ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR \& MAIDENHEAD SCHOOLS FORUM


## 1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 In July, Schools Forum requested an assessment of the impact of increasing the value of the lump sum in RBWM's pre 16 funding formula. This paper responds to that request and confirms that, following analysis of the modelling and other factors, the proposed recommendation to the Director of Children's Services and Lead Member will be for no change in the 2016-17 formula. Schools Forum are asked to comment on this.
1.2 The paper also notifies Forum about other funding changes for 2016-17 announced by the EFA as far as they are currently known. It confirms that after a period of significant funding reform there will be few significant changes both to the local funding formula and to school funding as a whole for 2016-17.

2 SUMMARY
2.1 Increasing the lump sum to the maximum of $£ 175,000$ for both primary and secondary schools would require an extra $£ 3.059 \mathrm{~m}$. Assuming no additional DSG funding, this $£ 3.059 \mathrm{~m}$ would need to be funded by a reduction in the primary AWPU rate of $8 \%$ ( $-£$ per pupil), and a reduction of $2.1 \%$ and $1.7 \%$ ( $£ 82$ and $£ 75$ per pupil) in KS3 and KS4 respectively.
2.2 The modelling pre Minimum Funding Guarantee shows that primary schools with 200 pupils or fewer and secondary schools with 600 or fewer are gainers under this model. The exception to this is that three out of the four middle schools, are disadvantaged because of the effect of the reduction in primary pupil funding.
2.3 The average gain in both primary and secondary schools is around $£ 15 \mathrm{k}$ per school. Schools which lose under the model stand to lose around £21k on average and in some cases over £40k.
2.4 The effect of Minimum Funding Guarantee produces some unexpected consequences, sometimes reducing the gains of gaining schools, and sometimes reducing the losses of losing schools. The impact of MFG on individual school funding will depend on finalised pupil data that is not yet available. Post MFG funding cannot therefore be modelled with any great certainty.
2.5 Other issues taken into account include the evidence or otherwise that smaller schools are currently disadvantaged, RBWM's existing lump sum and AWPU values relative to other LAs, and previous funding policy decisions.
2.6 On balance, we are not persuaded that an increase to the lump sum value would have significant benefits for smaller schools at the present time.
2.7 The EFA have announced that RBWM's Schools Block Unit of funding, the per pupil rate used to calculate the Schools Block DSG allocation, will increase from $£ 4,456$ to $£ 4,468$ in 2016-17. This reflects an adjustment to incorporate the funding previously added for free schools, and does not result in an increase in the overall DSF funding that RBWM will receive.

## 3 RECOMMENDATIONS:

3.1 That Schools Forum comment on the outcome of the modelling to increase the value of the lump sum for primary and secondary schools to the maximum, and to fund this from a reduction in AWPU rates.
3.2 That Schools Forum endorse the proposal not to increase the lump sum values for 2016-17 by reducing AWPU rates.
3.3 To note that RBWM's DSG Schools Block Unit of Funding will increase by £12 per pupil in 2016-17 to $£ 4,468$ per pupil to reflect the funding added for free schools (para. 6.3).

## 4 BACKGROUND

4.1 The DfE's school funding reforms introduced in 2013-14 have resulted in many changes to RBWM's local funding formula for pre 16 pupils in the last three years. In their ongoing consultation of the draft School and Early Years Finance Regulations covering 2016-17 the DfE have indicated that there will be very few new substantive changes to school funding arrangements in 2016-17. We also understand that schools would welcome a period of consolidation, and no significant changes to RBWM's local pre 16 funding formula are anticipated for 2016-17.
4.2 One area that Schools Forum did ask officers to look at was the value of the lump sum for primary and secondary schools. Specifically, what would be the impact on RBWM schools of increasing the lump sum to the maximum? All schools incur overhead costs - head teacher and management costs, finance and other costs etc.- that are not specifically related to the size of the school. The lump sum factor is a fixed amount that each school receives as part of its budget share to cover these kind of costs ${ }^{1}$. Because the lump sum amount is the same for all schools within the same phase, it follows that a higher lump sum value makes up a higher proportion of a small school's overall funding than it does for a larger school. The lump sum is therefore the one allowable factor that provides a level of funding protection for small schools. It was in the context of a discussion on this issue that this modelling was requested.
4.3 Subject to the outcome of this work, RBWM does not intend to consult schools on any further changes to its local funding formula for 2016-17 and the first draft funding formula will be submitted to the DfE by 31 October on this basis. The finalised funding formula, using October 2015 pupil data, will be submitted by 20 January 2016.

