

APPENDIX 4

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES FROM THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE CONSULTATION QUESTIONS OCTOBER 2015

Summaries of the main issues received on the 5 consultation questions and other issues are detailed below.

1. CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Q1. Do you support, subject to DSG availability, increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local schools formula to support a reduction in the amount needing to be contributed by the 7 relevant schools?

Overall there were 38 responses to this issue.

Maintained First/Primary

Overall this sector did not support increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local formula with **14** not supporting and **2** supporting.

The main issues raised: -

- PFI schools took this decision so they need to secure other means of funding.
- The issue of PFI funding should not be funded by non PFI schools.
- No real explanation of exceptional need that would justify an increase for these few schools
- Concerns on the open ended nature of the request.

Maintained Middle

Overall this sector did not support increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local formula with **4** not supporting and **2** supporting.

The main issues raised: -

- Position of agreements signed over a decade ago proving unsustainable in terms of size and current pupil numbers.
- PFI payment made by the schools should link to pupil numbers or as share of the overall budget.
- Non PFI schools have issues of their own regarding the buildings, etc and any increase in PFI support would limit the funds available to support other schools.

Maintained Secondary/High

Overall this sector did not support increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local formula with **2** not supporting and **1** supporting.

The main issues: -

- The original formula does not recognise fluctuations in school roll.
- PFI schools took the decisions on the risk and reward.

- To now have that balance amended in their favour at the expense of other schools that chose not to pursue PFI is not appropriate.

Academy Secondary/High

Overall this sector did not support increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local formula with **12** not supporting and **0** supporting.

The main issues: -

- This would lead to a reduction in funding for all other schools unacceptable at a time when all secondary schools are facing fundamental funding issues.
- It was the deal that they signed up for and knowingly entered into.
- Other schools do not benefit from such modern purpose built premises.
- Schools with the oldest poorest property stock do not benefit from any extra cash to pay for things like higher repair costs and utility bills.
- The current £2.3m contribution from the overall schools' budget is questionable.
- The agreement is in place and the 7 schools would rightly point to this should the LA be looking to reduce the contribution.
- However, PFI school increases in costs are out of their control e.g. not able to secure additional income through lettings, apply for academies capital funding or re-negotiate contracts.

Other

This respondent did not support increasing the PFI subsidy factor in the local formula.

The main issues:-

- Several of these schools were built significantly larger than their predecessors and yet expected influx of additional pupils and the associated funding has not happened.
- Concerns on who pays for the shortfall in PFI funding when all schools we are facing real-terms cuts.
- PFI was a national policy and if there is a funding shortfall then it is a national problem and needs to be resolved in a NFFF.

Q2. Do you support the proposed change in the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17?

Overall there were 34 responses to this issue.

Maintained First/Primary

Overall this sector supported the proposed change for the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17 with **12** supporting and **3** not supporting.

The main issues: -

- Not clear what impact this will have on the notional SEN allocation to each school.
- Bring the definition into line with the formula as amended for 2015-16.
- Purely a definitional change that will not generate additional resource to schools to support SEN.
- Support the national SEND review suggesting that notional SEN budgets are not working.

- Needs to be able to see the difference this change is likely to make to school budgets.

Maintained Middle

Overall this sector supported the proposed change for the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17 with **6** supporting and **0** not supporting.

Maintained Secondary/High

Overall this sector supported the proposed change for the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17 with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issue: -

- This will more accurately reflect the low cost high incident SEN within the Schools Block Allocation and seems to offer the fairest solution.

Academy Secondary/High

Overall this sector supported the proposed change for the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17 with **7** supporting and **2** not supporting.

The main issues: -

- This will more properly reflect the changes to the Minimum Funding levels in the local formula.
- By significantly reducing the low prior attainment level, some schools notional SEN funding has dramatically decreased.
- Support but need clarification of how the change affects SEN funding across schools.
- As much resource as possible should follow deprivation and low prior attainment.
- They are the most vulnerable and costly cohorts in school.
- 50% change in the notional SEN budget in 2015/16 is not acceptable.
- Insufficient information provided to make a truly informed decision.
- If the change is truly marginal so is there any point.
- Potentially represents double funding for those schools with higher Pupil Premium levels.

Other

This respondent did not support the proposed change for the definition for Notional SEN for 2016-17

The main issue: -

- Unclear what obvious shortcomings in the current definition of notional SEN the proposed changes are designed to correct.

Q3. Do you support the arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed for 2015-16 to continue for 2016-17? (Applicable to maintained schools only)

Overall there were 26 responses to this issue.

