Low Attainment	Not Sure	Comments
9	Which factor do you think should be used to distribute funding for 14-16 practical learning to secondary schools and Academies?	7	2	4	4	It is important to note that Grammar school children have practical learning needs too and all pupils need to be appropriately funded; Grammar schools have 14-16 practical learning needs too
		Yes	No	Not Sure		Comments
10	Do you support the de-delegation of maintained school fuding of Outreach (former Behaviour Support Services) in 2013-14 to support both the transition from a Council delivered service and development of provision?	13	0	1		Without this a financially viable outreach service will be impossible to deliver and sustain
11	Do you support the de-delegation of funding for any of the following:					See notes in response to question 7. Whilst all employers are expected to allow any employees called up for jury service the necessary time off, they are not expected to pay their salary, and the individual member of staff would be recompensed directly by the Court Service. Therefore there is no cost to the school who could use the saving on salary to employ replacements; The administration of this small amount of money must surely be onerous. Much more cost effective to delegate to schools
a	Contingency for variations in Dedicated Schools Grant pupil numbers following verification by the Education Funding Agency (funding at local authority level, not individual school level)	12	4	1		
b	Staff costs supply cover: trade union	12	3	2		
c	Staff costs supply cover: public service	6	10	1		

Appendix A

12 Do you have any other comments on the proposed formula?						<p>Comments</p> <p>The proportions of funding which go through basic entitlement, deprivation and low cost, high incidence SEN need to be right to ensure that turbulence is minimised. There needs to be a recognition that particularly at secondary phase that Slough is not typical of the rest of the country and whilst we appreciate there is little flexibility when it comes to the factors there needs to be some assurance the Grammar schools are going to be able to maintain the high quality education they currently provide. A better understanding and transparency in the way the different versions have been created will help. There needs to also be an agreement as to which version is going to be put forward for adoption; The current modelling would suggest that some schools will lose significant amounts of money and this will put their whole viability in jeopardy. This cannot be in the interests of Slough pupils; We appreciate the consultation meetings and information provided and feel that the proposals suggested are fair; Children arriving in KS2 from non-English speaking countries (many of whom have no</p>

Appendix A

13	Do you have any other comments on the proposed arrangements for the notional schools block?					The complexity of this work clearly demonstrates a clear need for someone with schools specific funding expertise to sit within the council's finance team.
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LA Name

Slough

Pupil Led Factors

Sample - the final pro forma may differ

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
		Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)				
2) Deprivation	Reception Uplift			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Primary (including reception)			12446	£37,256,151	£71,901,961	73%
	Key Stage 3			4947	£19,430,495		
	Key Stage 4			3274	£15,215,315		
					Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Indicator: FSM6	£1,105	£1,630	3,100	£6,733,384		
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25	£0	£0	3,168	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3	£0	£0	2,350	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.3- 0.4	£634	£1,271	1,709	£3,711,037	£13,131,727	13%
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5	£795	£1,568	659	£1,922,195		
IDACI Score 0.5-0.6	£987	£1,979	186	£701,188			
IDACI Score 0.6-1	£1,247	£2,461	13	£63,923			
				Number of eligible primary pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: LAC_X_Mart1		£0	42	£0	£0	0.00%
4) Low cost, high incidence SEN	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
6) Mobility	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
7) Lump Sum	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
8) London Fringe	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
9) Split Sites	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
10) Rates	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
11) PF funding	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
12) Sixth Form	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
14) Minimum Funding Guarantee	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
Other Factors		Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
7) Lump Sum		£55,000	per school	39	£2,145,000	£2,145,000	2.18%
8) London Fringe			per school in fringe district	0	£0	£0	0.00%
9) Split Sites							
10) Rates							
11) PF funding							
12) Sixth Form							
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)							
14) Minimum Funding Guarantee							
MFG is set at -1.5%, gains may be capped above a specified ceiling		MFG Floor		Ceiling	Scale Factor	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
		-1.50%		5.00%	100.00%	£866,258	1%
TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£)						£38,419,988	
RETAINED FOR GROWTH						£385,000	
PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO						1 : 1.43	

