

Funding consultation comments

Oaklands Junior

2c) I would like to see the split between Secondary and Primary Schools addressed more evenly. I feel that that more can be achieved for these pupils in Primary School and that the transition from Primary to Secondary needs to be better supported somehow

General - As a general note, I found the presentation given by Donna very informative. I do feel though that there is a need to better share and publicise the School Forums work with heads /bursars and governors. Posting it on the website, where people may or may not know its there is not, I feel, sufficient.

Crazies Hill Primary

3)The lump sum remains a very critical factor in funding small schools.

12) 3 years may be necessary for secondary schools whereas 2 years would seem more realistic for primary schools

St Nicholas

13b) Would like to close the gap between Primary and Secondary EAL funding, but not necessarily for the rates to be the same in both primary and secondary.

Q 15, 16 & 17: Split site funding

The Piggott School and Charvil Piggott Primary School are the only split site school in Wokingham. Our sites are in different villages, over two miles apart by road, on different sides of the A4. Our distance as the crow flies is 0.5 mile.

The national regulations state that all-through schools receive only one lump sum, the secondary amount. Thus as an all through school we only receive one lump sum, rather than two. We currently have 87 pupils on roll at Charvil and the per-pupil funding is inadequate to provide an education to the primary pupils. This is inherently unfair as there are multiple examples of infant and junior schools in Wokingham who each receive a lump sum of £175,000 in addition to their per-pupil funding. If Charvil Piggott Primary School had been set up as a separate academy it would attract the full lump sum. If it had been set up as part of an academy chain or MAT it would attract the full lump sum.

This issue is compounded by the diseconomies of scale of starting a new school but is offset somewhat by the economies of scale of being an all-through school. I would therefore ask that the split site funding element is introduced to a level of 85% of the primary lump sum, and that the criteria used is 'The sites are separated by a public highway.'

Evendons Primary

1a) this is the only factor which directs funding to children with low incident, high need SEN.

3a) to ensure the fixed costs of running a school are covered.

4a) No data given that indicates the overheads for a secondary are less than for a primary.

6a) there is no other funding factor which directs funding to schools which have children who have issues associated with moving school mid-year.

8a) Schools with LAC have £1,900 per annum additional funding via pupil premium to support the needs of LAC children in their setting.

11a) ensures schools with high EAL receive funding to support the children

Highwood

23) we have answered 'a' but this is dependent on what is decided for the fund mentioned in question 22. We don't want to answer yes to schools being, in essence, double funded.

I also have a query as to how many years the current level of funding for Resource places will be protected. It will be impossible for us to be able to make budget predictions / plans without knowing whether the current funding procedures will be continued.

Oaklands Infant

2c) Reconsider the percentage split to give more weighting to primary schools so that problems can be addressed earlier

18c) Suggest using the LAC funding freed up by Q8

Robert Piggot Infant & Junior

2c) Allocation should be targeted towards Primary Schools since early intervention will have more effect upon the individual child.

2c) – **GOVERNORS' COMMENT** I believe that allocation should be targeted towards Primary Schools. This will have more effect on individual children from an earlier point.

Holt

17) 80%

Wescott Infant

Whilst appreciating that we are still going through a period of enforced government changes to school funding it would really helpful if the changes to funding could be minimized as much as possible. The constant funding changes are very destabilising and make budgeting at school level very difficult at best and virtually impossible beyond the current year.

The message from the Consultation briefing and the general message from everywhere is that there will be no increase in funds to WBC from the DfE again this year and consequently no extra money to allocate (however it is decided to allocate after this consultation) to schools. As a full outstanding school we have watched our funding being reduced in the last two years (triggering MFG each time) as our costs continue to rise, this cannot continue. We will need to make some very tough decisions in the next few years in order to set balanced budgets. These decisions will inevitably have far reaching consequences on the ability to maintain let alone continue to improve our school. Wescott strives to provide the very best for the pupils in our care but inadequate funding will not enable us to do this to the same level as we have previously, this is very frustrating, and demoralising. From speaking to other schools we are by no means alone and it is a very worrying and concerning time for us all. Please can you ensure that Schools Forum, Wokingham Borough Councillors and the DfE are aware of these very serious concerns and the implications to the standard of education that will be able to be provided to the children of the borough.

*Question 22 whilst it is a good idea to have a Temporary Falling Rolls Fund in principle it does depend on amount to be kept in fund

* Question 24 in the interests of consistency please use the same method as last year

Colleton

Question 1

Schools with the highest deprivation also appear to have the highest carry forward which suggests that the deprivation factor does not work in WBC. If this factor is retained the secondary and primary values need to be much closer.

Question 8

LAC are in receipt of PPG so are doubly funded.

Question 13

The primary and secondary rates must be much closer together.

Question 16

We don't know – are these criteria specified by the DfE?

Question 17

We think this should be an amount equivalent to the lump lost by merging schools. It should be available for a limited time (2 years?) to allow the schools to achieve the economies of scale

Question 18

We do not support the prior attainment factor so don't support the current basis. We do believe that it is useful to have a contingency to support the most inclusive schools.

Questions 19 & 20

Could we request that "someone" researches whether the ratio is correct. We do not feel in a position to comment.

Question 21

We suggest that having two funds, one for new schools and one for existing schools, would be more transparent.

Question 22

WBC should be predicting falling roles and planning ahead to support these schools with additional funding if necessary. This should be available to all schools regardless of the Ofsted judgement.

Question 23

Schools with high MFG also have high carry forwards.

Question 24

We would like a breakdown of what we get for our money here. We need to prove to Governors that we are getting value for money and that we cannot achieve a better price elsewhere.

Emmbrook Infant

20c) 1:10 ratio as already double funded through AWPU

Waingels

17) £175k

21) It is not acceptable for pupils in current schools to suffer deprivation to pay for pupils in the future. As the LA made the decision to invest in growth it should consider how to fund the ongoing growth monies. This is clearly an investment that is being made for the future of the borough. It is recognised that the LA has funded capital monies for growth and these other aspects of growth should also be funded by the LA.

23) no preference

24) Why has the secondary lump sum changed?

General- Many of these questions don't allow for a truly open and consultative process. The questions are for choices of 'least worst', and not truly open answers.

Aldryngton

2c) As a school that relies very heavily on its AWPU funds and has very good attainment to have this factor eliminated and funds applied to the AWPU would assist schools such as ours with little additional funding particularly as we have no capacity to increase pupil numbers.

Emmbrook Senior

We recognise that the issue of Split Site is likely to grow as Academy Chains are forged. We therefore are happy for the Schools Forum to look at how best to support the issue of "Split Site" on a case by case basis. The criteria would be the site split by a public highway.

Sonning

AWPU

While we appreciate the fact that this consultation process is vitally important it reads as though our AWPU is in line with other Authorities and we know we are the lowest funded in the country. What are Wokingham doing about this?

SEN

In our experience accessing money from the Higher Needs Block has been extremely difficult, if not impossible, as well as incredibly time consuming making it even less cost effective. We have a large number of children whose special educational need or disability would not qualify for Higher Needs Block funding. Indeed of our 13 TA's approximately 75% of their time is spent supporting SEND children using up the £6,000 many times over.

This page is intentionally left blank