

Flintshire County Council Schools Funding Formula Review Primary Consultation Response Analysis

This document sets out the responses to the consultation document that was issued by Flintshire County Council on the proposals for the primary schools funding formula. A summary of the key comments is also included.

There were 35 questionnaires returned.

Consultation Point 1			
Transitional arrangements should be applied to reduce the impact of any changes in funding to schools in accordance with the table set out in 1.13 of the report.			
Agree	25 (71%)	Disagree	10
Comments			
<p>This facility would give schools the time to restructure if needed.</p> <p>If stability is maintained in our school, all well and good. We need further explanation regarding this. It depends if you are a 'winner' or a 'loser', without figures it is difficult to give an honest comment. Transitional arrangements must be set out clearly if all parties are to understand the implications</p> <p>A table showing the potential monetary value of the percentage affect, would have helped to guide response</p> <p>It is important to be fair but schools should be told as soon as possible of the impact of the changes.</p> <p>Question as to ability to handle Single Status and Formula change at same time.</p> <p>Transition should be 2 year max to encourage schools to make difficult decisions.</p>			
Consultation Point 2			
The two date pupil count will be retained for Primary schools.			
Agree	33 (94%)	Disagree	2
Comments			
<p>A two count system is essential.</p> <p>Two date count would mean that the monetary support needed for an increase in pupil numbers would be timely.</p> <p>Could date be altered, to allow for late admissions during October - seems to be a common trend over past years.</p> <p>Single Count allows for quicker budgeting, and trends may allow for identification of growth.</p>			

Consultation Point 3

It is proposed that all primary pupils are recognised in the funding formula at their full-time equivalent value.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If the school is able to maintain current staffing levels, then I would agree. We are working at the bare minimum at the moment. But would welcome this proposal, but also would welcome clarification regarding reception weightings.

Several comments querying the gap between Year 6 and Year 7 (KS2 vs KS3) funding. (188, 203)

This should also include the part time pupils because they need all the facilities including staff in order to operate effectively.

Would urge that the new formula takes account of the need for higher ratios of staff and increased number of 'consumables' used in the FP.

Providing this means that Reception is counted as 1

Consultation Point 4

The Primary School formula should include an element for leadership and management. This will comprise a lump sum for the baseline costs which are not linked to the size of a school. In addition there will be an amount per full time equivalent pupil recognising that the cost of leadership and management increases with the size of the school.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If it allows us to have the current members of staff stabilised on current leadership spine and funding matches this to allow us to operate on current levels - difficult to be fully in agreement without having the figures

Consultation Point 5

The formula should recognise that headteachers require management time. In larger schools with non-teaching headteachers there is a requirement for additional non-teaching management time.

The scale of protected management time is subject to variation dependent on the size of school.

Agree	32 (94%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Most definitely

Small school should be encouraged to federate to enable an increase in management time for their own school. Large schools dealing with high pupil levels have increased workload.

Option 1

The maximum amount of time that a headteacher should be presumed to be teaching should be 0.7 for a school of up to 30 pupils, reducing to zero at 240 pupils.

Agree	4 (13%)	Disagree	262
-------	---------	----------	-----

Comment

Not at all possible: Paid as 0.7 HT but actually they are 1.0HT and 0.7 CT.

A teaching load of 0.7 would make it very difficult to carry out HT functions.

There are four aspects to consider – curriculum management; building management and Health & Safety attached, staff management and home contact. Although curriculum management imposes similar pressures on everybody – large buildings require more attention H&S, maintenance etc and a large team of staff puts pressure on leaders (as managing people is the most challenging aspect).

On minimum HT commitment: An alternative of 0.7 up to 30 pupils, going down to zero at 200 pupils, (but at the same time appreciate that this may reduce the amount of funding available to distribute under other elements).

Don't want to funds coming from elsewhere. I have a .5 teaching commitment with 142 pupils on roll. This is not really going to reduce my commitment, unless I have an influx of 80 pupils. What about schools in the middle? Will any concessions be given? The wording implies a sliding scale and we would like to have the figures confirmed.

Option 2

The maximum amount of time that a headteacher should be presumed to be teaching should 0.5 for a school of 30 pupils reducing to zero at 210 pupils.

Agree	27 (77%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

The HT of a small school has the same admin as that of a large school and often without full time clerical support.

