**Response Summary**

30 Primary Schools

3 Secondary Schools

4 Special Schools

A list of the 37 respondents is given at the end of this document

**Response Analysis**

**Section 2.2 Formula Factors**

As central government did not propose any changes to the factors Merton uses and no anomalies was raised in the benchmarking exercise which would warrant us making any changes, we are not proposing any changes to Merton’s funding formula.

Respondents were asked to provide any comments that they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum in setting the 2016/17 formula.

Comments

|  |
| --- |
| * Would it be possible for Schools Forum to consider providing some funding to support LAC children who become subjects to SGO. We have at least 2 children who have had significant safeguarding concerns for many years and once they become SGO, no further funding and support was received for them. |
| * Why is the London Fringe factor not considered for Merton? |
| * As a school with low deprivation we struggle from our AWPU amount. We lose out with increasing SEN volume. |
| * Not enough money in budget to cover all costs - we have low deprivation in our school but still lots of individual needs to be funded. |
| * As Merton’s only split site school, we feel that the additional funding we receive is far short of what is needed. |
| * The delegated budget is not sufficient to run the school, especially as we are not a school with low deprivation but we have high SEN and EAL needs. |
| * We would appreciate a discussion with Marius on bandings for special school funding from high needs block, across all special schools |
| * As a school that is fortunate enough to not suffer low deprivation, we lose out. There is not enough money in the budget, however there are still individual needs to consider. |
| * RPHS submits that the funding factors that Merton uses should contain a greater weighting towards deprivation. Looking at the 2015-16 figures for the 32 London boroughs and Surrey, the percentage that Merton gives to deprivation is 30th out of 33. We accept that Merton diverts more funding towards low prior attainment than other boroughs (7th out of 33) yet the combined result for deprivation and low prior attainment (10.4%) is 26th out of 33. We feel that the amount should be raised to be more in line with the average amount - 13.79%. This will redistribute the funding in the borough towards those pupils most in need. Merton came 10th out of all London boroughs in the GCSE results in 2014 (results fell in 2015 in Merton). Out of the 9 boroughs that performed better than Merton in 2014, 6 invested more in deprivation plus low prior attainment. The mean percentage for the top 10 performing boroughs is 12.45%. Deprivation is not evenly spread across the borough and the way that the formula is weighted in Merton disproportionately favours some secondary schools over others leaving schools in already challenging circumstances with additional financial difficulties. In addition Merton chose not to allocate anything to pupil mobility which adversely impacts schools under PAN as opposed to oversubscribed schools as their populations will be more mobile. You say in your benchmarking document that Pupil Premium targets deprivation and has increased over the past four years, however this is a specious argument as the same also applies to the boroughs that you benchmarked against and so cannot really justify or explain the significant difference in allocation |

**2.3.5 Contingencies – Schools in challenging circumstances**

Respondents were asked as if they think this fund should increase by £100,000 to £300,000 to support more schools? This funding pot has not increased over the past years and, due to the pressure on school funding and lower school balances, schools are less able to deal with unforeseen issues?

## Results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Special | % |
| Yes | 22 | 1 | 3 | 66% |
| No | 8 | 2 | 1 | 34% |

**Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | * For the past two years we have been oversubscribed in at least one classroom and not received extra funding for this. As a successful one form entry school we face far more challenges financially as we don't have the pupil numbers to draw in more cash. Majority of good and outstanding schools don't benefit from this increase but ultimately we are affected by the impact it has on the amount of money we receive. | | * Are there more schools in challenging circumstances? | | * This is a large increase - we would support an increase but not of such a large amount unless we were presented with a case to show how this additional funding is needed and spent. | | * It is becoming tighter for all schools not just those in challenging circumstances. | | * All schools require more funding. If we agree to this schools that are not in challenging circumstances would really suffer. | | * Whilst we appreciate the importance of this, we would wish the amount of the increase to be considered - to double rather than triple. | | * Not in support unless specific example evidence of spend is provided | | * Greater understanding of the challenging circumstances, changes and why these have arisen needed to support a 200% rise. | | * No, it is becoming tighter for all schools, not just those in challenging circumstances. | | * I think it is vital the LA has the resources to support and would agree with an increase in funding. | | * If this increased, which other pot would be affected? Equally, as an Academy, we are not provided with services therefore would not wish to pay more. | | * It is much tighter for all schools, not just those in challenging circumstances. Clarity as to what constitutes "challenging circumstances" would be helpful, as some schools feel they have been forced into a challenging situation by having to expand, yet now face difficulties in filling places. | | * Currently pupil numbers are low. Additional funding is required for consultancy/training to move the school forward. | | * Agree - it would be useful to know how this funding is used each year - obviously, without naming schools but what the needs/ criteria for this pocket of money has been. | | * Please be transparent about who would receive the fund and how the fund would be used by the school. This could be presented annually. | | * This should be used to help schools through challenges and not to sustain on a long term basis. | | | **2.3.8 Free School Meals**  Respondents were asked to select which option below they would prefer:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Option 1** | Retain the subsidy for the whole of 2016/17, bearing in mind that there will be a contract change and we do not know what the charge will be from September 2016. | | **Option 2** | Retain the subsidy for April to July 2016 and remove from September 2016. | | **Option 3** | Remove the subsidy from April 2016. | | | **Results**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Primary | Secondary | Special | % | | **Option 1** | 1 |  | 3 | 6% | | **Option 2** | 8 |  | 0 | 26% | | **Option 3** | 21 |  | 1 | 68% | | | **Comments** | | |  | | --- | | * To keep in line with the Academic year rather than the financial year which would be more helpful to parents. | | * Do not want to continue subsidising 16p per meal per day. | | * No reason for schools to fund this | | * As the cost has remained so low for so long, a rise of this size for families is acceptable. | | * We don't wish to continue subsidising the ISS meal service. | | * I struggle with the contract the borough has with ISS for meals but my view on continuing subsidy would depend on who was awarded the contract. | | * This is costly for schools with high take up. | | * With tight budgets, we should not be subsidising school meals for those parents who are able to pay, especially in the context of UIFSM where large amounts of public money are subsidising school meals. | | * Governors felt that consideration should be given in the new contract tender process to the poor admin by ISS and the issue of cash collection and debt management. | | * It is easier for schools to manage a price increase, if this is necessary, at the beginning of an academic year. Schools will also be able to give notice to parents of an increase once the new contract is in place. | | * All primary schools must increase their school meal charges to parents to £2.10 from April. There hasn't been an increase for years. | | * 3 years of subsidy exists through UIFSM. Odd amount of cash not a problem as long as catering contract remains responsible for this. | | |

**Options relating to de-delegation**

**De-delegation**

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they would prefer a number of services to be de-delegated back to the Local Authority to be managed centrally rather than by each individual school.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Para.** | **Service** | **Primary**  **De-delegate Yes** | **%** | **Secondary**  **De-delegate Yes** | **%** |
| 2.3.5 | Contingencies - Schools in challenging circumstances | 27 | 90% | 1 | 50% |
| 2.3.6 | Contingencies- Merton Education Partnership | 29 | 97% | 0 | 0 |
| 2.3.7 | Contingencies - Marketing in schools | 20 | 67% | 2 | 100% |
| 2.3.8 | Contingencies- Tree maintenance | 28 | 93% | 2 | 100% |
| **Para.** | **Service** | **Primary**  **De-delegate Yes** | **%** | **Secondary**  **De-delegate Yes** | **%** |
| 2.3.9 | Primary school meals management | 26 | 87% |  |  |
| 2.3.10 | Licences and subscriptions | 28 | 93% | 2 | 100% |
| 2.3.11 | Staff cost- supply cover | 22 | 73% | 2 | 100% |
| 2.3.12 | Support to under-performing ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners | 13 | 43% | 2 | 100% |
| 2.3.123 | Behaviour support | 28 | 93% | 2 | 100% |

Respondents were asked to provide any comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum on the de-delegation of budgets for 2016/17.

**Comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | * 2.3.7 absolute waste of time and resources as hasn’t helped us in recruitment at all. The Grebot Donnelly promotional video was a complete waste of resources. 2.3.12 we would prefer to manage this ourselves and buy in support where necessary. We use our own bank of volunteers for this. |
|  | * 2.3.6 What does "the factor was not taken up by secondary schools" mean? 2.3.13 Can I have clarification on funding for TAMHS as we currently pay for a TAMHS worker directly. |
|  | * The only reason we are de delegating behaviour support is because of the benefit of the Language, Behaviour and Learning service. |
|  | * 2.35 Yes but limit increase. |
|  | * It is not clear if Academies are being asked to contribute to the areas above. If so, we need to be provided with details of the resources made available to us ie I have a large EAL cohort yet we have never been given any support with translation etc. Your document states schools can access this. |
|  | * 2.3.8 if tree maintenance can be opted out of, this is fine, however a school with no trees having to pay for schools with several trees is unfair. 2.3.12 no support has been given to the school for this service. |
|  | * I am unclear about supply cover arrangements from LBM? |
|  | * Could the MSSP funding be an additional de-delegated amount? This is a valuable service to schools, which should be continued. |
|  | * Charging for the behaviour support on the basis of low prior attainment effectively undermines the benefit of allocating funds on that basis. Behaviour support targeted where it is needed supports the education of all the children in the borough and consideration should be given to charging for this on a per pupil basis. Is there evidence to show that children with low prior attainment are the ones that require behaviour support? |

**2.4.3 Additional classes required due to pupil growth**

As the primary expansion pupils reach the secondary phase, we will need to support secondary schools and academies with expansion class funding. As the majority of this is calculated using AWPU the secondary allocation is proposed to be £80,000.

Respondents were asked to provide any feedback they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum on the expansion class funding allocation proposed for 2016/17.

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * Costs for secondary schools should be the same as primary schools as tables, chairs, teachers etc. are the same costs therefore transitional funding should be the same. |
| * We do not support such a larger increase than that given to secondary classes unless we were to receive a case as to why this extra funding level - above that of primary - is need. Have any calculations been done? |
| * We feel that the secondary allocation should be the same as primary. |
| * This should be on par with primary. |
| * Secondary allocation or expansion class funding should be the same as the primary allocation. |
| * We feel the funding for secondary schools should be on par with the funding received by primary schools. |
| * Do not understand why Secondary schools should receive £80k per bulge class when primary schools only get £60k. |
| * Please ensure special schools secondary expansion is considered as well. |
| * A year 7 secondary class should not be 25% more costly to set up than a primary bulge class so I don't support the increase to £80k without more evidence. |
| * Initially, secondary school should only receive the same as primaries as they are not buying anything extra. |
| * The level of funding should be the same as for primary schools - £60k |
| * N/A to CGS - but we do need a formulae for our expansion. |
| * Primary schools receive £60k so secondary schools should receive the same amount |
| * The differential between proposed £80k for additional classes at secondary seems unnecessarily steep in comparison to the allocated £60k when primary phase were granted expansion funding. |
| * £80k for secondary schools is not approved. |
| * This should remain the same as for primaries unless a cost case can be provided to show WHY/HOW these costs are higher for secondary schools the funding is for the same items (ie classroom set up/IT/staffing) |
| * Governors queried why it was £80k for a bulge class in secondary when it had been £60k for a primary. |
| * Is the additional £20k per class for Secondary pupils justified - if £60k is deemed adequate for Primary classes, Secondary classes should not cost or be funded significantly more. Equipment, furniture and resources are different but not necessarily more expensive |
| * The cost of a bulge class for primary schools was £60k. £80k is a significant increase. |
| * Primaries were funded @£60k. Secondary school have much more scope for economy of scale - should be funded at primary figure. |
| * This should remain at the same amount as for primary schools in the primary expansion. |
| * We would hope that this would also apply to a school which is moving back towards its PAN from a position of having lower numbers over a number of years. At RPHS staffing has been adjusted to take account of the reduced numbers and to grow back to PAN would have the same financial implications as taking a bulge class beyond PAN. |

**2.6 Merton Music Foundation**

Respondents were asked to provide any comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum on funding the Merton Music Education Hub for 2016/17.