Comparison - Option 2

1% Reduction in Low Attainment

	Before MFG and De-delegation				After MFG and De-delegation						
	Adjusted Funding	Modelled Funding	Diff	% Diff	Increase	Decrease	Modelled Funding	Diff	% Diff	Increase	Decrease
Western House Primary School	1,781,725	1,969,507	187,782	10.5%	10.5%		1,893,145	111,420	6.3%	6.3%	
Cippenham Infant School	929,436	946,377	16,941	1.8%	1.8%		946,377	16,941	1.8%	1.8%	
Willow Primary School	1,064,124	1,009,392	(54,732)	-5.1%	-5.1%		1,062,423	(1,701)	-0.2%		-0.2%
Godolphin Infant School	1,272,982	1,224,558	(48,424)	-3.8%	-3.8%		1,271,164	(1,818)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Foxborough Primary School	1,648,747	1,652,983	4,236	0.3%	0.3%		1,652,983	4,236	0.3%		0.3%
The Godolphin Junior School	1,611,001	1,503,205	(107,796)	-6.7%	-6.7%		1,607,586	(3,415)	-0.2%		-0.2%
PARLAUNT PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,855,929	1,917,096	61,167	3.3%	3.3%		1,917,096	61,167	3.3%		3.3%
Wexham Court Primary School	1,942,855	1,954,436	11,581	0.6%	0.6%		1,954,436	11,581	0.6%		0.6%
Penn Wood Primary and Nursery School	2,242,181	2,259,510	17,329	0.8%	0.8%		2,259,510	17,329	0.8%		0.8%
Claycots Primary	2,800,088	2,755,723	(44,365)	-1.6%	-1.6%		2,795,020	(5,068)	-0.2%		-0.2%
Monter Primary School	2,937,908	3,052,997	115,089	3.9%	3.9%		3,052,997	115,089	3.9%		3.9%
James Elliman School	2,528,242	2,518,307	(9,935)	-0.4%	-0.4%		2,525,358	(2,884)	-0.1%		-0.1%
St. Mary's C E Primary School	1,796,955	1,900,756	103,801	5.8%	5.8%		1,900,756	103,801	5.8%		5.8%
Colnbrook C.E. Primary School	862,099	750,318	(111,781)	-13.0%	-13.0%		859,224	(2,875)	-0.3%		-0.3%
OUR LADY OF PEACE R.C.INFANT	944,869	963,624	18,755	2.0%	2.0%		963,624	18,755	2.0%		2.0%
Our Lady of Peace Junior	1,237,269	1,346,929	109,660	8.9%	8.9%		1,315,662	78,393	6.3%		6.3%
St. Ethelbert's Catholic Primary School	1,535,497	1,563,044	27,547	1.8%	1.8%		1,563,044	27,547	1.8%		1.8%
ST ANTHONY'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY	1,617,829	1,696,635	78,806	4.9%	4.9%		1,696,635	78,806	4.9%		4.9%
Manor Primary School	2,338,076	2,349,667	11,591	0.5%	0.5%		2,349,667	11,591	0.5%		0.5%
Kilnara Primary School	1,545,242	1,443,835	(101,407)	-6.6%	-6.6%		1,544,518	(724)	0.0%		0.0%
IOB Slough Islamic Primary School	2,512,765	2,503,052	(9,713)	-0.4%	-0.4%		2,509,972	(2,793)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Cippenham Primary School	2,244,052	2,332,991	88,939	4.0%	4.0%		2,332,991	88,939	4.0%		4.0%
Priority School	2,511,916	2,408,835	(103,081)	-4.1%	-4.1%		2,512,180	264	0.0%		0.0%
Holy Family Catholic School	1,422,740	1,469,544	46,804	3.3%	3.3%		1,469,544	46,804	3.3%		3.3%
Castleview School	1,620,549	1,613,105	(7,444)	-0.5%	-0.5%		1,624,197	3,648	0.2%		0.2%
Pippins School	716,867	691,270	(25,597)	-3.6%	-3.6%		716,821	(46)	0.0%		0.0%
Lynch Hill School	2,623,889	2,590,505	(33,384)	-1.3%	-1.3%		2,621,725	(2,164)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Ryvers School	1,708,049	1,714,115	6,066	0.4%	0.4%		1,714,115	6,066	0.4%		0.4%
Primary Total	49,853,881	50,102,319	248,438	0.5%	0.5%		50,632,773	778,892	1.6%		1.6%
BAYLIS COURT SCHOOL	4,756,358	4,815,646	59,288	1.2%	1.2%		4,815,646	59,288	1.2%		1.2%
BEECHWOOD SCHOOL	5,301,722	5,295,754	(5,968)	-0.1%	-0.1%		5,295,754	(5,968)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Wexham School	4,693,168	4,916,310	223,142	4.8%	4.8%		4,916,310	223,142	4.8%		4.8%
Slough & Eton C of E Business & Enterprise College	5,471,697	5,659,354	187,657	3.4%	3.4%		5,659,354	187,657	3.4%		3.4%
St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School	3,018,591	2,895,219	(123,372)	-4.1%	-4.1%		3,008,764	(9,827)	-0.3%		-0.3%
St Joseph's Catholic High School	3,630,627	3,578,943	(51,684)	-1.4%	-1.4%		3,612,127	(18,500)	-0.5%		-0.5%
LANGLEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL	3,589,698	3,555,739	(33,959)	-0.9%	-0.9%		3,578,359	(11,339)	-0.3%		-0.3%
Herschel Grammar School	3,203,913	3,024,547	(179,366)	-5.6%	-5.6%		3,191,002	(12,911)	-0.4%		-0.4%
Slough Grammar School	3,890,559	3,891,565	1,006	0.0%	0.0%		3,891,565	1,006	0.0%		0.0%
THE WESTGATE SCHOOL	4,623,973	4,758,894	134,921	2.9%	2.9%		4,758,894	134,921	2.9%		2.9%
The Langley Academy	5,026,060	5,059,449	33,389	0.7%	0.7%		5,059,449	33,389	0.7%		0.7%
Secondary Total	47,206,366	47,451,421	245,055	0.5%	0.5%		47,787,225	580,859	1.2%		1.2%
Mainstream Schools Total	97,060,247	97,553,740	493,493	0.5%	0.5%		98,419,998	1,359,751	1.4%		1.4%

