

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**SCHOOLS FORUM****12th September 2012****Report of the Strategic Director for Children & Younger Adults****Further Delegation to Schools - Responses to Consultation****1. Purpose of the Report**

To inform the Schools Forum of the responses to the LMS Consultation document on the further delegation of resources and responsibility to schools from April 2013 and to seek decisions on whether or not some funds should be re-pooled.

2. Information and Analysis

The LA's consultation was published on 30th April 2012 and set out to:

- (i) Provide indicative proposals for delegating additional funding and responsibilities to schools; and
- (ii) Seek the views of schools on the potential re-pooling of specified budgets.

120 responses were received: 1 Nursery School; 96 Primary Schools; 18 Secondary Schools; 3 Special Schools and 2 Academies.

Appendices 1 and 3 summarise the votes of schools on each of the consultation questions posed. Appendices 2, 4 and 5 are the comments received on the consultation proposals.

It should be remembered that **all** of the funding in the consultation document has to be delegated via the LMS formula. Subsequently however, for some of the items delegated, the Forum has to determine whether or not the funding is then re-pooled i.e. taken back from schools' delegated budgets (not academies) and retained centrally.

The decision on whether to re-pool funding is a matter for the school sector representatives on the Forum. However, the DfE's Frequently Asked Questions section of their website has now confirmed that the Council has the right to determine whether or not to accept any re-pooling proposals. The FAQ further advises that "the LA should make clear the terms on which it would accept de-delegation, including charging any necessary administrative costs."

Where the Forum agrees to re-pool funding it is proposed that the funding is retained centrally for the financial years 2013-14 and 2014-15. The issue of re-pooling would then be re-visited for 2015-16, the start of the next government spending review period and the earliest date for a national funding formula.

Appendix 1 provides an analysis of the responses received to the Authority's delegation and/or re-pooling proposals. Schools Forum Members are asked to consider the Authority's proposals in the light of the responses as shown in the end column of Appendix 1. If necessary a vote will be taken on each item.

The responses to the delegation methodology (Appendix 3) is primarily for information and interest at this stage as final decisions on the nature and shape of the LMS formulae will be a matter for further consideration and agreement early in the 2012/13 academic year.

4. Other Considerations In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime & disorder, equality of opportunity, finance, human resources, legal & human rights, environmental, health, property and transport considerations.
5. Background Papers LMS Consultation published on 30th April 2012 and responses from schools held in CAYA Finance.
6. Strategic Director's Recommendations
 - (i) That the Schools Forum note the report and the views of schools and academies to the consultation proposals;
 - (ii) That the primary and secondary school (not academy) representatives determine which budgets in Appendix 1 should be re-pooled for their sectors;
 - (iii) That the Schools Forum agree that any budgets in (ii) above for re-pooling should be re-pooled for the financial years 2013-14 and 2014-15;
 - (iv) That the Schools Forum seek the Council's approval to the arrangements arising from (ii) and (iii) above; and
 - (v) That the Schools Forum agree to receive further reports on the School Funding changes later in the year.

IAN THOMAS
Strategic Director for Children & Younger Adults

Responses to the LA's proposal regarding re-pooling of budgets

Appendix 1

Nursery and Primary Sector

| Item | Service | Consultation Proposal | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | LA Recommendation |
|------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Contingencies | Re-pool | 61% | 21% | 5% | 4% | 9% | Re-pool |
| 2 | Insurance | Re-pool | 78% | 17% | 1% | 1% | 3% | Re-pool |
| 3 | Library & Museum | Re-pool | 38% | 20% | 23% | 11% | 8% | Re-pool |
| 4 | FSM Eligibility | Remain Delegated | 59% | 28% | 6% | 6% | 0% | Remain Delegated |
| 5 | Licences & Subscriptions | Remain Delegated | 49% | 31% | 4% | 13% | 3% | Remain Delegated |
| 6 | Min Ethnic / Under Achieving Groups | Remain Delegated | 47% | 32% | 14% | 4% | 3% | Remain Delegated |
| 7 | Behaviour Support | Remain Delegated | 53% | 28% | 9% | 7% | 3% | Remain Delegated |
| 8 | Staff Costs: Maternity | Re-pool | 78% | 15% | 3% | 2% | 2% | Re-pool |
| 9 | Staff Costs: Public Duties | Re-pool | 70% | 15% | 9% | 3% | 3% | Re-pool |
| 10 | Staff Costs: Trade Union | Re-pool | 57% | 17% | 13% | 11% | 2% | Re-pool |
| 11 | Staff Costs: Other | Remain Delegated | 51% | 29% | 13% | 3% | 4% | Remain Delegated |