## 5 CHANGING THE LUMP SUM

## Principles

5.1 The maximum permitted value for the lump sum for primary and secondary schools is $£ 175,000$. The value may be different for each phase. Middle schools receive an average lump sum value based on the number of primary and secondary year groups in the school. RBWM lump sum rates for 2015-16 are slightly below the national average (table 1)

| Table 1 Lump sum rates 2015-16 | RBWM | National <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | $£ 123,738$ | $£ 127,952$ |
| Middle | $£ 124,447$ | $£ 139,739$ |
|  | $£ 125,155$ | $£ 15{ }^{2}$ |

[^0]5.2 Increasing the lump sum to the maximum of $£ 175,000$ for both primary and secondary phases would require an extra £3.059m (table 2).

| Table 2 Cost of increasing | RBWM <br> lump sum to maximum | Maximum | Increase per <br> school | Total increase <br> for all schools |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | $£ 123,738$ | $£ 175,000$ | $£ 51,262$ | $£ 2,358,052$ |
| Middle | $£ 124,447$ | $£ 175,000$ | $£ 50,554$ | $£ 202,214$ |
| Upper and Secondary | $£ 125,155$ | $£ 175,000$ | $£ 49,845$ | $£ 498,450$ |
| Total |  |  |  | $£ 3,058,716$ |

5.3 Assuming no additional DSG funding, this $£ 3.059 \mathrm{~m}$ would need to be funded by a reduction in other formula factor rates so that the overall amount of funding allocated remained the same. The fairest way of doing this would be by reducing the AWPU rates for primary, KS3 and KS4 (see table 3). There is a larger decrease in the primary AWPU rate ( $8 \%$ ) compared with KS3 and KS4 ( $2.1 \%$ and $1.7 \%$ ). This is because the additional budget required to increase the primary lump sum for 46 primary schools is significantly greater than that needed for 14 middle and secondary schools.

| Table 3 Impact on AWPU rates <br> per pupil | RBWM <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | Reduction | Revised <br> lower AWPU | Total to be <br> reallocated <br> to lump sum |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Primary | $£ 2,880$ | $-£ 231(8.0 \%)$ | $£ 2,649$ | $£ 2.465 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| KS3 | $£ 3,950$ | $-£ 82(2.1 \%)$ | $£ 3,868$ | $£ 0.362 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| KS4 | $£ 4,502$ | $-£ 75(1.7 \%)$ | $£ 4,427$ | $£ 0.232 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $£$ |  |  |  | $£ 3.059 \mathrm{~m}$ |

5.4 Calculations are based on the principle that there should be no cross-subsidy across phases - so, primary schools would fund the full cost of increasing the primary lump sum through a reduction to the primary AWPU rate, and secondary schools would fund the cost of increasing the secondary lump sum through a reduction to the KS3 and KS4 rates proportionate to pupil numbers in each phase. Middle schools would be subject to the same reduction in primary and KS3 rates proportionate to pupil numbers in each phase.
5.5 The option to fund the full $£ 3.059 \mathrm{~m}$ budget requirement by an equal reduction in all three AWPU rates is also possible but this would unfairly disadvantage secondary schools. This is because they would have to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of increasing the primary lump sum. For this reason this approach was rejected.

## Analysis of results

5.6 The results of the modelling summarised in table 4 show that, increasing the lump sum for all schools by reducing the basic per pupil entitlement mainly benefits smaller schools, where the lump sum forms a larger proportion of the total budget share, and disadvantages bigger schools where the largest proportion of funding is pupil-led. Primary schools with around 200 pupils or fewer and secondary schools with around 600 or fewer are gainers under this model. However, all middle schools, except for the smallest St. Peters, are disadvantaged, because of the effect of the reduction in primary pupil funding.