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * This is another aspect that we don't require as we have our own specialist teacher. Would prefer this to be a buy in option like MFL is with Wimbledon Chase. |
| * Useful service |
| * We would continue to support the funding and work of MMF. |
| * We would agree to continue the funding for MMF. |
| * Continue funding this please. |
| * We are against continuing to fund this. |
| * MMF provide an excellent service and we should fund them generously. |
| * We want Merton to keep funding the MMF - such a valuable resource. |
| * MMF should continue to be subsidised. |
| * Please continue to fund this |
| * Supportive of continuing the funding linked to updated plan. |
| * Please continue with this funding allocation. |
| * MMF's funding should continue. |
| * I have not had much contact with MMF but would like to know more. |
| * MMF provides a valuable service for pupils in Merton and it is important that we continue to support it. |
| * A valuable resource - to support |
| * The service that MMF provides for schools is so valuable and we should continue to provide these experiences for the children through MMF. |
| * An essential service, crucial to be maintained for schools to meet demands of a curriculum demanding breadth of opportunities and extra curricular learning. |
| * This should continue and grow |
| * Continue funding for MMF. The service is greatly appreciated at Dundonald. |
| * To continue |
| * Would like to continue funding this |
| * Funding should continue as before to allow MMF to access maximum funding. |
| * Governors felt this should continue to be supported. |
| * Important to retain the MMF Music Hub to enable schools to promote and engage in high quality music provision such as the Music is for Life concerts. It is important that both sides of the borough have equal access to the MMF services and support. |
| * MMF funding should continue for 2016/17 |
| * Funding should continue as this is a great, well run resource. |
| * Must be retained |
| * Continue as before. |

**3 EYSFF comments**

There are three changes to be considered for consultation purposes:

* introduction of new SEN Support Levels to reflect the changes in the SEND Code of Practice
* alignment of funding methodology between SEN funding and EHCP (based on actual hours of attendance)
* change to the payment methodology for relevant PVI providers

Respondents were asked to provide any comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum in setting the 2016- 17 formula.

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * The threshold for SEN funding at 2.5% seems high. At 2.4% we are just under the threshold, yet if you match our actual raw SEN numbers of statements (5) its substantially higher than other schools. This actually equates to about 5.2 children with statements/EHCP. |
| * The SEN support levels do not reflect the levels of need funding required - it is too lengthy a process - might as well go for an EHCP |
| * This all seems sensible, but the funding levels are too low. |
| * Following the spending review, an increase in the level of funding (base rate) for Nursery provision should be considered. |
| * Seems sensible but the funding levels still need to be increased. |
| * Would like to know more about the alignment of funding methodology - how will this meet shorter and longer term targets set as part of EHCP - Primary to Secondary etc |
| * Appears to be a sensible approach, however funding for support levels is not clear. It is difficult to assess whether this will equate to more or less than original notional funding calculation which is based on percentages of various factors such as FSM, AWPU. attainment (100%) etc. Focus on specific pupils is preferable (if this is what is proposed), however the costings are detrimental to school, the per-pupil calculation may need re-evaluating if possible. |
| * The suggested funding levels would ensure EYFS pupils with SEN were able to be supported prior to receiving an EHCP. |
| * It is not clear how much SEN funding a child would get. Eg SEN support 1b £2.50 per? (hour/day/week/term). |