Maintained First/Primary

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **15** supporting and **1** not supporting.

The main issues: -

- No reason to change the decisions made last year and support the continuation of the 2015-16 arrangements into 2016-17.
- Proposals required for the provision of services in English as an Additional Language (EAL) and Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) from champion schools.

Maintained Middle

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **6** supporting and **0** not supporting.

Maintained Secondary/High

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

Other

This respondent supported the proposed arrangements for delegation and de-delegation as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17.

The main issue: -

- As in the primary sector hope that something may yet come of EAL and GRT retained services.

Q4. Do you support the arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015-16 to continue in 2016-17?
--

Overall there were 38 responses to this issue.

Maintained First/Primary

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **16** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issue: -

- Absolute support for the contribution to the Early Intervention Family Support Service (EIFS) to be retained alongside the other services outlined in the consultation paper.

Maintained Middle

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **6** supporting and **0** not supporting.

Maintained Secondary/High

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **3** supporting and **0** not supporting.

The main issue: -

- Offers the fairest solution available with clarity of provision and this flexibility.

Academy Secondary/High

Overall this sector supported the proposed arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17 with **8** supporting and **4** not supporting.

The main issues: -

- Support but this contains so many elements all bundled together in a take it or leave it package deal.
- Services are run successfully and benefit the schools within the LA.
- Believe that there should be further discussions about the role, purpose and potential independence of the WSF.
- A centrally retained pot reduces the funding available to both maintained and academy schools so supported for access by both maintained and academy schools fairly.
- Academies need to be able to benefit from and access all these areas with their funding not to reduce funding to subsidise costs for maintained schools.
- Value for money is required for these services.

Other

This respondent supported the proposed arrangements for centrally retained services as detailed for 2015/16 to continue in 2016/17

Q5. Please indicate your preferred for the future of the Falling Rolls Fund as follows: -

Option 1 – No longer operate a FRF and include the current budget in the local schools funding formula for the benefit of all schools

Option 2 – Continue to operate a FRF on the revised criteria as detailed above

Overall there were 36 responses to this issue – Option 1 Yes 19; Option 2 Yes 13; Different Criteria Yes 4.

Maintained First/Primary

Overall this sector was Option 1 **Yes 5**; Option 2 **Yes 7**; Different Criteria **Yes 3**.

The main issues: -

- Option 1
 - There will be funds available given no allocations have been made.
- Option 2
 - This is only a small fund and its impact will be negligible if spread across all pupils.

- We support the balance as stated that they should be affordable and appropriate and not too wide but be available to those schools who can clearly demonstrate a need.
- Different Criteria
 - The proposed criteria look unworkable
 - Request that the WSF takes another look.
 - Feel the existing criteria discriminate against small schools

Maintained Middle

Overall this sector was Option 1 **Yes 2**; Option 2 **Yes 3**.

Maintained Secondary/High

Overall this sector was Option 1 **Yes 3**; Option 2 **Yes 0**.

The main issues: -

- Option 1
 - Proposed changes to the scheme will lose the admirable simplicity of the current scheme.
 - Access to future support will be less available for schools that have managed their budgets well in the medium term.
 - Include the current budget in the local schools funding formula for the benefit of all schools.

Academy Secondary/High

Overall this sector was Option 1 **Yes 9**; Option 2 **Yes 3**.

The main issues: -

- Option 1
 - Evidence suggests that this is unlikely to be required in the short-term.
 - Allocate into the formula for 2016-17 for the benefit of all 11-16 students.
- Option 2
 - Should be a sliding formula depending on the predicted 'repair' time in years in pupil numbers (say up to 4 years) to allow for staff to be retained by the school in the short term (Year 1) whilst sections of the premises could be preserved in a 'mothball' condition.
 - Criteria should be changed to allow struggling schools to apply and be successful in getting additional funds.

Other

Overall this sector was Different Criteria **Yes 1**.

The main issues: -

- Different Criteria
 - It is felt the school community wants a falling rolls fund for schools in need.
 - The current criteria are workable and the latest proposals are even more inflexible.
 - Even if schools vote to discontinue the fund for 2016-17 is still an obligation to come up with workable criteria for 2015-16.

2. FURTHER COMMENTS RECEIVED

The main issues: -

Academy Secondary/High

- Significant concern that the Guaranteed Unit of Per Pupil funding for Worcestershire schools in 2016-17 has been reduced by the consolidation of the Holy Trinity Free School.
- The potential impact of the proposed University Technology College (UTC) with little evidence of need or desire.
- Buildings in some schools desperately requires an overhaul.