Table 4 Gainers and Losers - Pre MFG

| Gainers | Primary |  |  | Middle |  |  | Secondary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All schools | 46 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| Gainers | 29 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | NOR | £ | \% | NOR | £ | \% | NOR | £ | \% |
| Maximum gain | 43 | 41,258 | 16\% | 229 | 14,043 | 1\% | 189 | 34,873 | 3\% |
| Minimum gain | 222 | 8 | 0\% |  |  |  | 645 | 530 | 0\% |
| Average gain | 157 | 14,829 | 3\% |  |  |  | 443 | 15,269 | 1\% |


| Losers | Primary |  | Middle |  |  | Secondary |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All schools | 46 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| Losers | 17 |  |  | 3 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | NOR | $£$ | $\%$ | NOR | $£$ | $\%$ | NOR | $£$ | $\%$ |


| Maximum loss | 410 | $(43,397)$ | $3 \%$ | 456 | $(22,451)$ | $1 \%$ | 1,220 | $(46,720)$ | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minimum loss | 243 | $(4,841)$ | $1 \%$ | 439 | $(19,121)$ | $1 \%$ | 645 | $(989)$ | $0 \%$ |
| Average loss | 310 | $(20,391)$ | $2 \%$ | 443 | $(20,838)$ | $1 \%$ | 911 | $(22,254)$ | $1 \%$ |

5.7 Key points of the analysis, outlined in detail in annex A , are:

- Small schools, except for middles, are among the biggest gainers

All primary schools with fewer than 200 pupils gain from an increase to the lump sum. The 14 primary schools with fewer than 150 pupils are all among the biggest gainers. Five of the eight secondary and middle schools with fewer than 600 pupils gain, but only one of these gainers is a middle school.

- Large schools are among the biggest losers

17 of the 28 primary schools with more than 200 pupils lose funding, and 5 of the 6 secondary schools with more than 600 pupils also lose. In both primary and secondary sectors, the largest schools are among the biggest losers.

- Middle schools are disadvantaged by the changes

Three of the four middle schools lose funding even though they have relatively few pupils compared with other secondaries. This is because half their pupils attract primary AWPU which was reduced by $8 \%$. Middles are affected to a large extent by the same reductions as large primaries.

- Upper schools gain compared with similar sized secondary and middle schools This is mainly because most of their pupils are in KS4 and the KS4 AWPU rate is only reduced by $1.7 \%$. However the size of upper school gains are relatively small (between $0.1 \%$ and $0.3 \%$ ).
5.8 The above analysis is based on funding delivered through the formula before protection for Minimum Funding Guarantee. The effect of the calculation of MFG sometimes has unexpected consequences, but in general, schools which are currently protected through MFG tend to be disadvantaged. Some small schools which currently benefit from MFG topup see some or all of their gain eroded through a reduction in their MFG funding. For example, three of the smallest primary schools currently receiving MFG top-up which would each receive additional funding of around £35k pre-MFG, would see their post-MFG gain reduced to just £1k to £2k.
5.9 Conversely, other schools whose budget share is currently capped through the operation of the MFG calculation might not lose as much funding under the new model post MFG as they otherwise would have done. Other 'losers' pre MFG could become 'gainers' post MFG.
5.10 It is difficult to model the effect of the MFG calculation with any certainty as this depends on finalised pupil data and the impact of that data on individual schools' per pupil funding as well as funding overall. This analysis focuses therefore on the pre-MFG funding model.
5.11 Other issues to be considered in the decision to change the lump sum and AWPU rates are:
- The need to further support smaller schools is not clearly evidenced by analysis of maintained school balances ${ }^{2}$ brought forward from 2014-15. There has been a steady increase in primary balances since 2008-09 and, with a few exceptions, individual increases are spread across small as well as larger schools. Most maintained secondary schools have decreased in the last year but there is little correlation between the reduction in balances and the size of school.