LA Name

Slough

Pupil Led Factors

Sample - the final pro forma may differ

Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)	Number of eligible primary pupils	Number of eligible secondary pupils		
1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Reception Uplift		n/a		n/a	n/a
	Primary (including reception) Key Stage 3 Key Stage 4		12446	4947	£37,120,714 £19,091,493 £14,950,035	72%
2) Deprivation	Description		Total		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: FSM6		3,100	2,161	£6,733,384	
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25		3,158	1,855	£0	
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3		2,350	1,378	£0	
	IDACI Score 0.3 - 0.4		2,429	1,709	£3,711,037	13%
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5		1,103	659	£1,922,195	
IDACI Score 0.5-0.6		317	196	£701,188		
IDACI Score 0.6-1		13	19	£63,923		
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Description		Number of Pupils		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
Indicator: LAC_X_Mar11		£0	42	£0	£0	0.00%
4) Low cost, high incidence SEN	Description		Number of Pupils		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: LowAt_%, PRI_73 Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English and Maths)		2766	991	£4,032,696 £4,718,750	8.89%
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description		Number of Pupils		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1 PRI Secondary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1 SEC		295	117	£0 £0	0.0%
6) Mobility	Description		Number of Pupils		Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates Secondary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates		1,359	291	£192 £193	0.3%