Secondary SectorAppendix 1

| Item | Service | Consultation Proposal | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | LA Recommendation |
|------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Contingencies | Re-pool | 28% | 39% | 22% | 5% | 6% | Re-pool |
| 2 | Insurance | Re-pool | 67% | 17% | 11% | 0% | 5% | Re-pool |
| 3 | FSM Eligibility | Remain Delegated | 56% | 39% | 5% | 0% | 0% | Remain Delegated |
| 4 | Licences & Subscriptions | Remain Delegated | 39% | 33% | 11% | 6% | 11% | Remain Delegated |
| 5 | Min Ethnic / Under Achieving Groups | Remain Delegated | 39% | 29% | 27% | 0% | 5% | Remain Delegated |
| 6 | Staff Costs: Maternity | Remain Delegated | 39% | 39% | 6% | 5% | 11% | Remain Delegated |
| 7 | Staff Costs: Public Duties | Remain Delegated | 44% | 39% | 11% | 0% | 6% | Remain Delegated |
| 8 | Staff Costs: Trade Union | Re-pool | 28% | 17% | 11% | 28% | 17% | Re-pool |
| 9 | Staff Costs: Other | Remain Delegated | 44% | 44% | 6% | 6% | 0% | Remain Delegated |

(Unedited) Anonymous Comments on New Delegation

Appendix 2

Re-pooling Contingencies, Insurance, Library & Museums

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Primary | The governing body consider it vital that the local authority continue to take responsibility for these areas of the budget |
| Primary | In my opinion the LA needs to maintain the opportunity to support schools in difficulty and to reduce the administration burden on schools especially small school who would not have the human resources to actively seek e.g. appropriate insurance cover. |
| Primary | We are very anxious about the way we seem to be heading. As a very small school we feel unable to make decisions that DCC currently make on our behalf. We would much prefer these non-teaching issues were handled by DCC for us. |
| Primary | I would like the LA to maintain the opportunity to support schools in difficulty and to reduce the administration burden on schools. Some small schools do not have the human resources to perform these delegated tasks. |
| Secondary | (i) - Based on the information provided in Appendix 3, the amount delegated to secondary schools for 'contingencies' would be negative, even though the total amount of the contingency is almost £2m, therefore they would be better off if the budget were re-pooled. However, more information/transparency is required in order to see how the allocation for contingencies is currently spent and whether the existence of such a large contingency actually allows schools to become complacent about how they spend and control their budgets. (ii) - Funding should be re-pooled for these elements of insurance, so that schools are not tempted to save money by reducing their insurance cover below the required level. However, is it absolutely necessary for funding to be 're-pooled' to achieve bulk discounts on purchasing? The 'framework contracts' which exist for other goods and services seem to operate without requiring re-pooling. There is also a grey area regarding cover/funding for legal costs resulting from employment issues, especially for foundation schools. |
| Primary | Governors think school should have greater control over their own destiny hence answer to Ai) but recognise the need for some money to be pooled centrally to. Suggest some pooled and some delegated. |
| Primary | Re-pool contingency above the 5% level |
| Special | There appears to be no option for special schools to repool funding. If there was an option ----- would like to retain their contingency; we feel we can plan for our own eventualities because of the constant changing of pupil population and complex needs. We would like more transparency of the amount and how it was assessed and clarity over the definition of contingency. However, we would prefer that the L.A. had a contingency that we were able to if necessary to apply for funds particularly as mentioned above to support exceptional unforeseen costs and additional costs of a new school, a change in status and closing schools. |
| Secondary | A contingency fund is obviously a desirable resource and I was surprised to learn that DCC has one! It would be good to have an understanding of the criteria which determine access to such a fund should it continue, particularly as it is referred to elsewhere |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | in the document as a potential back-up to other delegated funds. |
| Secondary | Insurance: the status of foundation schools is not recognised in this consultation. Foundation school governing bodies own land and are the employer. We are very happy with the current situation where insurance funding is delegated and we are able to buy back from DCC at the same price. We have the option to go elsewhere if necessary, however would not expect to do so when the service and price are as good as they are currently. |
| Primary | Our Governors are against what amounts to 'privatisation' of education. At -----, we want to work collaboratively with other schools and our local authority, but because of budget cuts, changes to the way we are funded and reduced numbers, we will be forced to think selfishly, so having our share of the contingency budget may be in our favour, helping to reduce the likelihood of redundancies next year. |
| Secondary | In our opinion the LA needs to be able to support schools in difficulty and to reduce the administration burden on schools, especially small schools, that would not have the human resources to actively seek e.g. appropriate insurance cover. Funding for library and museum services should not be re-pooled, it should be up to individual schools to buy into the services. |
| Primary | The size of schools means that if the amounts are delegated they will barely act as a contingency. There has to be a central pool in case of serious issues. |