Also supported: Maximum teaching time for a Headteacher should not exceed 0.5 and preferably should be a lower maximum.

Consultation Point 6

Split Site and federated schools to receive additional non-teaching allowances for the leadership team.

Agree	27 (77%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Fully agree. But will the quality of leadership within school be effected?

Only if this had an overall cost saving effect on the budget.

Distance between sites should be taken into account.

There are huge challenges to leading a school in two buildings. These can be largely addressed by full time admin and reception support in each building and leadership non-

contact time when head is off site.

Travel time between sites may be factored in but otherwise should not attract additional funding.

The HT should not teach and also any leadership/ management team should receive non-teaching allowance to assist HT.

Essential for the success of amalgamated schools.

Consultation Point 7

Teacher funding should be allocated to Primary schools based on the number of classes required to accommodate their pupil numbers.

Agree	22 (69%)	Disagree	10
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

Proposal seems cumbersome, not transparent and not facilitating longer term forecasting. Schools will be penalised for having classes with less than 30 pupils if they have appropriate school places. A hybrid solution would be a fairer alternative.

This needs more discussion as it may force schools to have combinations of year groups which would be difficult to manage due to a large physical space.

Unfair - this would result in some schools getting significantly more per pupil than others.

Although we agree with this proposal we would like to see the MCSW updated as well as recalculated on a regular basis

Cannot agree on a formula for calculating teacher staffing costs without the figures. I am only concerned with being able to keep current staffing levels and hopefully have a little flexibility to increase in the future.

Classroom assistant support should be enhanced where there are more than two mixed age classes e.g. 3/4/5/6.

This would be much fairer to schools that have small dimension classrooms and so have had their admissions numbers cut. No class should be for more than 2 age groups, but the old formula causes small schools to put Years 3, 4, 5 and 6 together or all the 4 year groups of Foundation Phase.

There should be a recognised formula for this instead of a case by case basis.

The governors and head disagree with this proposal. A unanimous decision that all money should be distributed on pupil numbers only. Not on class or class sizes.

As long as the data used is accurate and up to date - there are anomalies.

Consultation Point 8

Cross phase classes will be assumed in the funding model in accordance with current practice and funding availability.

Agree	21 (64%)	Disagree	12
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

As long as the data used is accurate and up to date - there are anomalies.

Equal Opportunities / Equality and Diversity – All schools should avoid cross-phase classes.

Difficult due to the different curriculum in FP and KS2.

All schools should avoid cross-phase classes.

We would prefer the Review to state clearly that while such arrangements are necessary in

some situations they should not be the norm.
Should only be used as a last resort and only if the same applies to ALL schools both Welsh and English medium.
This should not be JUST for Welsh medium - NO school should have cross-phase.

Consultation Point 9

Welsh Medium schools to be funded to avoid the necessity of cross-phase classes.

Agree	17 (50%)	Disagree	17
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

As per Equal Opportunities / Equality and Diversity – All schools should avoid cross-phase classes, not just Welsh Medium schools.
There should be equality across all schools.
Equality is required
Most welcome proposal as it recognises that Welsh medium schools have to operate differently from other schools.
Welsh medium should be given extra funding in order to ensure that these pupils have to be of an equal standard in both Welsh and English by the time they leave the primary school - i.e. their English on par with English medium schools although Welsh is not on par in English schools.
Teaching English within a cross-phase class poses problems.

Consultation Point 10

Teacher Funding will be at M6, with an adjustment if average teacher costs are higher, but not penalising a school where the average cost is lower.

Agree	29 (85%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This principle should go a long way to avoid the current discrimination on grounds of age/experience. i.e. appointing a NQT rather than an experienced teacher on cost grounds. Similarly, teachers should not be denied access to the UPS on cost grounds.
For the long term, this proposal does not encourage movement of teaching staff, however in the short term avoids possible redundancies.
Agreed if schools not penalised for having experienced staff.
Some comments urged funding for the staff they have, and that Leadership posts counted as UPS 3 in determining average.
All schools should be given the funding to pay the actual staff in the school.
Need confirmation that current leadership, UPS & TLR costs will also be honoured.

