

## Mainstream Funding Consultation Questionnaire Response Form September 2012 – Annex A

(Please see “School Funding Consultation Overview and Guidance” document which describes the issues and options available)

The LA hopes to ascertain the consensus views of each sector at the planned consultation events. Schools/Academies may wish to complete this form prior to their event and/or submit an individual response to the LA either electronically to [schoolsfinanceteam@swindon.gov.uk](mailto:schoolsfinanceteam@swindon.gov.uk) or as a hard copy via internal mail marked for the attention of Steve Haley, Sanford House by 30<sup>th</sup> September at the latest.

Please strikethrough either Yes or No in the end column to indicate your view. Space is provided for your explanations and/or alternative suggestions on each area and at the end of the response form for any general feedback.

School / Academy ..... This Response form was completed by ..... Date .....

### Part A - Centrally Retained Budget Proposals 2013/14

**Question 1 - Do you support the LAs indicative 2013/14 budget proposals for the following central items:**

- Admissions - £200,000
- Operation of Schools Forum - £2,000
- Termination of employment costs - £100,000
- If you disagree with any/all of these items please specify .....

Yes  
Yes  
Yes

**Question 2 - Do you support the principle of the LA retaining funding in 2013/14 for the following central schools items (indicative values will be provided at the consultation event but are likely to total less than 2012/13) :**

- Contributions towards Equal pay - £TBC (LA will continue to fund 50% of each settings liability payments)
- Pupil Growth - set up costs - £TBC
- Pupil Growth - trigger funding - £TBC
- Infant Class Size compliance - £TBC
- If you disagree with any/all of these items please specify ...

Yes  
Yes  
Yes  
Yes

Comments

- *Some Head teachers were concerned that they are losing funding from the Equal pay element unfairly, as they have never had any equal pay claims.*
- *Pupil growth funding, consensus was that the same principle should be applied to Secondary's but potentially with different values, as it will affect them at a later stage*

<p><b>Question 3 – With regard to pupil growth <u>set up costs</u> do you support the following policy?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That, unless there are exceptional circumstances which would be reported to the Schools Forum, funding of £11,500 per additional class is allocated to relevant settings for them to purchase furniture and equipment etc.</li> <li>• If not what policy would you suggest .....</li> </ul>	Yes
<p><b>Question 4 - With regard to pupil growth <u>trigger funding</u> do you support the following policy?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That funding should only be allocated to those settings which have, following consultation with the LAs school place planning team, agreed to open additional classes - and that funding should be based on 7/12 of the annual “Basic Entitlement” funding applicable to the actual pupils in the additional class when it opens. (this is the LAs preference)</li> <li>• <u>Alternatively</u> – that the LA should retain greater funding to continue the practise of also allocating funds to settings where general pupil growth occurs in September or January where this is above a 4% increase?</li> <li>• <u>Alternatively</u> – that funding for additional classes should continue to be based on 7/12 of the annual “Basic Entitlement” funding applicable to the <u>net change</u> in overall pupil numbers when the class opens (not just the pupils in the additional class)</li> <li>• If not, what alternative policy would you suggest? .....</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments</u>  <i>Secondary’s did not comment on these options</i></p>	N/A
<p><b>Question 5 - With regard to <u>infant class size compliance</u> do you support the following policy?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That where it is necessary, due to exceptions in the Admissions regulations (e.g. following an appeal), for a primary school to take in excess of 30 pupils, that additional funding should be provided by the LA to recognise unavoidable extra costs?</li> <li>• That, unless there are exceptional circumstances which would be reported to the Schools Forum, funding of £4,500 per school per year (paid termly in advance based on 10 hours of Teaching Assistant Support costs per week @ £10 per hour for 45 weeks) is payable?</li> <li>• If not what alternative policy would you suggest ...</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments</u>  <i>Secondary’s did not comment on these options</i></p>	N/A

**Question 6A - With regard to items subject to delegation do you agree that the LA should continue to operate the following services on behalf of Swindon Schools – 2013/14 indicative funding levels are provided?**

**Items subject to de-delegation**

- Assessment for Free School Meals eligibility - should LA service continue at a gross cost to the DSG of £10,800?
- Trade Union Duties – should LA service continue at a net cost to the DSG of £22,100?
- Schools in Challenging Circumstances – should LA service continue at a gross cost to the DSG of £322,000?