Budgets for FSM Eligibility, Licences & Subscriptions, Support for Ethnic Minority/Underachieving Groups, and Behaviour Support Service Remaining Delegated

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Primary | (iv) <i>(Behaviour Support Service)</i> In this way schools be ensured of a quality bespoke service |
| Primary | MEP: we struggle to get any additional help/funding for this |
| Primary | Buying licences at a discounted rate sounds like a good idea. |
| Primary | The governing body feel that the local authority should take responsibility for behaviour support service in order to share expertise when and where appropriate |
| Primary | We have selected to disagree above out of consideration for the adverse impact on school admin time, with no apparent gain or benefit to the school. |
| Primary | Whilst seeing the argument for delegation I believe this division of the 'pie' dilutes the support that can be given to the most needy. Whilst it is good to have extra budget to use there are many cases where a school gets a portion of the budget that they do not require for the purpose that it was given and end up using it for other purposes. |
| Primary x 2 (identical response) | My main concerns are over behaviour support. At the moment despite the resource being delegated the service is mixed, and the impact less effective than comparable services. Maybe if I was paying for a service, even if it was a traded one then I would at least know what to expect, the frequency and cost of support. I get the feeling that the main resources go to secondary schools, who may be supplementing the core provision on any case. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Secondary | Delegation of FSM eligibility should be on the basis of FSM numbers and not AWP. Currently around 21% of students at ----- are on FSM and this would be another admin task to delegate in college. |
| Primary | Too many children are losing out because the delegated budget doesn't always reflect the school's needs. |
| Secondary | (ii) - Licences and subscriptions should be purchased centrally for all schools wherever it may prevent individual schools falling foul of the law. There is a proliferation of licenses which schools are required to have which are paid directly by schools and it would be beneficial if they could all be pooled. Again, is it necessary for funding to be 're-pooled' to achieve bulk discounts on purchasing? The 'framework contracts' which exist for other goods and services seem to operate without requiring re-pooling. |
| Secondary | some concern that if EAL is used to determine delegation of (iii) above then this will not achieve its aim - just like FSM certain parents will not state EAL... |
| Secondary | All schools need these licences which work on pupil numbers : the funding delegated will not cover the cost as the group discounts will be lost. There will also be a big duplication of effort as all schools will be doing individual administration. |

Special Staff Cost Budgets

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Primary | If there is no central funding support for maternity and paternity leave then many schools may be reluctant to support young, inexperienced teachers in the early stages of their career. There may be unexpected costs which any small school in particular would find it difficult to fund without support |
| Secondary | I feel that maternity costs are better covered centrally as this could cause significant problems to small secondary schools. |
| Secondary | Delegating special staff costs could lead to the discrimination of new employees to avoid risk of maternity payments. |
| Secondary | It makes sense to re-pool the contingency for maternity/paternity for the nursery and primary sector because there are a lot of them, they have lower staffing levels and very different staff profiles. However, the calculation of the size of the allocation, the split between sectors and how the re-pooled amount is spent will need more transparency if secondary schools are to be confident that they are getting their fair share. |
| Primary | If we can't have help with maternity cover then it will be hard to appoint young female staff without fear of incurring a substantial cost to school |
| Primary | As above, a small school will not have , they have to be protected from unforeseen staffing costs as far as practicable. the capacity to manage issues like maternity cover |
| Secondary | Re-pooling the maternity funding would be preferred as we find that maternity leaves come in groups! Numbers and costs can vary considerably from year to year. The cost reimbursement is very helpful and we would be sorry to see it go. Re-pooling trade union funding is essential as we employ one of the county trade union reps and would otherwise not be reimbursed for his county-wide activity. This would feel very unfair at this point as the system is long-established and there would be little time to plan for change. |