Consultation Point 11

It is proposed that the Foundation Phase grant is incorporated into the formula funding and allocated on the required ratios and grades of staff required to meet the Foundation Phase regulations.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

If not agreed to, this could affect the effective implementation of the Foundation Phase. We agree on the basis that the funding that is currently allocated to FP should be the minimum amount added to the current budget to maintain the allocations and provision. As long as we can maintain our current Foundation Phase staffing levels. We do not want to go into a situation where we have to make redundancies. This has always been recognised under the present system. The different grades needed in FP needed to be more transparent.

Would prefer it to remain as a separate grant until such time as the funding is absorbed into Flintshire's annual financial Welsh Government settlement.

Concern that funding would not be maintained at current levels.

Consultation Point 12

Funding for PPA cover is based on the number of classes deemed necessary and is based on HLTA rates.

Agree	14 (42%)	Disagree	19
-------	----------	----------	----

Comment

PPA cover has always been a high priority and when possible all classes have been taught by qualified teachers.

As PPA is statutory the funding should be statutory.

Teacher to cover teacher

We feel it should be based on teacher rates in KS2 with the additional funding not being diverted from another element within the budget

Teacher rate at KS2 and HLTA in Foundation Phase.

Not based on the number of classes deemed necessary but on NOR. Better to base on number of teachers than number of classes. However no problem with proposal to being funded on H.L.T.A pay rate basis.

In reality classroom assistants cannot maintain behaviour and standards in many KS2 classes – therefore we have to place a TEACHER in the class. Is it possible to have funding for 2-3 teachers initially for schools with over 100 children in the KS2, and then fund HLTA afterwards.

Consultation Point 13

Key Stage 2 Classroom support to be based on a per pupil (KS2) allocation.

Agree	31 (94%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We welcome this, especially in our school where we are unable to employ a permanent teaching assistant in KS2 - We would also welcome the ratio of pupil per teaching assistant in KS2.

Broadly welcomed on a per pupil basis.

This should be on a per class basis as every class needs classroom support.

If it is just per pupil then - disagree. If it reflects the wide spread of age groups within a KS2 class then -agree. Yrs 3, 4, 5 & 6 together regardless of number of pupils needs 2 TAs to help provide effective differentiated activities.

Consultation Point 14

The formula recognises the need for schools to be able to provide an administrative point of contact at all times.

Agree	34 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Minimum requirement – H&S considerations.

Health & Safety Issues

This should enable ALL schools no matter what size to have a full time secretary / admin support on a full time basis. This is especially true in smaller sized schools (like ours) where the Head is teaching at times when no secretarial support is available. When secretary is part time the HT also has to carry out admin tasks. Is this a good use of their time? Is it academically viable?

This would be a major factor in reducing disruption to teaching / learning. It should not mean the HT in small schools having to provide that point of contact - all schools should have full time admin especially if HT release is less in schools under 50.

Seen as an important principle and also addresses Health & Safety Issues.

Dependent on the size of school. Federated schools could have one call point.

This should enable ALL schools no matter what size to have a full time secretary / admin support on a full time basis. This is especially true in smaller sized schools where the Head is teaching at times when no secretarial support is available. When secretary is part time the HT also has to carry out admin tasks.

Will larger schools have commensurate increases to their admin budget as smaller schools as the workload increases exponentially?!

Consultation Point 15

Funding for administration (including meals) and mid-day supervision be merged. The funding to be allocated to Primary schools through a lump sum allocation and a per pupil amount.

Agree	28 (85%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Much of the work involved in organising the provision of mid-day meals and their supervision could be provided by the agency that supplies the meals.

If we are able to maintain current staffing levels - difficult to agree or disagree without figures. Could ratio for mid-day supervision be clarified and not reduced? Sufficient supervision must be provided no matter the size of school to meet H&S regulations and protect the breaktime of staff.

As long as funding is allocated on the basis of full time admin point of contact; plus other administrative costs as well as mid-day supervision. Sufficient supervision must be provided no matter the size of school to meet H&S regulations and protect the break-times of staff. Governors don't agree with an unknown lump sum percentage.

The evidence provided to support this proposal is insufficient and there appears to be no recognition of the importance of ensuring that the staff ratios for supervision at lunch times are adequate.

Consultation Point 16

A deprivation indicator is established comprising the following factors:

- FSM
- WIMD data - absolute ranking of schools
- WIMD data – ranking based on pupils on roll

Each factor would have equal weighting.

