

**SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES FROM THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE
CONSULTATION QUESTIONS OCTOBER 2016**

Overall there were **19** responses to the **3** consultation questions as follows: -

- **7** primary schools – **7** maintained; **0** academies.
- **2** middle schools – **1** maintained; **1** academy.
- **9** secondary schools – **1** maintained; **8** academies.
- **1** other – **1** maintained special school.

Summaries of the main issues received on the **3** consultation questions and further issues are detailed below.

1. CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Q1. Do you support the arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed in Table 1 of the consultation document for 2016-17 to continue for 2017-18?

APPLICABLE TO LA MAINTAINED MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS ONLY

Overall there were 8 responses to the proposed arrangements in consultation question 1 with 7 supporting and 1 not supporting.

Maintained First/Primary 7 Responses

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 1** with **6** supporting and **1** not supporting.

The main issues raised were:

- Once again in favour of stability.
- Continuing to fund these services in the traditional way will cause the least turbulence and provide the best chance of continued service.
- Services such as these should be reviewed under Fair Funding.
- Funding of ethnic minorities and underachieving groups should not be the collective responsibility of mainly Local Authority (LA) maintained schools. This should be a national imperative with funding 'top-sliced' at national level.
- Support of ethnic minorities and underachieving groups needs to serve all sectors – early years, schools, and post-16 both LA maintained and Education Funding Agency academies – yet most of the funding comes from maintained primary schools.
- It would be useful to know what % of funds used for de-delegated services/provision.
- Information could have been presented in a clearer way with more transparency, including actual figures and percentages of funds being de-delegated and retained.

Maintained Secondary/High 1 Response

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 1** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No issues were raised.

Q2. Do you support the further de-delegation in 2017-18 to allow central retention of some Schools Block funding to cover the statutory duties for maintained schools carried out by the LA which were previously funded through the general duties Education Services Grant?

APPLICABLE TO ALL LA MAINTAINED SCHOOLS ONLY

Overall there were 10 responses to the proposed arrangements in consultation question 2 with 6 supporting and 4 not supporting.

Maintained First/Primary 7 Responses

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **4** supporting and **3** not supporting.

The main issues raised were:

- Want to maintain the provision offered by the LA.
- A % of funds to be retained would have been helpful although appreciate that not all the budget allocations are known but a good estimate would have helped the decision making process.
- Cannot support this as unsure of what the changes will be.
- Clearly, these statutory duties have to be provided; the issue is how will they be funded?
- Unclear how schools will be impacted by the proposed retention of some Schools Block funding to cover additional costs arising from DfE required savings, or what proportion of the Schools Block funding will be retained for this purpose.
- It is unfair to place the entire £77 per pupil burden onto schools given the delay to the introduction of the National Fair Funding Formula together with the withdrawal in 2017-18 of £28.50 per pupil one-off funding provided in 2016-17. Together, these amount to a significant per pupil funding variation of over £100.
- Additional de-delegation to allow central retention of the schools block funding to cover these statutory duties implies that the full burden of these costs will be borne by schools.
- The cost of these duties needs to be shared between the County and schools with efficiencies needing to be made to the cost of these services.
- Not supported as statutory duties are by definition standardised and probably efficiently organised for all local schools.
- Object to the implied transfer of Education Services Grant funds by the DfE from other blocks e.g. Early Years to the Schools Block. Early Years is already under financial pressure.
- School Improvement and safeguarding are two critical areas that are best coordinated at County level probably with regional collaboration/oversight.

Maintained Middle 1 Response

Overall this sector did not support the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **0** supporting and **1** not supporting.

No issues were raised.

Maintained Secondary/High 1 Response

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No issues were raised.

Other 1 Response

The other respondent supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issues raised were:

- Small schools rely on the support of services and expertise centrally and believe that economies of scale benefit.
- SEN transport is relevant at the school for the majority of pupils and if the transport service was not held centrally and commissioned for schools this would have a major impact. It shows excellent value for money being critical and vital.

Q3. Do you support the arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed in Table 2 in the consultation document for 2016-17 to continue in 2017-18 including the new Education Services Grant retained rate provision transferred by the DfE to the Schools Block?

APPLICABLE TO ALL SCHOOLS BOTH LA MAINSTREAM AND EDUCATION FUNDING AGENCY ACADEMIES

Overall there were 17 responses to the proposed arrangements in consultation question 3 with 17 supporting and 0 not supporting.