**4.2.4 Sports Partnership**

Respondents were asked which options they would prefer.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Option 1 –** Cease the sports partnership contribution from April 2016. | 38% |
| **Option 2 –** Add the cost on to the MEP de-delegation funding and pay from the MEP budget in future. | 62% |

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * On the consultation document there was an option 3 (Harris to start running this as an SLA for schools to buy into.) We would prefer this option as we already paid £600 to Harris this year for sporting support. |
| * The Sports partnership is very good and we would like to retain it but agree option 2 allows to decide whether to buy in. If there are fewer schools then the subs can increase. |
| * We have no specific preference - we would be willing to pay an increased sum - within reason - for the Merton Sport Partnership. |
| * Should be funded directly from school budget. |
| * MSSP provide a valuable service to all schools. |
| * The MSSP should all be funded from schools' budgets |
| * The MSSP is critical to providing support for PE and sports opportunities in Merton, therefore we would want the contribution to be paid from the MEP budget. |
| * I think that this should now be a full subscription model and schools choose on basis of full cost. |
| * I have had a lot of dealings with MSSP and think this is a very valuable resource. |
| * Valuable service |
| * Delegate to schools - additional proposed payment of £200 approx per school should be subsumed per school. |
| * The cost should be for Primary schools only as there is no longer any contribution to Secondary PE. |
| * Schools to fund directly |
| * Schools pay individually |
| * Governors felt that investigating the possibility of an SLA was a good idea. |
| * Please see comments in de-delegation section. If this cannot become a de-delegated item on its own then paying from the MEP budget should be considered. |
| * MSSP is the best run sports partnership locally. Schools already use their sports funding to buy in annually. Why change what is working well. |
| * Excellent provision |
| * An annual report should be provided to show transparently how much each school has received/benefitted from the partnership. Can we justify £15 per school? |

**Other comments**

Respondents were asked to provide any other comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum.

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * When is the discussion around new ARP provision taking place? |
| * 1.2.10/1.2.11 - SLA costs - the document states that increases will be capped so as not to have a significant impact on schools budgets but does not give any indication of the amount of the increase. |
| * Split site factor - Governors request that School forum note re inadequacy of the split site factor as it is currently constructed |
| * Additional attention to census count in Spring to fund schools who have a significant increase of pupil roll since Oct census |
| * Funding is difficult for all schools in the current climate. It is particularly difficult for schools that are under PAN that have suffered from falling rolls. The funding formula that Merton applies favours the higher performing and oversubscribed schools. Funding needs to be reallocated so that schools that are facing significant difficulties with higher levels of deprivation, low attainment on entry and a mobile student population are better able to deliver school improvement and secure positive outcomes for some of the boroughs neediest pupils. |

**Respondents**

**PRIMARY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Abbotsbury Primary** | **St Mary's RC Primary** | **SECONDAR**Y |
| **All Saints' CE Primary** | **St Matthew's CE Primary** | **Harris** |
| **Beecholme Primary** | **St Teresa's RC Primary** | **Raynes Park** |
| **Bishop Gilpin CE Primary** | **Stanford Primary** | **Wimbledon College** |
| **Bond Primary** | **The Priory CE** |
| **Dundonald Primary** | **West Wimbledon Primary** |
| **Garfield Primary** | **Wimbledon Chase Primary** |
| **Haslemere Primary** | **Wimbledon Park Primary** |
| **Hatfeild Primary** |  | **SPECIAL** |
| **Hillcross Primary** |  | **Cricket Green** |
| **Joseph Hood Primary** |  | **Melrose** |
| **Liberty Primary** |  | **Perseid** |
| **Links Primary** |  | **SMART Centre** |
| **Malmesbury Primary** |  |
| **Merton Abbey Primary** |  |
| **Merton Park Primary** |  |
| **Morden Primary** |  |
| **Pelham Primary** |  |
| **Poplar Primary** |  |
| **The Sherwood** |  |
| **St John Fisher RC Primary** |  |
| **St Mark's Primary** |  |