Other Factors

Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
7) Lump Sum	£55,000	per school	39	£2,145,000	2.18%
8) London Fringe		per school in fringe district	0	£0	0.00%
9) Split Sites	Description		Total (£)		Proportion of funding
	Split Sites			£25,000	0.03%
10) Rates	Description		Total (£)		Proportion of funding
	Rates			£973,516	0.99%
11) PFI funding	Description		Total (£)		Proportion of funding
	PFI			£786,358	0.80%
12) Sixth Form	Description		Total (£)		Proportion of funding
	Existing Sixth Form Commitments			£0	0.00%
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)	Description		Sub Total (£)		Proportion of funding
	Excep Circs 1 Excep Circs 2 Excep Circs 3			£0 £0 £0	0.00%

Description	MFG Floor	Ceiling	Scale Factor	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
14) Minimum Funding Guarantee	-1.50%	5.00%	100.00%	£1,127,423	1%
TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£)				£38,419,988	
RETAINED FOR GROWTH				£385,000	
PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO				1 : 1.43	

Slough Datasets (October 2011)

Appendix B

	Primary		Secondary		Total	
	Total	Average %	Total	Average %	Total	Average %
<u>Basic per-pupil Entitlement</u>						
Number on Roll (NOR) at October pupil count	12533	60.2%	8279	39.8%	20812	
Key Stage 3 NOR			4978	60.1%		
Key Stage 4 NOR			3301	39.9%		
<u>Deprivation - Free School Meals</u>						
Eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) at latest October pupil count	2214	17.0%	1176	14.0%	3390	
Eligible for Free School Meals at any point in the previous 6 years (Ever6 FSM)	3120	24.0%	2184	25.0%	5304	
<u>Deprivation - Index of Deprivation Affecting Children (IDACI)</u>						
IDACI 0	3107	26.0%	2387	29.0%	5494	26.4%
IDACI 10%	3179	25.0%	1897	23.0%	5076	24.4%
IDACI 20%	2365	20.0%	1389	17.0%	3754	18.0%
IDACI 30%	2439	19.0%	1724	21.0%	4163	20.0%
IDACI 40%	1112	9.0%	664	8.0%	1776	8.5%
IDACI 50%	318	2.0%	198	2.0%	516	2.5%
IDACI 60% probability of living in deprived circumstances	13	0.0%	19	0.0%	32	0.2%
<u>English as an Additional Language</u>						
English as an Additional Language (EAL) 1 year	296	2.3%	118	1.0%	414	2.0%
EAL 2 years	1864	15.4%	204	2.0%	2068	9.9%
EAL 3 years	3245	26.4%	339	4.0%	3584	17.2%
<u>Looked After Children</u>						
Looked after Children (LAC) Ever as at March 11	32	0.5%	11	0.0%	43	0.2%
LAC 6 months as at March 11	21	0.3%	9	0.0%	30	0.1%
LAC 12 months as at March 11	19	0.3%	8	0.0%	27	0.1%
<u>Low cost, high incidence SEN</u>						
Low Attainment Primary Early Years Foundation Stage Profile fewer than 78 points	3805	30.5%				
Low Attainment Primary Early Years Foundation Stage Profile fewer than 73 points	2783	22.1%				
Low Attainment Secondary pupils achieving level 3 or below in both maths and english at key stage 2			1003	12.0%		
<u>Pupil Mobility</u>						
Mobility (start in last 3 academic years, but not in August or September (or January for Year 1))	1369	10.9%	294	3.0%	1663	8.0%

