

**Flintshire County Council
Schools Funding Formula Review
Secondary Schools 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 secondary schools funding formula. A summary of the key comments is also included.

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	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>Need to show that any gain would be phased in as well.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements as a requirement of this process, suggests that most schools will have a reduction in budget</p> <p>Given the fact that the maximum variation in schools' budgets will be 1% these are less important. However, we agree with the principle that a dampening arrangement should apply but only for a 1 year period.</p> <p>We agree with this because any changes to school budgets have the potential to destabilise a schools' staffing arrangements and curriculum offer.</p> <p>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</p> <p>For 2014/15 there should be protection to address the Sept/April/Aug funding arrangements. There should be no job losses as a result of the formula review.</p>			
Consultation Point 2			
A single pupil count will be adopted for secondary schools.			
Agree	11	Disagree	0
Comments			
<p>How will the change from 11 - 18 to 11 - 16 be managed in those schools with statutory notice?</p> <p>This is logical as there is limited variation in secondary school populations between September and January.</p> <p>The collection of this data in September will assist budget planning.</p> <p>This is better than the adjustment model that existed in the past. Nevertheless secondary school numbers are not always stable and some thought needs to be given to how sudden and significant reductions in roll can impact a school's delivery of the curriculum and its staffing levels.</p> <p>Sensible minimises workload</p>			

Consultation Point 3

The current AWPU values of 1.31 for KS3 and 1.72 for KS4 will be retained.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Would have preferred using STPCD KS3/KS4 ratio, as this has external value
Given the limited information provided for 2014-15 within the consultation document
Governors would value further evidence of the accuracy of these ratios when considering
budgets for future years.

This makes sense as it links to the values that used in the STPCD
There is no rational for them to be changed

Consultation Point 4

The Secondary School formula should include an element for leadership and
management

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Good to see that consideration is given to the point that leadership / management are
equally required in small schools as well as larger ones!

Given the fact that, irrespective of their size, all schools require a headteacher and
leadership structure, the inclusion of this element is supported

This is more desirable and it should include leadership at all levels within the school's
staffing structure so middle as well as senior leaders. Does there need to be a
leadership and management element for support staff as well?

Leadership and management costs should be identified so that schools can benchmark
themselves on their spending for this element

Consultation Point 5

Secondary Schools should receive a lump sum and an amount per AWPU for leadership
and management.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

There should be some incentive here to structure properly to manage cost.

Should be AWPU only. Would mean schools would need to rationalise their management
structures to be more efficient/cost effective. There are schools that are overstaffed in
terms of management where as others have made necessary changes.

The principle is cautiously supported. Funding must include a small base element to
recognise the needs of small schools, although this should be modest to encourage
federalisation. However, the funding should largely be based upon pupil numbers to
recognise the more complex leadership structure which is required to manage a large

school efficiently.
 t makes absolute sense to have a lump sum element as a school has to have a HT and a DHT or AHT to act as HT in the HT's absence
 It seems sensible to recognise the need for all schools to have a leadership and management structure, whilst also taking account of the size of the school.

Consultation Point 6

Teacher funding should be allocated to secondary schools on an AWPU basis.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This methodology for the allocation is logical to maintain pupil teacher ratios at their current level
 Teaching costs should be directly linked to pupil numbers

Consultation Point 7

There should be a top slice of teacher funding in the secondary sector of 1.5% which is reallocated to schools by reference to the largest school to reflect that a lower PTR is achievable in smaller schools at KS4.

Agree	7	Disagree	4
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

Request for an explanation as to how this is calculated
 If funding is on AWPU, no necessary slicing should be required. That would favour smaller schools, and disadvantage larger schools, also it would de incentivise larger school, support small school and not encouraging them to move to a position of attracting better pupil numbers
 This disadvantages larger schools. I do not agree with a 'top slice', certainly not of this magnitude.
 Yes if School is small and fully subscribed, No if school is small and under-subscribed
 Governors do not agree that top slicing is the correct mechanism to fund smaller schools
 If this comes from the quantum should the smaller schools' allocations be deducted before the top slice is made
 I would need to see data and calculations to establish if the 1.5% figure is appropriate
 Whilst this is agreed in principle, the size of the top slice should not adversely impact upon the opportunities for pupils in all schools to be taught in broadly similar class sizes irrespective of the size of the school.
 Define largest schools and smaller schools as it is not clear how this will impact.

Consultation Point 8

The Welsh Medium school should continue to receive funding based on one additional teacher for each of years 7 to 9 to facilitate teaching of children where Welsh is not their first language.

Agree	8	Disagree	3
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

The level of funding in Welsh medium schools is already significantly higher than English medium so this should be sufficient to meet this requirement.

Are the AWPU values of 1.31 for KS3 and 1.72 for KS4 the same for Welsh medium schools? If you do the slicing as above, this also benefits the smaller Welsh medium schools. What about other schools where resources are provided for pupils whose first language is not English or Welsh

Immersion course provision at YMG is separate to Welsh Med. Provision and must be staffed and timetabled differently. Clarification is required for the following points: 1. Pay Scale for additional teacher; immersion course teaching is very specialist discipline and requires an experienced practitioner. 2: WESP; In the light of Outcome 1 stating 'the target is to achieve an increase in size by 100%' is anticipated that the numbers on the immersion course will rise. The maximum class size is 15 according to the Welsh Language Board. If pupil numbers increase beyond this figure in a particular academic then funding for an additional teacher will be required.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there should be an element of enhancement to support the 'immersion' groups within the Welsh medium school, consideration should be given to the scale of this enhancement