Maintained First/Primary 6 Responses

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **6** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issues raised were:

- Want to maintain the provision offered by the LA and agree keeping the current funding mechanism for central services.
- A % of funds to be retained would have been helpful although appreciate that not all the budget allocations are known but a good estimate would have helped the decision making process.
- Need to understand the impact this will have on the school, budget and the services.
- Would want it to increase above the current percentage.
- Fully support the funding for the Early Intervention Family Support services in the district with this being fully used as required.
- Concern this is that not the case for the Early Intervention Family Support services in all other districts.
- Some Early Intervention Family Support services funding is supporting Early Help.
- There may be a lack of support for Early Intervention Family Support services if the funding is being used to support the more specialist family support.

- If service efficiency is the goal passing responsibility from LAs to thousands of education providers (0-19) is a step in exactly the wrong direction.
- Pupil growth funds impact unfairly on areas of the country that are seeing rapid growth in population. This type of support must be funded nationally not locally.
- Need further information and transparency on how the £15 per pupil for Education Services Grant retained duties is currently spent – this may be complicated as these funds are not ring-fenced.
- The County needs to decide what services are essential and what they cost so that County can campaign for an appropriate education services block.

Academy Middle 1 Response

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No issues were raised.

Maintained Secondary/High 1 Response

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No issues were raised.

Academy Secondary/High 8 Responses

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **8** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issues raised were:

- Support the arrangements for centrally retained services for 2017-18.
- For the pupil growth fund linked to basic need would like more transparency in how this funding is allocated.
- Agree that school admissions should be retained centrally as long as all schools confirm to the agreed procedures and code of practice.
- Suggest provision be made to supports schools with falling rolls, where this is due to demographic changes and is short term.
- Would like to know if a decision has been made as to how these services will be funded or operated when the National Fair Funding Formula is in place.

Other 1 Response

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **1** supporting and **0** not supporting.

Issue raised:

- Although the school do not benefit from admissions service are aware of the need for this service within a mainstream environment.

2. FURTHER ISSUES RAISED

National Fair Funding Formula

- Extremely disappointed that the move towards a National Fair Funding Formula has once again been delayed.
- Disappointed that the planned move to the National Fair Funding Formula has been delayed. The funding pressures are mounting on Worcestershire schools and this delay is only compounding this pressure.
- Understand that the introduction of the National Fair Funding Formula is outside of the LAs control but fear that it may be delayed later than 2018-19. This will increase the financial pressure that local schools currently face.
- The delay in the implementation of the National Fair Funding Formula is a huge disappointment and concern that the DfE cannot report back on their Stage 1 consultation that concluded 6 months ago.
- The news about the National Fair Funding Formula being put back another year is another blow to the Worcestershire schools.
- It would have been good to see a one off fund being given to Worcestershire to soften the blow for another year. Due to the delay in introducing the National Fair Funding Formula would ask County to lobby the DfE for additional one-off funding to mitigate cost pressures.
- County should be allocated funds to deal with at least some of its underfunding problems.
- During the period of transition there is a need to liaise with the Education Funding Agency and request an instruction to divert an allocation of funding in the 2017/18 financial year to schools in need.
- Although the delay in implementing is not an LA issue as such, the Treasury must have set aside funds to ease the transition and support those schools which would have 'lost' in the new funding methodology.
- If the National Fair Funding Formula is not going to be implemented until 2018-19 because of the complexity then at least the funding to support its introduction of £500m quoted should be used to top-up the poorly funded LAs on a similar (or better still, even fairer) basis to the previous £390m schools block top-up.
- What is surprising and inexplicable to schools from poorly funded areas is the continuation of the plan to change the education services framework, even though the National Fair Funding Formula initiative has been delayed.
- There is a low level of funding received for disadvantaged pupils where the disparity of funding between LAs is high and it is hoped this is something that the National Fair Funding Formula will resolve.

Other Issues

- Many of Worcestershire's rural primary schools continue to struggle with a combination of a low basic Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding, few pupils eligible for the Pupil Premium and a high proportion of High Needs pupils.
- Increase in staff costs e.g. changes to national insurance, pensions, etc has impacted.
- The whole education services strategy needs to be re-thought by the DfE.
- Passing responsibility down to schools without the funding is just another cut. Any cut at this time is a step away from Fairer Funding.
- Fairer funding is an ideal opportunity for the DfE to separate service funding, in support of education providers, from pupil funding.
- A list of essential services needs to be consulted, agreed and funded nationally.
- A funding model to serve all phases of education from 0 – 19 years is required.