

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

APPENDIX A

Overview

- 1) There were a total of 33 responses to the schools forum consultation. Two of the responses were sent either to the incorrect mailbox or were received after the 3rd of December deadline. These responses have been included within the consultation document as they were retrieved on Monday the 6th of December before 10am at the point from which the consultation responses were pulled together.

Consultation Questions

Question one

Option A transfer 0.5% from schools block to high needs block

??

Option B transfer 1.31% from schools block to high needs block

???

Comments

- 2) I am pleased to see the way high needs funding allocation is being reviewed.
- 3) Before anymore money is designated to the high needs block though I would like to see a comprehensive review of spending. In particular, costs of CEOs and SLT in special schools. The salaries advertised for some senior posts have been phenomenally high. I understand the way they are funded and that is related to secondary schools but when special schools with less than 300 children have CEOs heads of schools' deputies and assistant heads on secondary school salaries, I would question whether this money is being spent effectively to support the children.
- 4) I would also like to see a higher benefit for mainstream schools from the funding of special schools. Some do provide outreach which is valuable but some charge for this when they are already effectively being funded through schools' money. I think this should be an expectation and higher accountability of special schools providing specialist support where schools are in need.
- 5) Until we see better value for money on the high needs block, I do not think it's appropriate to put more money in when all schools are struggling financially. There is a desperate need in mainstream schools for high needs funding and I hope the review will make this much more accessible and transparent.
- 6) I believe option B is the best option for school funding moving forward as it enables more money to be put into higher needs funding retaining some of its services.
- 7) Prefer to enable current services to continue until full review of high needs funding is undertaken.
- 8) X 2 - Schools continue to be under pressure from rising costs and although 22-23 will see an increase in funding. One increase is not enough to relieve the commutative funding pressure faced on schools over the last five years.
- 9) Each year transfers have been approved. If it is structural in nature, why hasn't an effective SEND review been carried out before. There is also a significant increase in the proposed funding for NFF this year. If still insufficient, should ongoing representations be happening at

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

government level. Is the LA unique or are other LA's experiencing the same? What or how is this being addressed by the local authority at a national level.

- 10) We would prefer no additional transfer to the high needs block. We would instead welcome a more imaginative response to the issues in high needs funding with the virement of funds from other pots including non educational held by North Northamptonshire Council in line with the precedent set in previous years by other local authorities in this position. Further lobbying of government for high needs allocation in line with the need is also needed. The schools block funding should not be used to spend about problems elsewhere without treating the cause of the issue.
- 11) As we have a significant number of high needs students and students in unit provision, we would however need to be reassured that the funding for these students is not affected by this. We would like to be involved in any consultations around high needs block and wait in anticipation for the outcomes of the government review on high needs funding. In particular we would welcome further discussions on the methodology used to calculate the funding allocated to students in unit provision against those in special schools. In particular RAS funding.

Question 2 if the funding formula needs to be brought into balance the overall cost which methodology would you prefer an NC to use

A reduction of the floor

A cap on per pupil increases

??

Other

????????????????????????????????????

Comments

- 12) No preference
- 13) Mechanism preferred is through a reduction in AWPU only.
- 14) Prefer a cap to a reduction on the MFG which could have severe implications on budget setting.
- 15) The fairest approach would be to reduce the AWPU for all schools so that the cost of any schools' block transfer is funded fairly and equitably by all schools in north Northamptonshire.
- 16) North Northamptonshire Council should keep its funding allocation as close to the national funding formula as possible. Deviating from this leads to further inequalities in funding.

Question 3 with regards to the local authority commissioned outreach services paper which option do you support

Option 1

?

Option 2

??

Option 3

????????????????

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Other

????

Comments

- 17) See comments relating to transfer of high needs fund in answer one above.
- 18) As in question one I would prefer to enable current services to continue until full review of high needs funding is complete.
- 19) We would look to Commission these services as the work on offer has in the past been limited, time constrained, and there has been a long waiting list.
- 20) North Northamptonshire Council should continue to support this from the general fund as it has done in the past.

Question 4 splits site policy do you agree with rolling forward the split site policy for NCC

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

?

Other

??

Comment

- 21) The policy should be reviewed to bring it in line with the national funding formula.

Question 5 do you agree with using the 2021 2022 split site rates

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

?

Other

??

Comments

- 22) The rates should be tapered to bring in line with the national funding formula next year.

Question 6 growth fund policy do you agree with rolling forward the growth fund policy

Yes

????????????????????????????????

No

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Other

??

Comments

23) The growth fund policy should be updated to allow North Northamptonshire Council to fund growth fund pupils at a rate closer to the per pupil national funding formula rate.

Question 7 growth funding rates do you agree with using the 2021- 2022 growth fund rates

Yes

????????????????????

No

Other

??

Comments

24) The growth fund rates should be in line with the per pupil national funding formula rate.

Question 8 permanent exclusion claw back policy do you agree with the change from previous Northamptonshire County Council claw back policy to bring North Northamptonshire Council onto the claw back as set out in the legislation

Yes

????????????????????

No

Other

Comments

25) Need to be in line with legislation.

26) X 2 - Figures shown on table one page 116 don't reflect the weighted adjustment which will impact on the max claw back revising figures to around £6680 - £7240 significantly lower than shown.

Question 9 are you in favour of the continuation of the central services that are partly funded by the dedicated schools' grant

Yes

???????

No

Other

????????????????

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Comments

- 27) No response.
- 28) This element needs to be revisited as there are a number of elements within this that should be funded by the North Northamptonshire Council core funding not the schools' block. Also, no details provided on the historical commitments. This should be provided for transparency as we could be funding legacy costs not linked to schools or for which other schools are funding themselves from their reduced budgets.

Question 10 the delegation for trade union facility time - do you support the proposed continuation of this delegation and the rate proposed

Yes

????????

No

Other

Comments

Question 11 the delegation for school effectiveness do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate proposed

Yes

??

No

??

Other

Comments

- 29) I agree with the DEA delegation for services but not doubling the rate to 15 pound per pupil. That is too high.
- 30) School effectiveness in agreement but not the increase in rate proposed. If the service is working why is the additional resource required. Does a review of the service its aims and outcomes need to be taken out?

Question 12 de-delegation for redundancy costs do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation on the rate proposed

Yes

??

No

??

Other

SCHOOLS FORUM CONSULTATION

Comments

- 31) Support continuation of this delegation but not at the proposed rate. Believe this is too high and is a massive leap from the current rate. A lower rate of below £5 per pupil would be acceptable.
- 32) Redundancy costs in agreement but not the increase what guarantees are there that school deficits have not been allowed to continue and have not been actively managed and appropriate actions taken centrally in the local authority.