Consultation Point 9

Funding currently allocated as workload is amalgamated with support staff funding.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Would still like to see this line as remaining separate
 The clarity of the budget will be supported by this funding being incorporated into support staff funding
 We agree. This makes absolute sense given that the funding is used for support staff to ensure that the workforce reform arrangements are in place
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 10

The funding identified for support staff is allocated to secondary schools through a lump sum allocation and an AWPU amount.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This principle is cautiously supported. Funding must include a small base element to recognise the needs of small schools, although this should be modest to encourage federalisation.
 This needs to happen as well and this is clearly explained in the rationale in the introduction to the formula review
 Agree in principle, but in every secondary school pupil numbers should generate the necessary funding and so any lump sum allocation should be kept small.
 We are in broad agreement although English medium schools are facing the challenge of increasing numbers pupils joining the school as EAL pupils and some provision needs to be made for these.
 Single status will have implications, even after the 2 year protection. This will need reviewing.

Consultation Point 11

The Welsh Medium school will receive an amount in respect of translation costs.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Other high schools should therefore be able to access this service free of charge for translation issues

This allocation is endorsed. It is presumed that this allocation will be based on a per capita basis.

In order to promote clarity and consistency, and to assist schools in checking budget allocations, it is proposed that the same methodology is used for the allocation of the deprivation funding as is used for the allocation of the Pupil Deprivation Grant - based on FSM numbers only,

This can be costed accurately using Single Status for a translator and the staff member that provides specialist ICT/Admin support to produce translated documents

A balanced indicator would be appropriate

Consultation Point 12

A deprivation indicator is established comprising the following factors:

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

Each factor would have equal weighting.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

We broadly agree with this as using the three factors provides a better overview of deprivation.

A long overdue element. Strongly agree.

Consultation Point 13

Deprivation funding is allocated to all secondary schools using the deprivation indicator.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

All schools contain a proportion of pupils from deprived backgrounds; consequently, all schools should receive a share of this limited amount of money.

Strongly agree that funding should be available to all schools to target at the appropriate pupils

Consultation Point 14

Deprivation funding is targeted to secondary schools with the highest level of deprivation as identified by the deprivation indicator.

Agree	4	Disagree	7
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

This would not provide an equitable distribution of funding to schools to support young people from deprived circumstances.
 We disagree strongly with this option. The adoption of this option would divert funding from schools whose populations are slightly more advantaged overall
 Deprivation must be targeted in ALL secondary schools if it is a factor
 Strongly disagree - all schools will have individual pupils from deprived backgrounds and therefore all schools should receive an appropriate share of the funding.
 The objectives in 1.8 focus on narrowing the attainment gap. In schools where there is greater deprivation reducing the gap is more of a challenge. If the proportion of deprived children in school is greater than there needs to be adequate resource to support these children and their families.

Consultation Point 15

There will be a single formula for allocating funding to secondary schools under the heading of premises.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This opportunity to simplify this element of the budget is welcomed.
 This makes sense, however this will need to be examined more closely when modernisation is complete as in Holywell the primary and secondary schools will share some facilities
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 16

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	7	Disagree	4
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

All secondary schools should have an energy rating (DEC) as proposed by EU directive; this should be used to drive utility bills costs on a sliding scale relating to outcome of the assessment. The effect of a low energy rating outcome is not consistent or equitable for the school and is only in the control of the authority. Area and pupil numbers take no account of this factor.
 The condition of a building based on suitability survey should be taken into account as well as energy efficient ratings. This will be more complicated but would incentivise LA to tackle unsuitable buildings more quickly.

Whilst we support the principle of funding based on a lump sum allocation, and an element based upon the number of pupils, care has to be exercised in relation to area. Noting the current circumstances in some schools, where areas have been 'mothballed' as a result of demographics, the element of the allocation related to area should specifically relate to the area currently used for mainstream education
 Should 'full' schools subsidise those that have spare capacity/area? Per pupil allocations much fairer in my view
 A balanced approach to the formula seems fairest

The area of a school should not be included in the formula

Consultation Point 17

There will be an enhancement to the premises allocation for secondary schools providing meals to other schools.

Agree	8	Disagree	3
-------	---	----------	---

Comments

This should be a separate contract between the two schools
 The cost of this service should be met but why is additional 'premises allocation' needed?
 Yes - this is needed to reflect additional costs
 It is proposed that there should be an adjustment to the SLA costs for catering for schools which provide a service to other schools.

Consultation Point 18

There will be a single allocation for supplies and services.

Agree	10	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

This opportunity to simplify this element of the budget is welcomed
 This makes sense
 A welcome simplification

Consultation Point 19

The supplies and services allocation to secondary schools will consist of a lump sum plus an AWPU allocation.

Agree	11	Disagree	0
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Whilst this is supported, it is proposed that the lump sum allocation for this element is modest, with the majority of the funding being allocated on an AWPU basis.

This makes sense

A balanced approach is fairest

Consultation Point 20

Examination costs will be on a fixed cost per Year KS4 pupil.

Agree	11	Disagree	1
-------	----	----------	---

Comments

Can consideration be also given to raising the allocation threshold in view of externally driven rising costs which are beyond the control of schools?

Whilst this is supported, it is suggested that due regard is given to schools' historical entry policies, as some schools enter pupils for more examinations.

The fixed cost will need to take into account the varying costs for a range of qualifications and the varying costs of awarding bodies

Agreed, and they would hopefully be set at a more realistic level that doesn't require subsidy from other budget headings

KS4 examination costs at YMG are higher. Pupils sit full course GCSE Welsh Lang. and Welsh Lit. are in addition to the average cost of a Flintshire KS4 pupil

Cost of exams at KS3 - implications of this invigilation and administration costs.