[^1]- There is wide variability among the lump sum amounts of neighbouring LAs, from £48k to the maximum $£ 175 \mathrm{k}$. RBWM's lump sum is currently slightly below the national average, but above the average of the LAs in table 5.

| Table 5: Lump sum of neighbouring LAs | Lump sum <br> primary | Lump sum <br> secondary |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | 48,480 | 48,480 |
| Slough | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| RBWM | $\mathbf{1 2 3 , 7 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 , 1 5 5}$ |
| Buckinghamshire | 125,000 | 125,000 |
| West Berkshire | 126,400 | 126,400 |
| Bracknell Forest | 160,000 | 170,000 |
| Wokingham | 175,000 | 175,000 |
| Average of Berks LAs | 116,231 | 117,862 |
| National Average (incl London authorities) | 127,952 | 139,739 |

- Reducing AWPU rates to fund a lump sum increase would have the effect of taking RBWM's agreed AWPU rates back down below the Minimum Funding Levels (MFL) suggested by the DfE in the 2015-16 funding arrangements. This would reverse the decision, taken with schools' support, to use most of its additional 2015-16 School Block funding to increase AWPU rates in 2015-16 to the level of the MFL.
- One of the aims of the Government's ongoing school funding reforms is to increase the proportion of pupil-led funding allocated to schools. This proposal would reduce the proportion of funding allocated on a pupil-led basis.
- RBWM's current AWPU rates are broadly in line with the average of its neighbouring LAs (see table 6). A further reduction in AWPU rates would result in RBWM's primary rate moving from fourth highest of the Berks and Bucks LAs to second lowest. The changes in KS3 and KS4 would be less material. The proportion of funding allocated through AWPU is already lower than four of the six other LAs and would reduce further if the change in AWPU rates was implemented.

| Table 6 Comparison of AWPU <br> rates | Primary <br> Amount Per <br> Pupil (£) | KS3 <br> Amount Per <br> Pupil (£) | KS4 <br> Amount Per <br> Pupil (£) | Proportion <br> Total \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RBWM current | $\mathbf{2 , 8 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 4 \%}$ |
| RBWM revised | $\mathbf{2 , 6 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 8 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 4 2 7}$ |  |
| Avge of other neighbouring LAs | 2,920 | 3,929 | 4,326 | $79.3 \%$ |
| National average (median) | 2,899 | 4,008 | 4,517 |  |
| Buckinghamshire | 2,619 | 3,605 | 4,183 | $76.5 \%$ |
| Wokingham | 2,714 | 3,712 | 4,200 | $79.2 \%$ |
| Bracknell Forest | 2,843 | 4,067 | 4,067 | $80.4 \%$ |
| West Berkshire | 2,937 | 4,364 | 4,364 | $81.8 \%$ |
| Slough | 3,180 | 3,879 | 4,636 | $75.8 \%$ |
| Reading | 3,226 | 3,950 | 4,504 | $82.0 \%$ |

5.12 Other factors argue in favour of an increase in the lump sum:

- Some other authorities have already increased their lump sum to the maximum £175k. In 2015-16, the maximum was chosen by 14 out of $152(9 \%)$ authorities for their primary lump sum amount and by $38(25 \%)$ authorities for their secondary lump sum.


## Other options considered

5.13 It would be possible to increase the lump sum to an amount between the current rate and the maximum. This would mean a smaller reduction in AWPU rates than those outlined in table 3. However, an increase in the lump sum would need to be significant enough to make a difference to smaller schools, and any significant lump sum increase would mean equally significant reduction in pupil funding that would hit mainly the larger schools. Increasing the lump sum by around $£ 25 \mathrm{k}$ per school would still cost $£ 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ overall. Most of this cost would be funded by a reduction of $£ 118$ (4\%) per primary pupil
5.14 There is no requirement to have the same lump sum for primary and secondary schools, and an increase could be applied to one sector but not to the other. Applying a lump sum increase only to secondary schools would be consistent with the higher lump sum values that secondary schools attract in many authorities compared with primary and would cost considerably less than an increase applied to both sectors. A £50k increase for middle, upper and secondary schools would cost around $£ 700 \mathrm{k}$ instead of the $£ 3.1 \mathrm{~m}$ needed for the same increase to all schools. However excluding primaries from any increase in the lump sum would miss the key objective of supporting the smallest schools in the Borough.

