

**SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES FROM THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON OTHER CONSULTATION ISSUES NOVEMBER 2017**

The numbers of responses received from schools and other consultees for these consultation questions are detailed in **Appendix 2**.

**For consultation questions 2 to 4 not all questions were applicable to all respondents and some did not answer all the consultation questions**

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

**Please note although these are part of the all school consultation, as required under Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012 the decisions for consultation questions 2, 3 and 4 are for the relevant Worcestershire Schools Forum (WSF) members as determined under the Regulations.**

**1. CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

**Q2. Do you support the arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed in Table 3 of the consultation document for 2017-18 to continue for 2018-19 and 2019-20?**

**APPLICABLE TO LA MAINTAINED MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS ONLY**

Overall there were **43** responses to the proposed arrangements in consultation question 2 with **42** supporting and **1** not supporting.

**Maintained First/Primary 36 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **35** supporting and **1** not supporting.

**Comments made were as follows: -**

Absolute clarity about what is paid for from the delegated and de-delegated funds will be vital. How much for each item and what is the impact of the input of such monies?

This gives all important continuity whilst attending to disruption in other areas.

This school would like to see accountability for the services provided with de-delegated funds like EAL, together with some impact analysis where possible.

**Maintained Middle 3 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No comments were made.

### **Maintained Secondary/High 3 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2** with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No comments were made.

### **Other Response**

The Worcestershire Association of Governors (WAG) supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 2**.

Comments made were as follows: -

WAG would like to see accountability for the services provided with de-delegated funds like EAL together with some impact analysis where possible.

WAG would like WCC to apply to have the Gypsy, Roma, Traveller service funded under the CSSG where it can benefit all schools.

**Q3. Do you support the further de-delegation in 2018-19 and 2019-20 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 **42** responses to the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **0** supporting and **42** not supporting.

### **Maintained First/Primary 35 Responses**

Overall this sector did not support the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3** with **0** supporting and **35** not supporting.

Comments made were as follows: -

Acknowledge that ESG services were only continued after Sept 2017 thanks to WCC funding the shortfall to March 2018.

This matter should be sorted between WCC and central government.

If some ESG services will need to be funded by de-delegation, further detail would be required. Appreciate that all service funding is cut from the end of April except the core ESG services moving to the CSSG, but cannot sign a blank cheque for services – what services, what cost?

### **Maintained Middle 3 Responses**

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

No comments were made.

### **Maintained Secondary/High 3 Responses**

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

No comments were made.

### **Other Response**

The Worcestershire Association of Governors (WAG) did not support the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 3**.

Comments were made as follows: -

WAG appreciates that ESG services were only continued after Sept 2017 thanks to WCC funding the shortfall to March 2018.

If WAG is to recommend to schools to use their budgets to fund services, there must be a clear case made based on previous funding history and cost benefits together with projected costs moving forward.

**Q4. Do you support the arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed in Table 4 in the consultation document for 2017-18 to continue in 2018-19 and 2019-20?**

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

**Overall there were 71 responses to the proposed arrangements in consultation question 4 with 59 supporting and 12 not supporting.**

### **Maintained First/Primary 29 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **28** supporting and **1** not supporting.

Comments made were as follows: -

#### **General**

Would not consider contributing towards the services where there is currently no budget provision i.e.: -

- Back-pay for equal pay claims.
- Remission of boarding fees at maintained schools/academies.
- Places in independent schools for non-SEN pupils.
- Prudential borrowing costs.
- SEN transport costs.

- Funding to support falling rolls to prepare for future population growth meeting specific criteria for good or outstanding schools where growth in pupil numbers is expected within 3 years.
- Capital Expenditure Funded from Revenue (CERA).

However would consider contributing towards Existing Termination of Employment/Redundancy Costs – subject to further consultation and cost analysis.

Schools already have to fund interventions (social, health and educational) that are above the levels current funding allows for. For services that fall under the LA statutory remit require a clear breakdown of costs of services.

### **Academy First/Primary 14 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **10** supporting and **4** not supporting.

Comments made were as follows: -

#### **Early Intervention Family Support (EIFS)/Early Help (EH)**

Feel that the centrally retained monies for EIFS should be for early help and that schools should be able to access this without going through the family front door.

### **Maintained Middle 3 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No comments were made.

### **Academy Middle 5 Responses**

Overall this sector had a shared view on the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **4** supporting and **1** not supporting.

No comments were made.

### **Maintained and Secondary/High 3 Responses**

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

No comments were made.

### **Academy Secondary/High 16 Responses**

Overall this sector had a shared view for the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4** with **10** supporting and **6** not supporting.

Comments made were as follows: -

### General

Support this in principal but any budgets must be fixed at no higher than 2017-18 spending levels.

An important general principle it is vital that the maximum proportion of all funding received is delegated to schools to ensure their continuing viability at a time of maximum stress.

Areas where no current provision is made must not now be funded. There is not enough money to make any change. All other areas must remain under constant and rigorous scrutiny.

As a High School do not benefit from any of the other centrally provided services.

Have concerns over the size of the budget being used to support these services, when school budgets are under increasing pressure.

In principal no, however statutory services only need to be retained by the LA.

Recognise the need to retain some central services but are concerned that 'central services' previously supplied to academies (for example data analysis, census support) are now subject to SLAs, which have to be paid for.

