

Appendix 3 – Summary of responses from SRPs

The Commonweal School - PD	Robert Le Kyng Primary School - PD	Westlea Primary School - PD	Kingsdown - ASD	Lydiard Park Academy - ASD	The Ridgeway School & Sixth Form College - ASD	Ruskin - ASD	Eldene Nursery & Primary School - CLD	Millbrook Primary School - CLD	Red Oaks - LDD	The Commonweal School - SpLD	Even Swindon - SSL	Red Oaks - SBI
----------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	--	--------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	--------------------	----------------

OPTION

Option 1 - Take SPLD down 1 band and put PD up 1 band	5		1	1	1	1	3	6	2		5	4	
Option 2 - Provide Contingency from mainstream funding	6		5				5	3 (ii)	5		6	5	
Option 3a - Provide contingency from SRP units by reducing bandings	2	2	4				4	5	6		2	3	
Option 3b - Provide contingency from SRP units by reducing access to mainstream fees by 25%	1	2					1	2	3	2	1	6	2
Option 3c - Provide contingency from SRP units by reducing ASD fees by 15%	4	2	3				2	4	4	3	4	2	3
Option 3d - Provide contingency from SRP units by reducing all allowances by 1%	3	1	2	2			6	1	1	1	3	1	1

1 being the most preferred option and 6 the least

Comments received from various SRPs

Red Oaks

The overall feeling was that mainstream funding should not be touched as there is already pressure on this area due to the high number of SEN children in Red Oaks.

Lydiard Park

The only option that works for LPA is option 1.

Ruskin

Another option could be to remove the access to mainstream funding for all those schools that do not have a deficit and who would not go into deficit if it this was applied. For Red Oaks SBI this could be half the access to mainstream funding amount to prevent This would generate a contingency fund of £141,000 for re-distribution.

Kingsdown

Kingsdown consider just 2 of the options suitable, Option 1 and Option 3d.

I'd be keen to understand how this will work in future years. Will you expect to do a similar exercise? Costs will vary year on year depending on long term sickness, maternity, staff mobility etc. We will also have other varying factors such as PP to consider, I note PP is included in the income, yet no allocation for expenditure. Would this skew the figures by £41k overall? I do appreciate many schools will absorb PP within their staffing costs, however this is not always the case.

Kingsdown are happy to consider a self/peer to peer evaluation process.

We'd rank our response as Option 1) – 1st, Option 3d) 2nd. Naturally we'd of course like to see the current deficit balance netted off to zero as offered in Option 3d, however the reason this hasn't be ranked first is a) moral consideration for the benefit of all Swindon students, and b) not having sufficient certainty/clarity for future funding; Option 3d shows a Kingsdown's funding allocation £294k, with 'extra funding redistribution' of £106k – will this be available next year? Concerning to say the least! We vote as above assuming there would be some assurance that following this exercise, the funding would be static/consistent.

Robert Le Kyng

Any of the option 3 versions sort out my deficit, so I would happily sign up to any of them for 2015/16. Option 3d is probably the fairest as it takes into account all the deficits and leaves no school substantially out of pocket.

However, this may not be the perfect on-going model as it encourages schools to be pessimistic when budget setting in order to be given more funding. We may be creating a growing problem for future years. We can benchmark the costs of leadership and premises etc., but the largest outgoing by far is staffing and this would be harder to benchmark.

Equally, I don't want to put my school in the position of having to justify this same position every year. As you have seen from the few meetings we have had, new people enter the conversation and we go back to square one. The problem does lie in PD funding and there must be a straight forward way to add more weight to these bandings in future years to balance the funds.

Commonweal

We have no figure for the impact of Option 2 on PD funding. Since all other options have subsidised the deficit for that SRP rather than removed it we have assumed that this would also be the case under that option? Looking at this option we noted that the choice was for an additional cost per student of £1.82. We also saw that the various options 3a-d were for the creation of a contingency. Is there an assumption that this would be delegated to PD settings or would it down to us to apply for this funding each year?