Agree	25 (76%)	Disagree	8
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This is an improved mechanism for identification of pupils in accordance with Equality and Diversity policies and H&S.

Categories needed financial explanation with figures. Rationale for WIMD needs clarification Why? This creates less transparency.

Consultation Point 17

Deprivation funding is allocated to **all** Primary schools using the deprivation indicator. [Consultation point 18 offers an alternative allocation].

Agree	29 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

In accordance with point 16 above.

Would funding be allocated per pupil or by post code of the school?

Some comments point out that the proposal is complex for relatively small amounts of funding.

Support for both FSM and WIMD (alone) distribution.

An allocation on the basis of FSM eligibility / entitlement is all that is required as this would then tie in with how the Welsh Government allocates their Pupil Deprivation Grant.

FSM should have 50% weighting, WIMD data (absolute ranking) 25% and WIMD data (pupils on roll) 25%.

Using FSM as the only basis for allocating expenditure is misleading.

Preference for funding to be allocated to all schools in proportion to deprivation indicator (whichever is used).

The PDG would support those schools in areas of deprivation.

Some schools already benefit from PDG, while all schools have a degree of deprivation.

Consultation Point 18

Deprivation funding is targeted to Primary schools with the highest level of deprivation as identified by the deprivation indicator. [Consultation point 17 offers an alternative allocation].

Agree	4 (13%)	Disagree	28
-------	---------	----------	----

Comment

The most deprived schools should get the most funding

It should be targeted at where it will have the most impact.

The funding is aimed at schools operating in areas with high incidences of deprivation 'Leafy suburb' schools have many streams of funding not available in deprived areas - professional sponsorships through local businesses / industry / parental links, contributions from PTA raising significant amounts of money etc.

Consultation Point 19

There will be a single formula for the premises allocation.

Agree	28 (93%)	Disagree	2
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We agree to this under the assumption that this is just for day to day maintenance and utilities, not fabric of the building.

Considerable concern expressed that without seeing the impact on budgets it would be difficult to understand the implications.

As long as it takes into account the needs of the building - eg we have to have lights on all year round due to the lack of natural daylight in the building.

The simplicity is persuasive.

As long as lump sum and top up is going to cover expenditure on repairs and maintenance, grounds, caretaking, cleaning and utilities with some to spare. Need to be aware of age of premises and condition.

The age and adaptability of any premises should be considered at all times - new buildings do not need the maintenance that older buildings need, and should be more energy efficient.

Will the energy efficiency rating of the building be factored in, and the location?

Please allow for schools which have to buy costly LPG for their mobile classrooms.

School building will always remain the same size regardless of pupil numbers!

Consultation Point 20

The formula for the premises allocation will be a combination of a lump sum amount, a per pupil allocation and an allocation based on area.

Agree	24 (83%)	Disagree	5
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We feel this is an inappropriate question as part of a consultation process.

Definition of 'area' needed

As long as it is able to cover all our costs as it currently stands - again difficult to agree or disagree without figures. Clarification needed on allocation based on area

The caretakers have been given contracts agreed on floor space historically, this will need to be covered especially in light of single status.

Consultation Point 21

There will be an enhancement to the utilities allocation for Primary schools providing meals to other schools, and for those not having access to mains heating fuel.

Agree	30 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

This needs to be considered on an individual basis as schools have very differing circumstances even under these headings as a school may provide only ten meals to another school, whereas some schools may provide 100, these are very different amounts of costing to take into account.

Case for case consideration needed

With the escalating costs of energy, the proposed arrangement is far more equitable than the current position.

We suggest that the allocation is based on actual costs.

Consultation Point 22

There will be a single formula allocation for supplies and services.

Agree	31 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Simplification broadly welcomed.

Consultation Point 23

The formula for the allocation of Supplies and Services to Primary schools will comprise a lump sum and a per pupil allocation.

Agree	29 (91%)	Disagree	3
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Difficult to agree or disagree without figures.
Some concern expressed that without seeing the impact on budgets it would be difficult to understand the implications.
As long as lump sum covers at least minimum requirements.
Single allocation better as if pupil numbers reduce then there will still be the same amount of services needed for those pupils that are left. Will this be based on size?