## 6 DSG SCHOOLS BLOCK UNIT OF FUNDING 2016-17

6.1 In July 2015, the Education Funding Agency published its Schools funding arrangements 2016 to 2017 with details of LAs' 2016-17 Schools Block Unit of Funding (SBUF). The only changes compared to 2015 to 2016 SBUFs are as a result of an adjustment for former nonrecoupment academies (NRAs) and free schools. In 2015 to 2016, these schools were brought into LAs' DSG schools block funding allocations to make the system simpler. This was done by adding a cash amount to each LA's 2015 to 2016 DSG allocation, to ensure they had sufficient funding for these schools within their overall funding allocation. RBWM received $£ 1.255 \mathrm{~m}$ in this way for its two free schools.
6.2 For 2016 to 2017, the EFA has adjusted RBWM's SBUF from 2015 to 2016 to incorporate the funding added for the free schools. This means that in 2016 to 2017, RBWM will receive funding for Braywick Park and Holyport College within the schools block allocation on the same basis as other mainstream maintained schools and academies, i.e. by multiplying the SBUF by the schools block pupil count.
6.3 As a result of this change, RBWM's SBUF will increase by $£ 12$ per pupil from $£ 4,456$ in 2015-16 to $£ 4,468$ in 2016-17. Schools Forum should note this is not additional funding but a change in the way existing funding is calculated as shown in table 7.

| Table 7 Calculation <br> of 2016-17 SBUF | 2015-16 <br> SBUF | Pupils | Schools <br> Block <br> funding | Cash <br> allocation <br> free schools | Total <br> funding |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015-16$ | a | b | $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{a}^{*} \mathrm{~b}$ | d | $\mathrm{e}=\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{d}$ |
| $2016-17$ | $£ 4,456.14$ | 17,968 | $£ 80,067,924$ | $£ 1,254,567$ | $£ 81,322,490$ |
|  | $£ 4,468.08$ | $18,201^{*}$ | $£ 81,322,490$ | $£ 0$ | $£ 81,322,490$ |

* Includes 233 pupils in RBWM free schools.
6.4 RBWM's 2016-17 DSG Schools Block allocation will be calculated by multiplying the 201612 SBUF by the school block pupil count in October 15. No further adjustment will be made for schools block allocations for 2015 to 2016 or 2016 to 2017 for adjustments to estimated pupil numbers for the free schools. This means that there will be no extra DSG funding for the expected additional pupils who will start at the two free schools in September 2016. We are nevertheless required to fund growing schools for additional classes as they join the school, using an estimate of the new intake in September multiplied by 7/12ths. For Braywick and Holyport College this equates to around 67 additional FTEs ( $(28+88)^{*} 7 / 12$ ) at an estimated cost of between £250k and £300k which will need to be found from existing funding.

Annex A - Impact of increasing lump sum to $£ 175 k$. In order of highest gainers to highest losers

