

Slough Borough Council

5-16 Funding Formula for Schools

Consultation Response Form

To support Governors, Head teachers and Bursars to respond to the consultation, three sessions will be held where officers will explain the proposals and answer questions:

Tuesday, 25 September at noon

Tuesday, 25 September at 6pm

Wednesday, 3 October at noon

**The closing date for this consultation is: 11 October 2012
Your comments must reach us by that date.**

Name:

Role:

Organisation:

Address:

Under the new arrangements, schools and Academies will be funded based on data from the October pupil census rather than the current January pupil count . To prevent schools with lots of deferred entries to reception classes being disadvantaged, a reception uplift could reflect the difference in Reception pupil numbers only between the October and January counts. We believe that, since Slough primary schools operate a single point of entry, this is not necessary.

- 1. Do you agree that no reception uplift is applied when calculating school budget shares for pupils joining school in January**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

The Slough formula does not currently target resources towards children for whom English is an additional language (EAL). However, pupils with EAL often require additional support. The DfE have considered evidence on how much support is needed and have decided that 3 years – from the point at which the pupil enters compulsory education in England – should be sufficient. This factor would not target 2nd or 3rd generation pupils as it can only be applied based on data sets issued by the DfE.

- 2. Do you agree that we should include English as an Additional Language as a factor in the formula?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

With early intervention, pupils with EAL can achieve well, even earlier. However the cost of supporting pupils who start school in England at an older age can be considerably higher. We are able to allocate one rate

for EAL pupils in primary schools and a different rate for EAL pupils in secondary schools.

3. If you answered yes to question 2, do you agree that we should have different rates for EAL in primary and secondary schools?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

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. The current Slough formula does not make any provision for the additional costs incurred by schools operating from split sites. **Need to confirm whether we have 2 schools or a split site at Claycotts**

4. Do you agree that we should not include a split site factor in the formula?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

The new arrangements restrict the number of allowable factors in the local 5-16 formula. Most of the current factors in the Slough formula have been mapped to compliant factors. However, there are five factors which cannot be included in the formula. The compliant factors which could be used to distribute this funding are: basic pupil entitlement; deprivation; low cost, high incidence SEN; lump sum or pupil mobility.

5. Do you agree that the funding for the following current factors which are no longer compliant should be funded through the basic per-pupil entitlement?
- (a) Teachers Pay Grant

Yes No Not Sure

(b) Small school protection

Yes No Not Sure

(c) Catering

Yes No Not Sure

(d) New Schools; and

Yes No Not Sure

(e) Partial Class Size

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

The attached schedule shows the breakdown of the former mainstream grants factor in the current formula which is also no longer compliant. The compliant factors which could be used to distribute this funding are: basic pupil entitlement; deprivation; low cost, high incidence SEN; English as an additional language; lump sum and / or pupil mobility.

6. Do you agree that the funding for the former mainstream grants, which is also no longer compliant under the new arrangements, should be funded through a combination of:

- (a) Basic per-pupil entitlement
- (b) Deprivation; and
- (c) Low cost / high incidence SEN

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Slough has already delivered a key stage 1 expansion programme to support rapid growth in pupil numbers to date. This growth is now feeding through into key stage 2 and expansion in secondary places will be required in the future. In order to support coordinated growth provision, Slough is able to create a growth fund from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in advance of allocating school budget shares. The growth fund will be ring-fenced so that it is only used for the purposes of supporting growth in pupil numbers to meet basic need and will be for the benefit of both maintained schools and Academies.

7. Do you support the central retention of a Growth Fund for funding significant pre-16 pupil growth in primary schools, secondary schools and Academies?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Schools Forum is required to approve the transparent and consistent criteria on which any growth funding is to be allocated and agree any allocations.

8. Do you agree with the following proposed criteria for the Growth Fund?
- (a) For each new form of entry recommended by the School Organisation Committee and endorsed by Schools Forum, the appropriate AWPU for a full class; and
 - (b) For each bulge class provided at the request of the local authority and endorsed by Schools Forum, the appropriate AWPU for a full class.

In either case, funding to continue until actual pupil numbers for the new form of entry or bulge class is included in the October count and funded through the formula.

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

It is proposed that the current contingencies held for Significant September Intake (£195k) and School Places (£189k) are transferred into the Growth fund. Any funds remaining at the end of the financial year will be added to the following year's DSG and reallocated to maintained schools and Academies through the formula.

9. Do you agree that the contingency funding previously held centrally is transferred into a Growth Fund?

 Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

One of the intentions of the new arrangements is to establish schools as commissioners through the maximum delegation of responsibilities and funding.

10. Do you agree that the contingency funding previously held centrally or distributed to Academies through LACSEG for rates variations and changes in DSG pupil numbers should be delegated to all maintained schools and Academies using the basic per-pupil entitlement factor?

 Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

11. Do you agree that the funding previously held centrally or distributed to Academies through LACSEG for the following:

(a) 14-16 practical learning

Yes

No

Not Sure

(b) Behaviour Support Services

Yes

No

Not Sure

(c) Staff costs supply cover: public service

Yes

No

Not Sure

(d) Staff costs supply cover: trade union

Yes

No

Not Sure

should be delegated using the basic per-pupil entitlement factor or the low cost, high incidence SEN factor?

Comments:

There are some services where the regulations allow optional de-delegation for maintained schools only.

12. Do you support the de-delegation of maintained school funding for Behaviour Support Services in 2013-14 to support the transition from a Council delivered service and development of provision?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

13. Do you support the de-delegation of funding for any of the following:

- (a) Contingency
- (b) Staff costs – supply cover (Trade Union)
- (c) Staff costs – supply cover (General)

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

14. Do you have any other comments on the proposed formula?

15. Do you have any other comments on the proposed arrangements for the notional Schools Block?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 11 October 2012.

Send by post to: Wendy Sagar, Schools Funding Reform Project manager, 3rd Floor West, St. Martin's Place, 51 Bath Road, Slough. SL1 3UF

Send by e-mail to: wendy.sagar@slough.gov.uk