Consultation Point 24

KS2 pupils will attract a premium per pupil in recognition of additional curriculum requirements.

Agree	33 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Very welcome
For amalgamations of Junior and Infant departments, there should be a buffering of base funding whilst the new funding formula is introduced. These would be special circumstances and applied in the event of schools which may lose a significant amount of funding from the new funding formula.
An additional allocation of administration and Leadership has already been given so no further additional amount would be required.
KS2 consistently underfunded in comparison to FP.
Although we agree we are mindful of the costs of the FP where staff ratios are high and more 'consumables' required.

Consultation Point 25

Welsh Medium schools will receive a premium for supplies and services.

Agree	21 (75%)	Disagree	7
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

We recognise the additional costs incurred for providing Welsh medium resources through translation etc., however we feel that additional funding should be provided from WG for this so as not to penalise other schools within the county by a reduction in their budgets as a result.

Again the fact that Welsh medium schools are bilingual and that the pupils learn both Welsh and English to the same degree, additional resources are need for such schools.

Children who receive free school meals, LAC or EAL children should also be taken into account as expensive extra resources are also required for them.

English medium schools do have to purchase supplies and resources for Welsh as a second language curriculum need. EAL children also need support and resources in their own languages.

What additional costs do they have?

Translation and Welsh books are expensive.

We deliver 2 curriculums and 2 literacy and numeracy framework! Also all our documentation is bi-lingual prospectus, policies etc and therefore admin costs are higher.

Need to consider doubled costs for Welsh medium requirements – combine this with the lump sum and allocation per pupil.

Agree in relation to teaching and learning resources only.

Why? Can this be clarified?

Consultation Point 26

There will be a formula allocation for Additional Needs to include a lump sum for the ANCO.

Agree	34 (97%)	Disagree	1
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Governors don't agree with an unknown lump sum percentage. This should be given based on need.

Consideration must be given to schools in deprived areas as they have significantly higher incidences of pupils with SEN. This will be particularly important as school support becomes allocated to schools. This is a future time-bomb for SEN Tribunals.

Agree to an extent but it seems as if statemented children will be losing out. However, funding is needed for each ALNCo.

It is very much to be deplored that some schools do not recognise the ALNCo in salary terms. The more children on the ALN register, the more paperwork associated with this and the more contact with external agencies – so more ALNCo TIME is required (Time = Costs).

Consultation Point 27

The remaining funds to be allocated by the weighted numbers of :

- Pupils on the Special Needs Register at stages : School Action, School Action Plus, and Statemented
- Pupils on the EAL register at each stage of language acquisition
- Pupils who are in care (LAC).

Agree	28 (88%)	Disagree	4
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Including School Action would possibly create an increase in fund allocation unless there were independent criteria allocated.

Should consider pupils from the Gypsy and Traveller communities which tend to be transient. Traveller pupils should also have a weighting equal to EAL.

As School Action is not moderated, using School Action Plus, Statemented, LAC and EAL would be better measures.

Funding should be available when required and assessment undertaken quicker.

Will there be adjustment during the school year (our school has just had to take 3 SEN pupils which have a huge impact).

Weighting should be higher for SAP then less for statemented as they already have support in place. SAP are regulated numbers as they must have outside agency involvement.

Currently significantly underfunded. Many children with specific learning difficulties are not supported appropriately due to lack of funding.

There needs to be additional funding.

Don't statemented pupils receive funding from elsewhere?

Funding should be available when required and assessment undertaken quicker

Consultation Point 28

There will be a formula allocation for Split site / Federated schools, based on the lump sum elements within the overall formula.

Agree	25 (81%)	Disagree	6
-------	----------	----------	---

Comment

Although we agree we recognise that this is complicated and will require more in depth study in the future.

Consultation Point 29

Additional travel costs associated with a split site or federated schools will be recognised by an allowance based on the separation of the premises.

Agree

27 (84%)

Disagree

5

Comment

The potential additional costs (which are not directly associated with teaching and learning) of operating federated or split site schools needs to be fully considered when determining such arrangements in future.

This would need to be dependent on the spread of schools, ones that have sites close together would not need additional funding.

At the County mileage rate

Other Comments

Important that review facilitates forecasting for years 2 and 3.