Responses to the LA's proposals on methods of delegation

Appendix 3

Nursery and Primary Sector

| Item | Service | Proposed Method | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Indicated | General View |
|------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1 | Contingencies | Pupil Numbers | 41% | 31% | 11% | 8% | 7% | 2% | Agreement |
| 2 | Insurance | Pupil Numbers | 46% | 38% | 6% | 4% | 5% | 1% | Agreement |
| 3 | Library & Museum | <i>Block</i> | <i>21%</i> | <i>22%</i> | <i>15%</i> | <i>8%</i> | <i>6%</i> | <i>28%</i> | <i>Undecided</i> |
| | | Pupil Numbers | 37% | 28% | 12% | 7% | 2% | 14% | Agreement |
| 4 | FSM Eligibility | Deprivation | 58% | 29% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 2% | Agreement |
| 5 | Licences & Subs | Pupil Numbers | 48% | 34% | 11% | 5% | 2% | 0% | Agreement |
| 6 | Min Ethnic/ Under Achieving Groups | EAL Indicator | 45% | 28% | 12% | 7% | 7% | 1% | Agreement |
| 7 | Behaviour Support | Pupil Numbers | 58% | 29% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 2% | Agreement |
| | | Deprivation | 36% | 26% | 9% | 7% | 6% | 16% | Agreement |
| 8 | Staff Costs: Maternity | Pupil Numbers | 36% | 32% | 16% | 7% | 8% | 1% | Agreement |
| 9 | Staff Costs: Public Duties | Pupil Numbers | 35% | 35% | 16% | 6% | 6% | 2% | Agreement |
| 10 | Staff Costs: Trade Union | Pupil Numbers | 31% | 35% | 20% | 7% | 6% | 1% | Agreement |
| 11 | Staff Costs: Other | Pupil Numbers | 32% | 36% | 21% | 4% | 6% | 1% | Agreement |
| 12 | School Catering | <i>Block</i> | <i>23%</i> | <i>16%</i> | <i>14%</i> | <i>6%</i> | <i>12%</i> | <i>29%</i> | <i>Undecided</i> |
| | | <i>Deprivation</i> | <i>34%</i> | <i>13%</i> | <i>8%</i> | <i>6%</i> | <i>15%</i> | <i>24%</i> | <i>Undecided</i> |
| | | Pupil Numbers | 42% | 27% | 8% | 4% | 9% | 10% | Agreement |
| 14 | Broadband | <i>Block</i> | <i>33%</i> | <i>19%</i> | <i>7%</i> | <i>6%</i> | <i>9%</i> | <i>26%</i> | <i>Undecided</i> |
| | | Pupil Numbers | 41% | 24% | 8% | 6% | 9% | 12% | Agreement |
| 15 | CRB Checks | Pupil Numbers | 45% | 25% | 13% | 8% | 8% | 1% | Agreement |
| 16 | Sports | Pupil Numbers | 38% | 32% | 19% | 2% | 6% | 3% | Agreement |

Secondary Sector

| Item | Service | Proposed Method | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Indicated | General View |
|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Contingencies | Pupil Numbers | 33% | 56% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 5% | Agreement |
| 2 | Insurance | Pupil Numbers | 33% | 44% | 6% | 11% | 0% | 6% | Agreement |
| 4 | FSM Eligibility | Deprivation | 56% | 33% | 0% | 11% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 5 | Licences & Subs | Pupil Numbers | 39% | 57% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 6 | Min Ethnic/ Under Achieving Groups | EAL Indicator | 17% | 56% | 17% | 5% | 5% | 0% | Agreement |
| 8 | Staff Costs: Maternity | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 56% | 5% | 17% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 9 | Staff Costs: Public Duties | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 56% | 11% | 11% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 10 | Staff Costs: Trade Union | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 26% | 17% | 5% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 11 | Staff Costs: Other | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 56% | 17% | 5% | 0% | 0% | Agreement |
| 13 | 14-16 Practical Activities | KS4 Pupil No | 39% | 56% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | Agreement |
| 15 | CRB Checks | Pupil Numbers | 28% | 26% | 5% | 0% | 11% | 0% | Agreement |
| 16 | Sports | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 50% | 22% | 0% | 6% | 0% | Agreement |
| 17 | Twinning | Pupil Numbers | 22% | 50% | 17% | 6% | 5% | 0% | Agreement |