Increasingly concerned about the capacity of the LA to deliver the centrally retained services for which pay; there is no doubt that in recent years the level of service and response times have declined rapidly. Aware that schools increasingly have to make alternative arrangements for these services. Given this, whilst recognising the necessity for some services to be retained centrally feel able to support this as the services provision is lacking.

### School Admissions

The LAs retained duties (e.g. school admissions) must be administered as cost-effectively as possible.

Do not support the centrally held funds with the exception of Pupil Admissions although question why this costs approximately £700,000 and SEN Transport (the costs of which are not stated).

There has been discussion about the whole process of in-year admissions being returned to LA control and would support this process.

### Early Intervention Family Support Service (EIFS)/Early Help (EH)

This is a particular concern as schools are finding it increasingly difficult to access the level of support needed. In many cases schools are employing their own staff to fulfil this role, but still being expected to fund this centrally. A business plan or justification to support and explain the work of these various departments may help schools understand more about their need.

Supported in principle, however raise the question of value for money of the service in terms of the quality and security of an on the ground support service to young people and schools.

Believe that the service needs to be a central one but would like to see a clear improvement plan for this service.

Do not support the contribution to the service.

### **All Through Schools Sector**

No response was received.

### **Other Response**

The Worcestershire Association of Governors (WAG) supported the proposed arrangements in **consultation question 4**.

No comments were made.

## **2. FURTHER ISSUES RAISED**

### **National Fair Funding Formula**

#### **Maintained First/Primary**

Can see why the word 'fairer' has been dropped from the headlines as clearly making more money available is a good thing for children's education it is vital that this 'new' money is allocated fairly and does not favour High Schools and more urban areas with generally larger primary schools. If do not wish to see even more 'village' schools forced out then allocated money must help to ensure they remain viable.

The proposed and existing formula must be very difficult to administer, given each line represents a dedicated aspect of administration.

Remain committed to giving the very best education to the pupils who come to the school, and need to increase funding in order to do that. Thanks to a very effective senior leadership team and board of governors, micro-manage the budget – as WCC and the tax payer would expect. However, options are running out with access needed to the share of additional funding entitled to.

The NFF does not appear to address the inequalities of national funding and therefore cannot be supported in this form. An element of tailoring by education leaders to meet local needs is crucial and appears to be lacking in the NFF. This needs to be addressed.

NFF does not address inequalities and new money should be used to improve national averages.

As a small school funding changes have a huge impact on the school. At the moment there is a deficit budget due to 10 children less on the census, reduced pupil premium funding and reduced early years funding. The impact this has had this year on the school is phenomenal any further changes to funding will question if the school is a viable option.

Feel that the NFF does not address the inequalities of funding for schools. As a small rural school in what is considered to be an affluent area are often left to rely on fundraising to provide even the basic essentials for the school and left wondering why children in the school are left wanting purely

because of the postcode that they live in. The NFF seems to increase funding for additional needs by removing from basic funding. This seems very much to favour large, urban schools and the detriment of small, rural schools.

### **Academy First/Primary**

After years of fighting for Fairer funding, how can it have such little impact on future funding?

Appreciate the need for formulas but surely every child in WCC is important – why are those at the school missing out once again? There are buildings to maintain, an ever increasing demand on budgets because of SEND needs, huge staffing costs. The school qualified for sparsity funding previously but saw no additional funding as it was taken off in other ways – do not feel this is fairer funding for all, but rather fairer funding for some!

### **Academy Secondary/High**

It would also appear that a fundamental examination of school provision, particularly at primary level, is required.

Acknowledge that as a rural county it will have a number of small, rural schools. Are these the schools that will have capacity issues as the population grows, or will this be more acute for schools in more densely populated areas? The funding, however, is being distorted by the sheer proportion of these small schools. In an era of austerity, the LA cannot just assume that the system can continue as it has always been.

Understand that a significant proportion of first and primary schools have 50 pupils or fewer. Although politically very difficult there has to be a realisation that in the current climate and with the budget pressures that exist, requires solutions which are efficient and rely on a certain economy of scale.

Very concerned that the Worcestershire Association of Governors (WAG) has circulated a recommended response to the consultation in respect of a point of principle, which is felt on the face of it, is a conflict of interest.

Would expect that increased High Level needs funding from Government is passed onto the relevant schools to ensure sufficient funding to meet the needs of each individual student.

### **Worcestershire Association of Governors (WAG)**

WAG feels that the NFF does not address the inequalities of national funding and therefore cannot be supported in this form and cannot support any formula that does not allow for some element of tailoring by education leaders to meet local needs.

In the meantime, recommend that any new money is used to boost national averages. It has taken WCC schools a long time to coalesce around a formula based on national averages. Scaling up from this position is a collegiate approach and provides the best opportunity for all schools to benefit fairly according to their pupils' needs.

Hope that all WCC education providers, the LA and Council will continue to campaign for fairer funding that is consistent across all phases from 0 – 19 years.

## **Special Schools**

Very concerned that there is no mention or /consideration of special schools in all of the discussions.

Understand that the DfE has had difficulty grasping the funding for special schools and have therefore chosen not to make any changes. Cannot see how, when some WCC schools are expecting an increase of 6% over 2 years, special schools, who educate the most needy and vulnerable pupils, may only get 0.5%. Would like to see WCC taking the lead on this subject and making representation to the DfE to ask what plans are in place to increase the funding for these pupils, in line with their mainstream counterparts.