|  |  | Current 2015-16 Budget |  |  | Model allocating lump sum of $£ 175 \mathrm{k}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | NOR | Budget pre MFG | 15-16MFG Adjustment | 15-16Post MFGBudget | Budget pre MFG | MFG <br> Adjustment | Post MFG Budget | Pre MFG change in budget | \%change in pre MFG budget | POSTMFG change in budget | \%change in POSTMFG budget |
| Braywick Court | 43.33 | 263,857 | 0 | 263,857 | 305,115 | 0 | 305,115 | 41,258 | 15.6\% | 41,258 | 15.6\% |
| Burchetts Green CE Infant School | 66 | 339,309 | 48,135 | 387,444 | 375,334 | 13,633 | 388,97 | 36,024 | 10.6\% | 1,523 | 0.4\% |
| Knowl Hill C of EAcademy | 80 | 383,468 | 55,625 | 439,093 | 416,260 | 25,427 | 441,687 | 32,792 | 8.6\% | 2,594 | 0.6\% |
| The Royal School | 99 | 429,190 | 31,026 | 460,217 | 457,596 | 3,390 | 460,986 | 28,405 | 6.6\% | 769 | 0.2\% |
| Bisham School | 107 | 463,837 |  | 463,837 | 490,396 | $(1,947)$ | 488,449 | 26,558 | 5.7\% | 24,611 | 5.3\% |
| Alexander First School | 106 | 504,556 | 34,991 | 539,547 | 531,345 | 5,941 | 537,286 | 26,789 | 5.3\% | $(2,261)$ | (0.4\%) |
| Cheapside CE Primary School | 115 | 474,715 |  | 474,715 | 499,426 |  | 499,426 | 24,711 | 5.2\% | 24,711 | 5.2\% |
| Waltham St. Lawrence CP School | 124 | 513,640 | 0 | 513,640 | 536,273 | 0 | 536,273 | 22,633 | 4.4\% | 22,633 | 4.4\% |
| Eton Porny C of E First School | 127 | 564,885 | 0 | 564,885 | 586,826 | $(5,890)$ | 580,936 | 21,941 | 3.9\% | 16,051 | 28\% |
| Braywood CE First School | 142 | 572,958 | 11,516 | 584,474 | 591,436 | 0 | 591,436 | 18,478 | 3.2\% | 6,961 | 1.2\% |
| Trinity St Stephen CE First | 144 | 596,743 | 0 | 596,743 | 614,759 | 0 | 614,759 | 18,016 | 3.0\% | 18,016 | 3.0\% |
| Eton Wick C.E. First School | 142 | 615,454 | 4,018 | 619,471 | 633,931 | 0 | 633,931 | 18,478 | 3.0\% | 14,460 | 2.3\% |
| The Queen Anne RF CE First | 147 | 606,047 | 0 | 606,047 | 623,371 | 0 | 623,371 | 17,323 | 2.9\% | 17,323 | 29\% |
| Woodlands Park Primary School | 142 | 660,352 | 0 | 660,352 | 678,830 | 0 | 678,830 | 18,478 | 2.8\% | 18,478 | 28\% |
| Dedworth Green First School | 150 | 681,249 | 0 | 681,249 | 697,880 | 0 | 697,880 | 16,631 | 2.4\% | 16,631 | 24\% |
| Cookham Dean CEAided Primary | 176 | 659,341 | 0 | 659,341 | 669,969 | 0 | 669,969 | 10,628 | 1.6\% | 10,628 | 1.6\% |
| Boyne Hill CE Infant School | 179 | 771,665 | 0 | 71,665 | 781,601 | 0 | 781,601 | 9,935 | 1.3\% | 9,935 | 1.3\% |
| Larchfield Primary School | 183 | 801,125 | 0 | 801,125 | 810,137 | O | 810,137 | 9,012 | 1.1\% | 9,012 | 1.1\% |
| Cookham Rise Primary School | 202 | 798,841 | 0 | 798,841 | 803,466 | 0 | 803,466 | 4,625 | 0.6\% | 4,625 | 0.6\% |
| South Ascot Village School | 203 | 794,118 | 0 | 794,118 | 798,512 | 0 | 798,512 | 4,394 | 0.6\% | 4,394 | 0.6\% |
| St Michael's CE Primary School | 207 | 778,053 | 0 | 778,053 | 781,524 | 0 | 781,524 | 3,471 | 0.4\% | 3,471 | 0.4\% |