Comparison - Option 1

Appendix F

12-13	Before MFG and De-delegation					After MFG and De-delegation					
	Adjusted Funding	Modelled Funding	Diff	% Diff	Increase	Decrease	Modelled Funding	Diff	% Diff	Increase	Decrease
Western House Primary School	1,781,725	1,963,958	182,233	10.2%	10.2%		1,893,145	111,420	6.3%	6.3%	
Cippenham Infant School	929,436	943,450	14,014	1.5%	1.5%		943,450	14,014	1.5%	1.5%	
Willow Primary School	1,064,124	1,006,813	(57,311)	-5.4%	-5.4%	-5.4%	1,062,423	(1,701)	-0.2%		-0.2%
Godolphin Infant School	1,272,982	1,221,348	(51,634)	-4.1%	-4.1%	-4.1%	1,271,164	(1,818)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Foxborough Primary School	1,648,747	1,649,022	275	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1,649,022	275	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
The Godolphin Junior School	1,611,001	1,499,320	(111,681)	-6.9%	-6.9%	-6.9%	1,607,586	(3,415)	-0.2%		-0.2%
PARLAUNT PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL	1,855,929	1,911,840	55,911	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	1,911,840	55,911	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Wexham Court Primary School	1,942,855	1,948,886	6,031	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	1,948,886	6,031	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Penn Wood Primary and Nursery School	2,242,181	2,254,831	12,650	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	2,254,831	12,650	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Claycots Primary	2,800,088	2,748,748	(51,340)	-1.8%	-1.8%	-1.8%	2,795,020	(5,068)	-0.2%		-0.2%
Montem Primary School	2,937,908	3,046,228	108,320	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3,046,228	108,320	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%
James Elliman School	2,528,242	2,511,648	(16,594)	-0.7%	-0.7%	-0.7%	2,525,358	(2,884)	-0.1%		-0.1%
St. Mary's CE Primary School	1,796,955	1,895,957	99,002	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	1,895,957	99,002	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%
Colbrook C.E. Primary School	862,099	748,522	(113,577)	-13.2%	-13.2%	-13.2%	859,224	(2,875)	-0.3%		-0.3%
OUR LADY OF PEACE R.C.INFANT	944,869	960,686	15,817	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	960,686	15,817	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Our Lady of Peace Junior	1,237,269	1,343,088	105,819	8.6%	8.6%	8.6%	1,315,662	78,393	6.3%		6.3%
St. Ethelbert's Catholic Primary School	1,535,497	1,558,691	23,194	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1,558,691	23,194	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
ST ANTHONY'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY	1,617,829	1,692,141	74,312	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	1,692,141	74,312	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%
Manthorpe Primary School	2,338,076	2,343,323	5,247	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	2,343,323	5,247	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Kingsley Primary School	1,545,242	1,439,602	(105,640)	-6.8%	-6.8%	-6.8%	1,544,518	(724)	0.0%		0.0%
IOU Slough Islamic Primary School	2,512,765	2,496,327	(16,438)	-0.7%	-0.7%	-0.7%	2,509,972	(2,793)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Cum gratia Primary School	2,244,052	2,326,386	82,334	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	2,326,386	82,334	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%
Princes School	2,511,916	2,401,512	(110,404)	-4.4%	-4.4%	-4.4%	2,512,180	264	0.0%		0.0%
Holy Family Catholic School	1,422,740	1,464,941	42,201	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	1,464,941	42,201	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Castleview School	1,620,549	1,607,751	(12,798)	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.8%	1,624,197	3,648	0.2%		0.2%
Pippins School	716,867	689,322	(27,545)	-3.8%	-3.8%	-3.8%	716,821	(46)	0.0%		0.0%
Lynch Hill School	2,623,889	2,583,323	(40,566)	-1.5%	-1.5%	-1.5%	2,621,725	(2,164)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Ryvers School	1,708,049	1,709,218	1,169	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1,709,218	1,169	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Primary Total	49,853,881	49,966,882	113,001	0.2%	0.2%		50,564,597	710,716	1.4%		
BAYLIS COURT SCHOOL	4,756,358	4,820,321	63,963	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	4,820,321	63,963	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
BEECHWOOD SCHOOL	5,301,722	5,301,733	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5,301,733	11	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wexham School	4,693,168	4,946,606	253,438	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%	4,946,606	253,438	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%
Slough & Elton C of E Business & Enterprise College	5,471,697	5,703,674	231,977	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	5,703,674	231,977	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%
St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School	3,018,591	2,849,165	(169,426)	-5.6%	-5.6%	-5.6%	3,008,764	(9,827)	-0.3%		-0.3%
St Joseph's Catholic High School	3,630,627	3,575,092	(55,535)	-1.5%	-1.5%	-1.5%	3,612,127	(18,500)	-0.5%		-0.5%
LANGLEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL	3,589,698	3,500,413	(89,285)	-2.5%	-2.5%	-2.5%	3,578,359	(11,339)	-0.3%		-0.3%
Herschel Grammar School	3,203,913	2,978,680	(225,233)	-7.0%	-7.0%	-7.0%	3,191,002	(12,911)	-0.4%		-0.4%
Slough Grammar School	3,890,559	3,833,635	(56,924)	-1.5%	-1.5%	-1.5%	3,876,440	(14,119)	-0.4%		-0.4%
THE WESTGATE SCHOOL	4,623,973	4,762,903	138,930	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4,762,903	138,930	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
The Langley Academy	5,026,060	5,053,472	27,412	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	5,053,472	27,412	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Secondary Total	47,206,366	47,325,693	119,327	0.3%	0.3%		47,855,400	649,034	1.4%		
Mainstream Schools Total	97,060,247	97,292,575	232,328	0.2%	0.2%		98,419,998	1,359,751	1.4%		