Recognition that each school contributes to the available resources within the County, and that could be encouraged by a limit on the number of children that can attend larger schools, and the promotion of smaller settings as a sound alternative for pupils who can fare better in smaller classes with more individualised attention.

Introduction – Paragraph 1.6 says that the funding formula is a mechanism for distributing funds to schools and by so doing provides a single total budget. It goes on to say that it is not intended to fund or set budgets for individual categories of expenditure within schools. However, under the proposals a number of the Elements in paragraph 2.1 in my opinion would appear to contradict these statements as they appear to allude to specific areas of expenditure. Whilst I can appreciate the need for greater transparency in letting schools see how the new formula is to be calculated we also need to strike a balance so as not to take away from schools their autonomy in deciding how they wish to spend this budget.

Approach – Paragraph 1.10 talks of consultation on the principles and not of the impact of the new proposals on individual school budgets. If more time was available, bearing in mind that these Consultation Documents were over 3 weeks late in coming out, I could perhaps accept this concept but unfortunately we have not been afforded this luxury and we now find ourselves in a position where we, as schools, could be agreeing to a new formula which could seriously affect our funding and our ability therefore to achieve the 4 main objectives outlined in the Introduction. I acknowledge that to mitigate this effect you propose to introduce Transitional Arrangements over a 3 year period.

In conclusion, whilst I commend the vast amount of work that has been undertaken in getting the Formula Review to the stage where it is currently at I firmly believe that there is still an awful lot of work to be done over the next few months if a new Formula is to be agreed and implemented by April, 1st 2014. The decision by Flintshire to consult only on principles and not on the impact on individual schools will only add to this workload and in my opinion was not the right decision.

From the information provided within the Consultation Document and also from information gleaned from the few Working Group meetings that I attended I am still not 100% convinced that this proposed new Formula is going to help Flintshire achieve its desired aims as stated in Paragraph 1.7 of the Introduction i.e. transparency, simplification and greater predictability of resources for future years. I fear that the proposed formula is still too complicated and will not meet the needs of schools who wish to understand fully how their budgets are calculated and also will not provide schools with the means to predict any changes to their budgets in future years which may arise from changed circumstances within the school e.g. a major change in pupil numbers.

A further point I would like to make is with regard to the Authority's Section 52 Budget Statement. The Welsh Government Regulations state that at least 70% of all Primary & Secondary funding must be on the basis of pupil numbers. Is Flintshire confident therefore that with the introduction of this proposed new Formula it will be able to achieve this limit?

Comments on Welsh Medium

Again, I hope consideration is given to the views of people who UNDERSTAND the requirements of Welsh medium education and the system that exists in our Welsh medium schools – often people who are connected to non-Welsh medium schools don't really understand the requirements of being COMPLETELY BILINGUAL on all levels. It is vital that Flintshire LA show that it DOES fully understand the NEEDS of Welsh Medium Schools.

It is not only funding for quality first language WELSH materials that is needed, but also second language Welsh materials across ALL aspects of the curriculum –the 'subjects/learning areas' and the Welfare and Emotional Development (PSE) aspects; then in to Language and Speech work – copies/books and exercises are needed in Welsh and English – and all aspects of the Additional Learning Needs area also require equal materials in both languages. In terms of the school's every day resources – double the paper etc is required for policies / letters / parent contact leaflets/ Governors' reports and termly Staff to parents reports. The TIME used by school staff – especially the Head to complete the whole task is endless (often having to do translation work to the early hours of the morning to fulfil the statutory requirements only). Time (Head and UDA) means money – in order to seek quality daily translation/typing/admin support in the office to improve 'work demands' on school leaders.

Duplicating all policies and school letters is double the cost – paper and time – this has never been recognised by Flintshire – and this consultation is a real opportunity to change the way of thinking (which corresponds with and understands the Welsh Medium Education Strategy).

As Welsh medium schools are bilingual schools and therefore, all documentation at all levels are produced bilingually, which means that this takes double the time, double the paper to produce them, double the number of copies e.g. for parents.

Curriculum resources are required in both Welsh and English as the pupils in Welsh medium schools are completely bilingual by the time that they leave the school, and one of their predominant skills is to be able to gain knowledge in one language and transfer it to the other.

Therefore, these additional factors need to be identified and acknowledged when the budget review is considered – especially so in this day and age when there is so much emphasise on a bilingual Wales.

January 2014