| Homer First School | 207 | 829,086 | 0 | 829,086 | 832,557 | 0 | 832,557 | 3,471 | 0.4\% | 3,471 | 0.4\% |
| White WalthamC of EAcademy | 209 | 773,562 | 0 | 773,562 | 776,571 | 0 | 776,571 | 3,009 | 0.4\% | 3,009 | 0.4\% |
| St. Francis Catholic Primary | 210 | 781,410 | $(30,147)$ | 751,263 | 784,188 | $(15,871)$ | 768,317 | 2,778 | 0.4\% | 17,054 | 2.3\% |
| Holy Trinity CE Primary School | 211 | 797,442 | 0 | 797,442 | 799,989 | 0 | 799,989 | 2,547 | 0.3\% | 2,547 | 0.3\% |
| Hilltop First School | 210 | 880,390 | 0 | 880,390 | 883,169 | 0 | 883,169 | 2,778 | 0.3\% | 2,778 | 0.3\% |
| Riverside Primary School and Nurs | 209 | 970,849 | 5,315 | 976,165 | 973,858 | 1,710 | 975,569 | 3,009 | 0.3\% | (596) | (0.1\%) |
| Holy Trinity CE Primary School | 214 | 789,672 | 0 | 789,672 | 791,527 | 0 | 791,527 | 1,855 | 0.2\% | 1,855 | 0.2\% |
| Kings Court First School | 222 | 820,514 | 0 | 820,514 | 820,522 | 0 | 820,522 | 8 | 0.0\% | 8 | 0.0\% |
| St Luke's CE Primary School | 244 | 1,072,253 | $(6,315)$ | 1,065,938 | 1,067,182 | 0 | 1,067,182 | $(5,072)$ | (0.5\%) | 1,244 | 0.1\% |
| Datchet St. Mary's School | 243 | 985,946 | 0 | 985,946 | 981,105 | 0 | 981,105 | $(4,841)$ | (0.5\%) | $(4,841)$ | (0.5\%) |
| St Edward's Catholic First School | 254 | 921,650 | 0 | 921,650 | 914,270 | 0 | 914,270 | $(7,380)$ | (0.8\%) | $(7,380)$ | (0.8\%) |
| All Saints C.of E. Controlled | 260 | 1,064,811 | $(29,794)$ | 1,035,017 | 1,056,046 | $(3,370)$ | 1,052,67 | $(8,766)$ | (0.8\%) | 17,659 | 17\% |
| dewer Green CEAided First Schoo | 266 | 991,080 | 0 | 991,080 | 980,929 | 0 | 980,929 | $(10,151)$ | (1.0\%) | $(10,151)$ | (1.0\%) |
| Furze Platt Infant School | 270 | 1,039,619 | 0 | 1,039,619 | 1,028,545 | 0 | 1,028,545 | $(11,074)$ | (1.1\%) | $(11,074)$ | (1.1\%) |
| Lowbrook Academy | 269 | 958,061 | 0 | 958,061 | 947,218 | 0 | 947,218 | $(10,843)$ | (1.1\%) | $(10,843)$ | (1.1\%) |
| Oakfield First School | 281 | 1,065,903 | $(5,455)$ | 1,060,447 | 1,052,289 | 0 | 1,052,289 | $(13,614)$ | (1.3\%) | $(8,159)$ | (0.8\%) |
| Oldfield Primary School | 300 | 1,132,548 | $(65,382)$ | 1,067,166 | 1,114,547 | $(25,524)$ | 1,089,023 | $(18,001)$ | (1.6\%) | 21,857 | 2.0\% |
| Alwy Infant School | 303 | 1,164,022 | $(1,125)$ | 1,162,897 | 1,145,328 | 0 | 1,145,328 | $(18,693)$ | (1.6\%) | $(17,568)$ | (1.5\%) |
| St Mary's Catholic Primary School | 304 | 1,163,082 | 0 | 1,163,082 | 1,144,158 | 0 | 1,144,158 | $(18,924)$ | (1.6\%) | $(18,924)$ | (1.6) |
| Furze Platt Junior School | 333 | 1,217,144 | $(52,060)$ | 1,165,084 | 1,191,525 | 0 | 1,191,525 | $(25,619)$ | (2.1\%) | 26,441 | 2.3\% |
| Wraysbury Primary School | 365 | 1,366,557 | $(11,156)$ | 1,355,401 | 1,333,550 | 0 | 1,333,550 | $(33,007)$ | (2.4\%) | $(21,851)$ | (1.6\%) |
| Holyport CE Primary School | 374 | 1,310,106 |  | 1,310,106 | 1,275,021 | 0 | 1,275,021 | $(35,085)$ | (2.7\%) | $(35,085)$ | (2.7\%) |