**Yes  
No  
Yes**

	Free School Meals	Trade Union Duties	Schools in Challenging Circumstances
Gross Budget 2013/14	£10,800.00	£22,100.00	£322,000
Less Academy element	(£6,500.00)	(£12,200.00)	(£183,780) -
Net Budget Amount 2013/14	£4,300.00	£9,900.00	£138,220
Amount Per Pupil	£0.38	£0.79	£11.48
<i>(These are the notional amounts per pupil an Academy receives and which all schools would receive if the budget is delegated)</i>			

**Comments**

- *FSM Ever data, schools requested a list of pupils, which the LA will look into*
- *Consensus view that Trade Unions should pay for the Reps*
- *After discussions it was made clearer that of the £322k SICC £132k would be retained for allocation by the LA, the remaining amount would be distributed to Academies.*

**Question 6B - With regard to other items do you agree that the LA should continue to operate the following services on behalf of Swindon Schools – 2013/14 indicative funding levels are provided**

**Yes**

**Other Items for local discussion – services the LA proposes will form part of the High Needs Funding Block**

- Portage service at Saltway – £148,000?
- Education Support Service Monitoring - £10,000?
- Statemented Pupils Equipment - £130,000?
- Speech, Language and Occupational Therapy - £164,000 less £50,000 added to Special School Band Values?
- Travellers Children - £77,000?
- SENRAP - £1,369,000?

**Comments**

*Secondary's felt that the SENRAP hourly rate of pay should be increased to at least £12 Per hour and that BPPE rates should be reduced to fund this*

<b>Part B - Local Mainstream Formula Issues 2013/14</b>	
<p><b>Question 7 – Do you agree with the guiding principle that whilst harmonising per pupil funding rates across sectors for deprivation, SEN prior attainment, EAL and lump sums (mandatory if retained) the LA should adjust basic entitlement per pupil values (up or down) to broadly retain overall existing primary and secondary sector funding totals?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If not please specify which factors should vary in value across sectors, by how much and why overall sector funding levels should be amended .....</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>
<p><b>Question 8 - Do you agree that funding for the following factors which are currently used locally but are <u>not allowed</u> from 2013/14 should <u>initially</u> be moved into the relevant sector Basic Pupil Entitlement funding subject to subsequent changes that may be necessary following decisions on the levels of EAL and other funding?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cash flow interest abatement - £105,000 (all settings)</li> <li>Recent LA delegations of maternity funding, primary &amp; secondary strategy funding etc. - £482,350 (all settings)</li> <li>Secondary Behaviour support funding – £177,000 (secondary)</li> <li>Portage Service funding - £80,000 (primary)</li> <li>If not please specify how this funding should be allocated .....</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b>
<p><b>Question 9 – The LA proposes allocating a <u>lump sum</u> value per school of £106,700 (which equates to the current average of flat rate and small schools protection funding allocated) as not having this would put severe financial pressures on all small schools who would not receive sufficient basic entitlement pupil funding to cover their fixed costs.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you agree that the LA should allocate any flat rate funding?</li> <li>Do you agree that the value should be £106,700?</li> <li>If a different value should be allocated please specify how much (the DfE maximum is £200,000)</li> <li>Do you agree that basic entitlement funding values per pupil should be adjusted accordingly to maintain existing overall sector funding totals?</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>n/a</b> <b>Yes</b>
<p><b>Question 10 – Against the consensus of views expressed at the July events the LA intends to continue allocating <u>PFI affordability gap funding</u> of £1,004,900 to the 7 PFI settings to recognise contractual agreements. The LA could centrally retain (rather than delegate funding to settings to match their costs) but this may disadvantage Swindon’s overall DSG position if other LA pupils are placed at an SBC setting (e.g. Uplands Special School).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you agree that the LA should continue to delegate PFI affordability gap funding until/unless this ever disadvantages the 7 schools involved?</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p><i>The two schools were split on this issue, one preferred for the funding to be retained and one preferred to continue with the current approach</i></p>	<b>Mixed</b>

**Question 11 – The LA had originally intended to retain a factor to allocate additional funding for schools with split site but no longer proposes to - this will have a marginal negative impact on the funding of Swindon Academy**

- Do you agree that the LA should not retain a factor to provide additional funding to schools operating on split sites?
- If a factor should be retained please specify the policy and methodology by which funding should be allocated .....