Budgets That Could be Re-pooled

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Primary | Although the current funds for “Support for minority ethnic pupils/underachieving groups” currently covers travellers the consultation states that “delegation could be on the basis of the number of children on the census with English as an additional Language” This would imply that travellers are no longer to receive any additional funding. I would ask that this be seriously looked at. Traveller children often bring a specific set of needs with them additional support. The current system of support is greatly appreciated and makes a considerable difference to those children, I would ask that somehow of continuing this for these children be considered. |
| Primary | (vi) the factor should be 4 (<i>Low Cost, High Incidence</i>). Low cost, high incidence SEN to account for travellers and underachieving groups |
| Primary | Maternity is not necessarily based on size of school/pupil numbers. We are a large primary and had no maternity leave for over 10 years, a colleague with 3 classes in school has had all staff out on maternity! |
| Primary | If factors other than pupil numbers are used for areas other than the recovery of funds then there is a high probability of destroying small school budgets |
| Primary | Some areas of Derbyshire with the greatest amount of deprivation and high numbers of pupils who underachieve have low levels of ethnic minority children. To give support to underachievement on the grounds of EAL seems a nonsense in these instances. |
| Primary | It would appear that Section 2 is making an assumption that funds will be delegated from Section 1 regardless of what the outcome is? If we are making a calculation that were they to be repooled then 'my share' would be calculated by AWP / pupil numbers then this would seem the most logical approach as opposed to block charges which would hit small primaries particularly hard. |
| Primary | I do not agree with the delegation of any of these budgets due to the administrative workload it would place on schools, smaller schools, with fewer admin hours would be hit particularly hard. Many heads in smaller schools already have a teaching commitment and the extra burden placed on them by delegation seems entirely unnecessary. |
| Primary | Insurance - as our school is much larger in size than the current pupil numbers it would be unfair to delegate purely on this basis - some consideration should be taken of the size of the building when funds are delegated to schools. |
| Primary | I think small schools often lose out when budgets are based on pupil numbers, but I am very confused about this and need a conversation to understand it better |
| Secondary | Maternity costs should be done on a real-cost basis. |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Secondary | 1- FSM - We feel that other factors as well as Deprivation should be taken into consideration eg LAC/SEN 2 - Minority Groups/Underachieving - EAL should not be the only factor here eg LAC/SEN |
| Secondary | Should the Schools Forum opt to re-pool certain monies, will this be transparent? If money is delegated via AWPEN we will never know how much is to be returned. Any re-pooling should be directly linked to the increased delegation per school. If Insurance remains delegated I fear for schools ensuring that they are appropriately covered. Surely the LA would have to check each policy which sounds more labour intensive than pursuing a county wide policy on behalf of schools? Are insurance costs directly linked to the NOR/AWPEN? Not sure whether as a PFI this is wholly relevant but on principle the monies should be re-pooled to the LA. |
| Secondary | (ii) There should probably be a 'block' element to the methodology for delegating funding for insurance. There may need to be an additional allocation for Foundation Schools to reflect the fact that they are the employer of staff and the owner of school buildings rather than the LA. |
| Primary | Once again we are being asked to answer questions we are not qualified to answer. How can we tell if it would be better for us to have money allocated on pupil numbers or in a block without having worked examples depending on school size or knowing what the impact on other schools will be? Neither disagree or agree often means 'don't know'. |
| Primary | On principal staff cost should not be delegated, but if they have to be then staff numbers as well as pupils numbers should be used. Behaviour support should be delegated on a formula of pupil numbers and deprivation |
| Primary | Not sure I understand fully how 'deprivation' works as a multiplier and feel numbers should also be used to calculate FSM; EAL seems crude measure for 'underachieving groups'. |
| Primary | We don't agree with the method of delegation for the Behaviour Support Service budget. We have higher SEN than national average but much lower deprivation, if measured by FSM. We have a high number of vulnerable children with behavioural/emotional/medical needs, which have nothing to do with financial deprivation, so we would prefer delegation based on pupil numbers only. We already lose out through Pupil Premium since our FSM numbers are very low. If the measure was based on number of SEN pupils and not FSM/deprivation, we would be entitled to a much fairer share of the budget. |
| Secondary | It would appear that Section 2 is making an assumption that funds will be delegated from Section 1 regardless of what the outcome is? If we are making a calculation that were they to be repooled then 'our share' would be calculated by AWPEN / pupil numbers then this would seem the most logical approach as opposed to block charges which would hit small schools particularly hard. |
| Primary | We strongly feel that these costs should not be delegated to schools. |

