

**School Budgets 2010/11 – Proposed Changes to the Resource Allocation Formula for Schools****Question 1****Premises Funding**

Do you agree with proposal to remove premises funding for condition and backlog and redistribute through the floor area unit of resource from April 2010?

Total value of condition and backlog funding 2009/10 £370k ( 2.1% of Total Individual Schools Budget)

Yes	No	Not stated	Comments
8	5	1	<p><b>Earls High (response yes)</b> - Needs more regular reviews than 5 years.</p> <p><b>Priory (response yes)</b> - It is an absolute disgrace that a failure of management has led to many schools being overfunded for years at the expense of others.</p> <p><b>Ham Dingle (yes)</b> - Do not agree with redistribution through floor area. A more equitable distribution would be through pupils numbers/condition of the building, in order for it to go to where it is most needed/most appropriate. Primary schools are losers/secondaries are gainers under this proposal - hardly fair.</p> <p><b>Bramford (yes)</b> - This will make the formula a lot fairer across the board.</p> <p><b>Alder Coppice (no)</b> - Governors wish to state that in their opinion the proposals unfairly favour secondary schools in a climate where a lot of primaries are still not in A1 condition and as such need increasing amounts of maintenance. In order to be absolutely fair could we update the condition/backlog data instead so reflecting the true condition of the buildings?</p> <p><b>Gigmill (no)</b> - Primary schools appear to suffer while the secondary sector benefits. Questions: When were floor areas of individual schools last measured? Would it be better to wait until all condition backlog work was completed?</p> <p><b>Wallbrook (no)</b> - It looks like the Primary Sector would take too much of a hit if this were introduced at a stroke. We are in favour of some transitional element being introduced for this to happen in 2010-11.</p> <p><b>St Josephs RC (Stourbridge) (no)</b> - Our school situation is adversely affected by the change in the proposed resource allocation formula. There is a serious negative variance and this impacts critically on our budget. We do not understand either the formula calculation or how it is applied. There is a disproportionate effect on two schools; of which we are one. It appears that we are suffering from the negative effects of the application of the economics of scale – this is patently unfair: we note the comparison between our situation and that of larger schools and of schools in the secondary sector. 30% negative variance needs some investigation and explanation. We cannot absorb or countenance a loss of such a proportion from a small budget. We are at present seeking advice from Deputy Director of the Diocesan Schools Commission and the Head Teachers Forum.</p> <p><b>Thorns Primary (no)</b> - The re-distribution of the "condition and backlog" funding is going to have a greater impact on the Primary school by comparison to the secondary school. It appears that all secondary schools, bar one, stand to gain additional revenue. Governors have expressed concern that our revised funding here at Thorns Primary is predicted to reduce by 10%.</p> <p>The Governors would like to note that schools who have received new buildings are set to see an increase in funding based on the new system of calculation. Although we appreciate the new system will probably be less time consuming as the previous, as a school in an older building we fail to see how a new build such as Wrens Nest can receive the same amount of unit of resource as ourselves. One would hope that the new builds should not require as much up keep as older buildings.</p> <p>Perhaps a more sensible approach could include a standard amount per unit of resource but with a sliding scale for depreciation on the building i.e the age of the building actually determined the percentage of the standard £1.07 that the school received. This would also help out where schools have had new extensions added on, but still had older parts of the building that required more care and attention.</p> <p>Governors of the Thorns Primary school are deeply concerned about these proposals which we believe to be ill conceived.</p>

Recommendation of DCS - to remove funding for condition & backlog and re-distribute through the floor area unit of Resource from April 2010 in accordance with Consultation responses received.

**Question 2****Funding for Special Educational Needs (SEN) without statements**

Which model do you prefer to allocate funding for Special Education Needs (SEN) without statements in secondary schools from April 2010?

Total value of SEN without statements funding based on KS3 SATs 2009/10 £671k (3.8% of Total Individual Schools Budget)

Model 1	Model 2	Not stated	Comments
2	5	7	<p><b>Earls High (model 2)</b> - As SATS (KS2) may be abolished in the future I believe teacher assessment would be most consistent method. However, an alternative model would be a combination of KS2 TA and FSM.</p> <p><b>Wollescote (model 2)</b> - Industrial action may disrupt SATs in 2010 and there would be no difficulty if SAT's were abolished in due course.</p> <p><b>The Wordsley School (model 1)</b> - Greater chance of equality</p>

Recommendation of DCS - to allocate funding for Special Education Needs (SEN) without statements in secondary schools from April 2010 based on KS2 SATs data (Model 1) as recommended by Secondary Heads (July 2009), until such time that SATs data is no longer available, thereafter to allocate funding based on Teacher Assessment data.