| Wessex Primary School | 10 | 1,557,976 | 0 | 1,557,976 | 1,514,579 |  | 1,514,579 | $(43,397)$ | (2.8\%) | $(43,397)$ | (28\%) |
| Courthouse Junior School | 402 | 1,445,557 | 0 | 1,445,557 | 1,404,007 | 0 | 1,404,007 | $(41,550)$ | (2.9\%) | $(41,550)$ | (2.9\%) |
| St Edmund Campion Catholic Prime | 398 | 1,396,410 |  | 1,396,410 | 1,355,784 |  | 1,355,784 | $(40,626)$ | (2.9\%) | $(40,626)$ | (2.9\%) |
|  | 9,852 | 38,769,055 | $(10,808)$ | 38,758,247 | 38,852,450 | $(2,500)$ | 38,849,949 | 83,395 |  | 91,702 |  |
| Secondary and Middle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holyport College | 189.42 | 987,598 | 0 | 987,598 | 1,022,471 | 0 | 1,022,471 | 34,873 | 3.5\% | 34,873 | 3.5\% |
| ST PEIERS C.E. MDDLESCHOOL | 229 | 1,030,925 | 0 | 1,030,925 | 1,044,968 | 0 | 1,044,968 | 14,043 | 1.4\% | 14,043 | 1.4\% |
| CHURCHMEADC of E(VA) SCHOOL | 413 | 2,358,779 | 0 | 2,358,779 | 2,376,000 | 0 | 2,376,000 | 17,221 | 0.7\% | 17,221 | 0.7\% |
| Desborough College | 428 | 2,186,032 | 15,237 | 2,201,269 | 2,201,917 | 2,500 | 2,204,417 | 15,884 | 0.7\% | 3,148 | 0.1\% |
| Windsor Girls' School | 545 | 2,919,984 | 0 | 2,919,984 | 2,927,820 | 0 | 2,927,820 | 7,836 | 0.3\% | 7,836 | 0.3\% |
| The Windsor Boys' School | 641 | 3,432,262 | 0 | 3,432,262 | 3,432,792 | 0 | 3,432,792 | 530 | 0.0\% | 530 | 0.0\% |
| ALTWOOD CESCHOOL | 645 | 3,245,814 | 0 | 3,245,814 | 3,244,825 |  | 3,244,825 | (989) | (0.0\%) | (989) | (0.0\%) |
| Cox Green School | 790 | 3,830,070 | 0 | 3,830,070 | 3,817,356 | 0 | 3,817,356 | $(12,714)$ | (0.3\%) | $(12,714)$ | (0.3\%) |
| Newlands Girls School | 906 | 4,375,899 | 0 | 4,375,899 | 4,353,976 | 0 | 4,353,976 | $(21,923)$ | (0.5\%) | $(21,923)$ | (0.5\%) |
| Furze Platt Senior School | 997 | 4,845,401 | 0 | 4,845,401 | 4,816,479 | 0 | 4,816,479 | $(28,922)$ | (0.6\%) | $(28,922)$ | (0.6\%) |
| CHARTERS SCHOOL | 1,220 | 5,604,897 | 0 | 5,604,897 | 5,558,178 | 0 | 5,558,178 | $(46,720)$ | (0.8\%) | $(46,720)$ | (0.8\%) |
| Trevelyan School | 439 | 1,914,306 | $(4,428)$ | 1,909,878 | 1,895,184 | 0 | 1,895,184 | $(19,121)$ | (1.0\%) | $(14,693)$ | (0.8\%) |
| Dedworth Middle School | 456 | 1,983,253 | 0 | 1,983,253 | 1,960,802 | 0 | 1,960,802 | $(22,451)$ | (1.1\%) | $(22,451)$ | (1.1\%) |
| St. Edward's Royal Free Ecumenical | 434 | 1,773,899 |  | 1,773,899 | 1,752,957 |  | 1,752,957 | $(20,941)$ | (1.2\%) | $(20,941)$ | (1.2\%) |
|  | 8,332 | 40,489,119 | 10,809 | 40,499,927 | 40,405,724 | 2,500 | 40,408,224 | $(83,395)$ |  | $(91,703)$ |  |
| Total all schools | 18,185 | 79,258,174 | 1 | 79,258,174 | 79,258,174 | 0 | 79,258,174 | (0) |  | (1) |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ As with all delegated funding, there is no requirement to use the funding allocated through a particular factor on any specific services and functions.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Academy school balances are not publicly available.

