

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
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
3	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 (c) Low cost, high incidence SEN (low attainment)?					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.

Appendix A

	Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
3	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)?	12	0	0	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.

Appendix A

	Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Comments
4	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	<p>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</p>
5	Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the Growth Fund?	17	0	0	<p>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?</p>

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
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?				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
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 factor 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 funding 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

					Comments
12	Do you have any other comments on the proposed formula?				<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

Sample - the final pro forma may differ

Pupil Led Factors

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Reception Uplift				n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Primary (including reception)		£2,993		12446	£37,256,151		73%
	Key Stage 3		£3,928		4947	£19,430,495	£71,901,961	
	Key Stage 4		£4,647		3274	£15,215,315		
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)	Number of eligible primary pupils	Number of eligible secondary pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: FSM6	£1,105	£1,530	3,100	2,161	£6,733,384		
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25	£0	£0	3,158	1,885	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3	£0	£0	2,350	1,378	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.3- 0.4	£634	£1,271	2,429	1,709	£3,711,037	£13,131,727	13%
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5	£795	£1,588	1,103	659	£1,922,195		
	IDACI Score 0.5-0.6	£987	£1,979	317	196	£701,188		
	IDACI Score 0.6-1	£1,247	£2,461	13	19	£63,923		
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: LAC_X_Mar11	£0		42			£0	0.00%
4) Low cost, high incidence SEN	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: LowAtt_%_PRI_73	£1,458		2766		£4,032,696	£8,272,892	8.41%
	Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English and Maths)	£4,279		991		£4,240,196		
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1_PRI	£0		295		£0	£0	0.0%
	Secondary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1_SEC	£0		117		£0		
6) Mobility	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£192		1,359		£260,883	£316,986	0.3%
	Secondary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£193		291		£56,103		

Other Factors

7) Lump Sum	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Lump Sum	£55,000	per school	39		£2,145,000	2.18%
8) London Fringe	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	London fringe pay bands (only applicable to Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent and West Sussex) . Applies to All per pupil values and lump sum		per school in fringe district	0		£0	0.00%
9) Split Sites	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Split Sites					£25,000	0.03%
10) Rates	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Rates					£973,816	0.99%
11) PFI funding	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	PFI					£786,358	0.80%
12) Sixth Form	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Existing Sixth Form Commitments					£0	0.00%
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Excep Circs 1				£0	£0	0.00%
	Excep Circs 2				£0		
	Excep Circs 3				£0		

14) Minimum Funding Guarantee	Description	MFG Floor	Unit	Ceiling	Scale Factor	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	MFG is set at -1.5%, gains may be capped above a specified ceiling	-1.50%		5.00%	100.00%		£866,258	1%

TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£) :						£98,419,998	
RETAINED FOR GROWTH :						£385,000	
PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO :						1 : 1.43	

Comparison - Option 2

Appendix G

1% Reduction in Low Attainment

	Before MFG and De-delegation						After MFG and De-delegation				
	12-13										
	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%
Montem 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%	
Marish Primary School	2,338,076	2,349,667	11,591	0.5%	0.5%		2,349,667	11,591	0.5%	0.5%	
Khalsa Primary School	1,545,242	1,443,835	(101,407)	-6.6%		-6.6%	1,544,518	(724)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IQRA 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%	
Priory School	2,511,916	2,408,835	(103,081)	-4.1%		-4.1%	2,512,180	264	0.0%	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%	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%			50,632,773	778,892	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 Colleg	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%			47,787,225	580,859	1.2%		
Mainstream Schools Total	97,060,247	97,553,740	493,493	0.5%			98,419,998	1,359,751	1.4%		

LA Name

Slough

Sample - the final pro forma may differ

Pupil Led Factors

1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Reception Uplift				n/a		n/a	n/a
Primary (including reception)		£2,983		12446		£37,120,714	£71,162,242	72%
Key Stage 3		£3,859		4947		£19,091,493		
Key Stage 4		£4,586		3274		£14,950,035		
2) Deprivation	Description	Primary amount per pupil (£)	Secondary amount per pupil (£)	Number of eligible primary pupils	Number of eligible secondary pupils	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: FSM6	£1,105	£1,530	3,100	2,161	£6,733,384	£13,131,727	13%
	IDACI Score 0.2 - 0.25	£0	£0	3,158	1,885	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.25-0.3	£0	£0	2,350	1,378	£0		
	IDACI Score 0.3- 0.4	£634	£1,271	2,429	1,709	£3,711,037		
	IDACI Score 0.4-0.5	£795	£1,588	1,103	659	£1,922,195		
	IDACI Score 0.5-0.6	£987	£1,979	317	196	£701,188		
IDACI Score 0.6-1	£1,247	£2,461	13	19	£63,923			
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Indicator: LAC_X_Mar11	£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
	Primary pupils- Indicator: LowAtt_%_PRI_73	£1,458		2766		£4,032,696	£8,751,446	8.89%
Secondary pupils not achieving (KS2 level 4 English and Maths)	£4,762		991		£4,718,750			
5) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1_PRI	£0		295		£0	£0	0.0%
Secondary pupils- Indicator: EAL_1_SEC	£0		117		£0			
6) Mobility	Description	Amount (£) per pupil		Number of Pupils		Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Primary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£192		1,359		£260,883	£316,986	0.3%
Secondary pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£193		291		£56,103			