Non Re-Poolable Budgets

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Primary | As a small school, I feel that we pften lose out due to low pupil numbers: not all costs are dependent upon this. For example, I have a large Victorian building to maintain. |
| Primary | As a very small school the catering would not not be able to continue as it is now. |
| Primary | Something as important as CRB should be automatically completed by the LA and they should be transferrable between different local authorities. We are in danger of losing our excellent sporting help and advice (AVSS) if schools do not choose to support this area.. The governing body had not realised that we were supporting secondary school twinning projects when we found it so difficult to get funding to support our efforts to gain our International Schools Award. |
| Primary | <p>My governors and I are especially concerned about the negative impact of the delegation of (i) school catering and (iv) CRB checks. With regard to catering, this is a relatively large primary school (around 300 pupils) and for many years we have supplied meals for a very small school nearby (----- Primary). We are concerned about how this arrangement will be reflected under the new regime and worry that it will become a further administrative and/or financial burden for this school. We are concerned that this move will herald the eventual demise of the school meal system as the added admin/financial burden for schools will not be sustainable.</p> <p>With regard to CRB checks, we would receive around £800 under delegation, but the cost (based on current numbers of checks, averaged out over the 3-year renewal period) would amount to around £1,320. Currently, everyone has an enhanced check, and if this were reduced to a standard check for volunteer helpers the overall cost would reduce to around £1,078 per year. We would then obviously have to limit the number of volunteers in order to stay within budget - with the resulting negative imapct on teaching & learning.</p> <p>We agree that in most cases the fairest method of delegation is pupil numbers.</p> |
| Primary | I do not believe that funding of any description should be heavily weighted towards pupil numbers. I recognise that it is an 'easy' method and one that can be justified to a certain extent when challenged. I think the whole formula for delegation of budget is unfair. It penalises schools with low numbers or falling rolls when still trying to manage large old and delapidated sites. The cost of this is disproportionate to the amount of money a school receives compared to smaller schools or newer built schools when the weighting is heavily biased towards pupil numbers. If a school is using large proportions of its budget simply to manage the site, pay utility bills etc how can they then be expected to keep raising standards putting on intervention strategies which all require staff. |
| Secondary | <p>We are a small school with around 3 times the number of SEN students than many other schools. As a result, we employ far more teaching assistants. As a result, staffing costs such as CRB checks; maternity etc impact more on our budget and it is for this reason we that we do not support certain delegations via pupil numbers.</p> <p>With regards to the 14 - 16 Practical Learning Option - again, due to the high number of students joining us with low ability levels, we have a far greater number who need to access Practical Learning options and therefore do not support pupil numbers</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | as a way forward in delegating this budget. |
| Primary | I cannot believe that the notion of delegating catering to schools is being considered as being in the least bit feasible. Should this be the case then I would urge the Governors to close the kitchen and move over to 100 sandwiches brought in from home. Schools do not have the expertise to run catering departments, the knowledge of H&S, hygiene and preparing menus. In many schools this would end up being run by outside caterers, (a mistake, simply because of the loop holes this would create in safeguarding children). The idea that heads, or their teams could take onboard this additional responsibility shows a total lack of understanding of the roles of headteachers in maintaining standards and safeguarding children, what a nonsense! |
| Primary | I do not believe that delegating catering is at all feasible. Schools do not have the expertise to run catering departments and yet again this places additional burdens onto already overburdened heads and their teams. I fear the delegation of such budgets would have a huge impact on my ability to continue to focus on raising standards of learning and teaching in my school, which is, after all my primary role. If this were to be implemented I would seriously consider advising the governing body to close the school kitchen. |
| Primary | School Catering - we have an issue being an exporting kitchen - we feel at present the costs to school to export meals to another school may not always be covered by the income we receive. This would perhaps be exacerbated if the Catering Service is delegated. Also unsure who the catering staff would be employed by. We really do not want this budget to be delegated. It could be extremely costly to smaller schools. |
| Secondary | Broadband charges are nothing to do with the size of the school but the distance from the hub. They need to be delegated on a real cost basis as it is very unfair on small rural school such as ours that are paying far more than larger schools elsewhere. |
| Secondary | School Catering should be on basis of a block, to support smaller schools, plus pupil numbers. Deprivation should not be part of this delegation. |
| Secondary | Would be interested in buying the CRB service back from the LA as part of a traded service. |
| Secondary | I am of the view that a combination of block and student numbers should be used in the formulae to calculate allocations where I have indicated this in the response |
| Secondary | We feel that broadband should be delegated on pupil numbers only unless the blocks were based on broadband-related factors. The additional factors seems a good idea if it will be permitted. |
| Secondary | Broadly speaking AWPB is the most appropriate methodology in most cases |
| Primary | Small schools have to be protected. |