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS INCLUDING NOTIONAL SEN BUDGET

General

From April 2013 schools will receive three elements of funding. Element 1 is the basic per pupil entitlement, Element 2 is for Additional Educational Needs (AEN) and Element 3 is top up funding for pupils with statements. Elements 1 and 2 will be allocated to schools from the Schools Block of funding whilst Element 3 will be allocated for individual pupils from the centrally retained High Needs Block.

Element 1

This is the basic per pupil allocation which replaces the AWPU.

Element 2

This is the funding for AEN which will be used by schools to provide support for any individual pupils or groups of pupils with additional needs including:

- those with high incidence low level special educational needs; and
- up to £6k for pupils with Statements of SEN.

Based on the cost of a TA/LSA this £6k could buy 16 hours of support per week. Clearly schools can also use funding from Element 1 to support additional needs.

Element 2 will be calculated using data related to:

- deprivation, which is calculated on IDACI data;
- free school meals, which is calculated on the Ever 6 data;
- pupil mobility; and
- prior attainment, which is based on 73 points at EYFS for primary and those not achieving Level 4 in Maths and English for secondary.

This funding for AEN includes the Notional SEN Budget. There is an expectation that schools will provide the first £6k of support for statemented pupils from the Notional SEN Budget. In order to ensure that there is sufficient funding within the Schools Block for this purpose, with Schools Forum agreement, it is proposed to transfer £1m from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block.

Pupils with SEN do not all require provision costing £6k but anything under this level will be within the Notional SEN Budget which is part of the AEN Budget in schools.

The document setting out what schools are expected to provide from within their Notional SEN Budget will be amended in consultation with schools.

Element 3

This is top up funding for pupils with statements where the cost of their provision is over £6k. In future statements will only be required for any funding needed over £6k.

For pupils with statements in selective schools, the requirement to provide the first £6k of funding will not apply as they do not attract funding for prior attainment.

A schedule showing the proposed AEN Budget for each mainstream school, the amount of funding that each school must allocate to statemented pupils (based on January 2012 data) and the top up funding for each school is attached.

The balance of funding remaining in a school's AEN Budget (once the statemented pupils have received £6k each) could be less than £30k. In such cases, the Authority will discuss the implications with that school to consider whether or not additional top up funding from the High Needs Block is required.

Inter-Authority Recoupment for Statemented Pupils

It should be noted that inter-authority recoupment for statemented pupils will end on 31 March 2013. From 1 April 2013 schools will be required to negotiate directly with the individual placing Authority about the cost of top up funding required for individual pupils with statements and also to invoice the Authorities for payment. Slough will not provide the top up funding for pupils from other Authorities.

We will arrange a workshop for affected schools in the spring term to assist with this change in responsibility.