Yes

**Question 12 – With regard to secondary basic entitlement funding per pupil**

- Do you agree that the ratio between KS3 and KS4 should be retained at 1.00 / 1.22?
- If a different ratio should be applied what do you think it should be?

Yes

Comments

- *Head Teachers wanted some work completed around the relative costs between KS3 and KS4 as the ratio of 1:1.22 is historic and therefore may no longer be relevant. The LA would welcome receiving calculations of the additional costs of educating KS4 pupils in order to progress this.*
- *Please note that the above reference to 'KS3 & KS4' has been corrected following the consultation events where KS1 & KS3 were incorrectly stated*

**Question 13 – With regard to social deprivation funding**

- Do you agree that the same methodology should be applied to allocate deprivation funding across each sector?
- Do you agree that the same per pupil funding values should be used across each sector?
- Do you agree that a blend of 50% funding via FSM ever 6 and 50% via IDACI is appropriate?
- Do you agree that the overall level of deprivation funding should remain the same and that where harmonising the funding values per pupil causes sector totals to vary, basic entitlement funding rates are increased / reduced accordingly to retain overall sector funding levels?
- Assuming that all the above are agreed each **FSM ever 6 pupil** would attract **£868 per** pupil and schools would also receive the following amounts per pupil according to the number in each IDACI band;

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

IDACI Band	Lower limit score	Upper limit score	£ per pupil
-	Up to 0.2 pupils are not deprived		-
1	0.2	0.25	<b>£434</b>
2	0.25	0.30	<b>£529</b>
3	0.30	0.40	<b>£608</b>
4	0.40	0.50	<b>£781</b>
5	0.50	0.60	<b>£955</b>
6	0.60	1.00	<b>£1,215</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree with the above values per pupil which increase as levels of deprivation increase?</li> <li>• If a different approach should be taken regarding deprivation please specify .....</li> </ul>	Yes
<p><b>Question 14 – with regard to Low cost high incidence SEN funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree that primary funding should be allocated to pupils scoring fewer than 78 points in their EYFSP?</li> <li>• Do you agree that funding in each sector should be harmonised at £359 per pupil – requiring an overall increase of approx. £131,000 to secondary funding which would need to be matched by a reduction to secondary pupil Basic Entitlement values?</li> <li>• Do you support the LA’s aim of increasing the prior attainment funding values (as a priority over other areas) if there is an opportunity to do so within the overall DSG settlement?</li> <li>• If a different approach should be taken regarding prior attainment funding please specify.....</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes
<p><b>Question 15 - With regard to EAL Funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This can only be provided for a maximum of 3 years, should funding be allocated for a pupil’s first 1, 2 or 3 years after entering education – the LA is proposing 3 years?</li> <li>• Would you prefer to have one funding rate for all sectors or should we have a higher rate for secondary pupils (this cannot be lower than primary) – the LA is proposing one funding rate?</li> <li>• In future, EAL funding will be allocated to a smaller number of pupils. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Should we use the current Primary rate of £304 or secondary rate of £89 or the current average figure of £227 which equates to the existing level of EAL funding divided by the number of EAL pupils? OR</li> <li>○ Should we retain the existing EAL overall funding levels by allocating funding of £494 per pupil (based on 3 year pupil numbers) – this is the LA’s proposal?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do you agree that the overall level of EAL funding should remain the same and that where harmonising the funding values per pupil causes sector totals to vary basic entitlement funding rates are increased / reduced accordingly to retain overall sector funding levels – this is the LA’s proposal?</li> <li>• If a different approach should be taken regarding EAL funding please specify .....</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
<p><b>Question 16 - With regard to the Drove BME Project Funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you agree that current funding of £124,000 should continue to be allocated in 2013/14 subject to a satisfactory feedback from the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012 Schools Forum?</li> <li>• Do you agree that the effectiveness of the service should be annually reviewed by the Schools Forum?</li> <li>• If a different approach should be taken regarding BME funding please specify....</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments</u>  <i>Secondary’s felt that this could possibly become a traded service</i></p>	No ? 

<b>Question 17 – MFG – Should MFG be funded</b> A. Top slicing all gaining schools by a percentage of (51.1%) of their gain B. Limiting the Maximum gain to 0.8% per pupil	<b>B</b>
<b>General Feedback</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Please provide any feedback on the consultation which are not covered in the questions above .....</li></ul>	