Other Factors

7) Lump Sum	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	Lump Sum	£55,000	per school	39		£2,145,000	2.18%	
8) London Fringe	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	London fringe pay bands (only applicable to Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent and West Sussex) . Applies to All per pupil values and lump sum		per school in fringe district	0		£0	0.00%	
9) Split Sites	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	Split Sites					£25,000	0.03%	
10) Rates	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	Rates					£973,816	0.99%	
11) PFI funding	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	PFI					£786,358	0.80%	
12) Sixth Form	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	Existing Sixth Form Commitments					£0	0.00%	
13) Exceptional circumstances (can only be used with prior agreement of EFA)	Description	Amount (£)	Unit	Number of Schools	Unit	Sub Total (£)	Total (£)	Proportion of funding
	Excep Circs 1					£0	£0	0.00%
	Excep Circs 2					£0		
	Excep Circs 3					£0		
					£0			
14) Minimum Funding Guarantee	Description	MFG Floor		Ceiling	Scale Factor	Total (£)	Proportion of funding	
	MFG is set at -1.5%, gains may be capped above a specified ceiling and / or s	-1.50%		5.00%	100.00%	£1,127,423	1%	

TOTAL FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS BLOCK FORMULA (£) : £98,419,998

RETAINED FOR GROWTH : £385,000

PRIMARY/SECONDARY RATIO : 1 : 1.43

Slough Datasets (October 2011)

Primary		Secondary		Total	
Total	Average	Total	Average	Total	Average
	%		%		%

Appendix B

Basic per-pupil Entitlement

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%		

Deprivation - Free School Meals

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	

Deprivation - Index of Deprivation Affecting Children (IDACI)

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%

English as an Additional Language

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%

Looked After Children

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%

Low cost, high incidence SEN

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%		

Pupil Mobility

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

	Before MFG and De-delegation					After MFG and De-delegation					
	12-13 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%	1,062,423	(1,701)	-0.2%		-0.2%
Godolphin Infant School	1,272,982	1,221,348	(51,634)	-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%	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%		1,911,840	55,911	3.0%	3.0%	
Wexham Court Primary School	1,942,855	1,948,886	6,031	0.3%	0.3%		1,948,886	6,031	0.3%	0.3%	
Penn Wood Primary and Nursery School	2,242,181	2,254,831	12,650	0.6%	0.6%		2,254,831	12,650	0.6%	0.6%	
Claycots Primary	2,800,088	2,748,748	(51,340)	-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%		3,046,228	108,320	3.7%	3.7%	
James Elliman School	2,528,242	2,511,648	(16,594)	-0.7%		-0.7%	2,525,358	(2,884)	-0.1%		-0.1%
St. Mary's C E Primary School	1,796,955	1,895,957	99,002	5.5%	5.5%		1,895,957	99,002	5.5%	5.5%	
Colnbrook C.E. Primary School	862,099	748,522	(113,577)	-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%		960,686	15,817	1.7%	1.7%	
Our Lady of Peace Junior	1,237,269	1,343,088	105,819	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%		1,558,691	23,194	1.5%	1.5%	
ST ANTHONY'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY	1,617,829	1,692,141	74,312	4.6%	4.6%		1,692,141	74,312	4.6%	4.6%	
Marish Primary School	2,338,076	2,343,323	5,247	0.2%	0.2%		2,343,323	5,247	0.2%	0.2%	
Khalsa Primary School	1,545,242	1,439,602	(105,640)	-6.8%		-6.8%	1,544,518	(724)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IQRA Slough Islamic Primary School	2,512,765	2,496,327	(16,438)	-0.7%		-0.7%	2,509,972	(2,793)	-0.1%		-0.1%
Cippenham Primary School	2,244,052	2,326,386	82,334	3.7%	3.7%		2,326,386	82,334	3.7%	3.7%	
Priory School	2,511,916	2,401,512	(110,404)	-4.4%		-4.4%	2,512,180	264	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Holy Family Catholic School	1,422,740	1,464,941	42,201	3.0%	3.0%		1,464,941	42,201	3.0%	3.0%	
Castlview School	1,620,549	1,607,751	(12,798)	-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%	716,821	(46)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lynch Hill School	2,623,889	2,583,323	(40,566)	-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%		1,709,218	1,169	0.1%	0.1%	
Primary Total	49,853,881	49,966,882	113,001	0.2%			50,564,597	710,716	1.4%		
BAYLIS COURT SCHOOL	4,756,358	4,820,321	63,963	1.3%	1.3%		4,820,321	63,963	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%		4,946,606	253,438	5.4%	5.4%	
Slough & Eton C of E Business & Enterprise College	5,471,697	5,703,674	231,977	4.2%	4.2%		5,703,674	231,977	4.2%	4.2%	
St Bernard's Catholic Grammar School	3,018,591	2,849,165	(169,426)	-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%	3,612,127	(18,500)	-0.5%		-0.5%
LANGLEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL	3,589,698	3,500,413	(89,285)	-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%	3,191,002	(12,911)	-0.4%		-0.4%
Slough Grammar School	3,890,559	3,833,635	(56,924)	-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%		4,762,903	138,930	3.0%	3.0%	
The Langley Academy	5,026,060	5,053,472	27,412	0.5%	0.5%		5,053,472	27,412	0.5%	0.5%	
Secondary Total	47,206,366	47,325,693	119,327	0.3%			47,855,400	649,034	1.4%		
Mainstream Schools Total	97,060,247	97,292,575	232,328	0.2%			98,419,998	1,359,751	1.4%		