General [Unedited] Anonymous Comments on Consultation**Appendix 5**

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Primary | Unless smaller schools join together the pressures of managing a small business without collective powers to get best value and to share the risks will cause huge disruption to education |
| Primary | It is difficult for small schools to operate without some recognition of the particular problems. The revised formula does not give ant recognition to these problems. Unles some additional support is forthcoming I can envisage that there will be significant (financial) problems in small schools. Geographical issues are also of importance ie distance from a BT exchange, when the charge for Broadband is made. |
| Primary | We appreciate the opportunity to have some input into the decision-making process and the governors at this school gave very careful consideration to all the issues put forward. Thank you also for setting out a complex situation so clearly for us. Nevertheless, we remain very concerned about the implications of these new arrangements both for this school and for Derbyshire schools in general - how nonsensical to expect our many small village schools to operate financially independently of each other - where's the 'best value' in that?! We can't help but feel that it's academisation by stealth, under the guise of 'more freedom'. The cost in financial terms and in admin time & expertise would seem to be considerable. |
| Secondary | We agree with the principle of simplification and delegation as much as possible. |
| Primary | There are greater issues regarding fairness in the allocation of funding between secondary schools and primary schools and there is also a growing issue in these straightened times regarding larger primary schools finance going to support and subsidise the running of very small village schools. |
| Special | I am very disappointed that, as a special school, we cannot have a say re the proposed delegation budgets. I have concerns particularly about the delegation of maternity, catering and CRB. The school has not desire for further delegation and it is not appropriate to be based on pupil numbers, as this does not reflect staffing levels as per mainstream schools. I am also concerned about the implications of £10,000 per place + top up - we cannot afford to be worse off. |
| Primary | This has made me think only of my own school circumstances, although I realise that there are schools in deprived areas for whom my answers would not be beneficial |
| Secondary | I have a real concern that delegation predicated mainly upon size and numbers, and with an element of deprivation, will see small schools like ours, with falling roll in 'leafy suburb', further disadvantaged unless there is some element of protectionism. I understand that there is likely to be an MFG of 1.5% but wonder whether there couldn't be some transitional arragments? |
| Primary | If the time and energy that headteachers have had to use in order to secure a broadband connection is an example of what is to happen when other budgets are delegated, it would seem a significant amount of time will be lost to the education system. Headteachers have become purchasing managers! The principle of the LA officer organising contracts on behalf of schools at an advantageous rate should be maintained as long as the LA has a good track record. |
| Primary | It is with regret that we are signing up to some of these additional funds being delegated to schools. This breakaway from the LA is the start of a shift from collaborative, cooperative and supportive working together to a more devisive, competitive system, whereby schools will be forced to put their budgets before equality of provision and quality of education for all children. |

| | |
|---------|---|
| | <p>We believe that the majority, if not all, Derbyshire primary schools would wish to have a fair and equitable distribution of resources. We want to work together and provide every child with equal opportunities in education and well-being, but these changes will impact on our ability to do this. When 'going it alone', we lose the power of bulk buying and procurement expertise, so we question whether these measures will bring cost savings overall. How can it make economic sense if all schools are duplicating administration costs in search of the same services? And without a business manager, which would add to our costs considerably, how will we run our schools effectively, economically and sustainably? It doesn't make sense! We acknowledge we all need to tighten our belts but education is about children - EVERY CHILD - not just about saving money which, ultimately, these changes, we believe, won't do anyway.</p> |
| Primary | <p>To delegate further would in our view be absolute madness. Unforeseen Maternity costs could for example seriously damage schools ability to provide for the pupils in their care.</p> |