

School	NOR	De -delegation										Top slicing							
		10% growth(Primary)			Maternity Cover		Fidelity Ins	Trade Union duties		School Improvement		Redundancy		Statutory school finance	Statutory HR (H&S)	Education Access Service		Multi cultural Development Team	
		A	B	C	A	B		A	B	A	B	A	B			A	B	A	B
Oakmeadow Primary School	354			1	1		1	1			1		1	1					1
Meole Brace Secondary School	1215				1		1	1					1	1	1			1	
Brown Clee Primary School	95									1									
Longden Primary School	114									1									
Christ Church Primary School	79		1		1		1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1	
Whitchurch Infants	258			1	1		1	1			1		1	1		1			1
Hinstock Primary School	103		1		1		1	1				1	1	1		1			1
Meole Brace Primary School	332			1		1	1	1				1	0	0		1			1
Buntingsdale Primary School	73									1									
Community College	423				1		1	1		1		1	1	1	1				1
Woore Primary School	59									1									
Gobowen Primary School	172			1	1		1	1			1		1	1	1			1	
St Mary's Bluecoat Primary	133			1	1		1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Worfield Endowed Primary	194			1	1		1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Beckbury Primary School	55			1	1		1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Norton in Hales Primary	81	1			1		1	1		1		1	1	1	1			1	
St Giles Primary School	316			1	1		1	1			1		1	1		1			1
St Laurence Ludlow	193	1			1		1		1			1	1	1	1	1		1	
St Mary's Albrighton	181	1			1		1	1			1		1	1	1	1			1
St Mary's Shawbury	175	1			1		1	1				1	1	1	1	1			1
Kinlet Primary	43	1			1		1	1				1		1	1	1			1
Farlow Primary	50	1			1		1	1				1		1	1	1			1
Oxon CE Primary	417		1				1	1			1		1	1		1			1
Stoke on Tern Primary	111			1	1		1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1			
Albrighton Primary School	200			1	1			1			1		1	1	1	1			1
Baschurch Primary School	166										1								
Myddle Primary School	81										1								
Crowmoor Primary School	186	1			1		1	1				1	1	1	1	1			1
Bicton CE Primary School	138	1			1		1	1				1	1	1	1	1			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>5997</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>

## Notes

EAS - To be able to make an informed decision on this we would need to be aware of the rates and possible charges if we were to fully delegate this back to school.

No comments

No Comments

No comments

No comments

10% Growth- Where LA requests school to admit over PAN funding should be immediate

10% growth - If we knew that surplus balances would not be clawed back when pupil growth is evident in the three year plan and in the community then we could cope with fully delegated funding, otherwise we need to know that the contingency is there with particular growth in our community expected.

Pupil growth - Fully support c but option B would be preferable to keeping the status quo as the provisional amount for 17-18 is double 16/17. The stability of NFF budget should allow schools to be in a position to plan ahead for pupil growth. Maternity - We are one of the largest primary schools and I feel that our de-delegated amount of approx. £7,500 represents a good amount to use as a starting point to manage the risk within the school budget. (as academies have to now) Trade Union - Minimal expenditure and I would doubt that this amount could be reached if schools were asked to 'buy back' this cover. Redundancy - Again due to the NFF I can only see the pressure on this pot increasing and we can plan a multi year budget. If this was to be fully delegated to schools we would have to manage the risks of this much like our Academy colleagues do which I feel is a fairer approach. SSF/HR - Can this be built into the SLA that schools currently buy into? It seems more transparent to do this. EAS - Again, as our academy colleagues, fully delegate more transparent. MDT - This seems very logical and transparent to do this on a needs basis for schools.

Fidelity Ins - It would be beneficial of schools could be informed of the amount in advance. At present schools do not know what the charges will be for these insurances which makes it difficult to budget. EAS - Access to TMBSS is very limited. There are enough spaces available and it is very difficult to meet all the criteria.

Schl Imp - With increasing financial pressure on small schools, option A is the **only** one viable for us. It seems very unfair that our small school which is already scraping through just to be in the black is paying additional costs through the lump sum option.

Pupil Growth - the return that schools would get if this was triggered has not been made clear, the cost is increasing each year. Mat cover - we would like certainty that the maternity cover cost is at a competitive rate. Redundancy - we would like a clear statement that defines the circumstances in which this funding can be accessed to cover redundancy costs. MDT - please provide clarity regarding how this support will be funded if we need to access this service and the 90 pupil threshold has already been reached. Sch Imp - please clarify whether our contribution is purely used to cover the costs of providing support to m/t schools or does it also contribute towards the cost of the statutory service for academies.

No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

No comments

Stat finance - (left blank)we buy in at Gold level to financial support

Stat finance - (left blank)we buy in at Gold level to financial support

10% growth - Set the level high – 15%, it may need to increase in future years or be removed. Mat cover - The world is changing. Schools becoming academies have to take on these costs. Redundancy - Schools becoming academies have to take on these costs. With a smaller group of remaining schools we need them to take more responsibility for staffing decisions and financial planning. Stat finance - Money spent on this will help to protect all maintained schools from bad financial decisions made by a small minority of schools. HR - I am concerned about the 'headlines' with this (split with SLAs). After reading the appendix I am willing to support it. Further review and clarification may be required in future years. MDT - Now the NFF progression is confirmed this seems reasonable. Very clear communication will be needed with schools about this. Sch imp - This consultation does not give schools the option to indicate if they would wish to see a reduced School Improvement Service with greater use of SLAs to buy in support. A comment is made in the report that 'Headteachers from maintained schools have indicated their preference for the continued provision of school improvement services at their current level.' I am receiving significant feedback that indicates the reverse. Colleagues cannot understand why one visit a year costs them around £4,595 for a large primary school. In the revised proposal, this would drop to £2,689 but is still a huge amount for one visit (as schools perceive the service).

The notes say the authority received a 'new school improvement monitoring and brokering grant for local authorities from September 2017'. I can see no mention of how much this was for – this is important information.

No mention is made of how the government has provided significant money for Shropshire schools through the Strategic School Improvement Fund. This will benefit some Shropshire schools and should reduce some demands on the LA for supported schools.

I am very concerned that this document was not included in the main consultation paper. I also think it was a mistake not to present the information on this consultation at the Lord Hill.

I have been repeatedly challenged by schools about this issue. I think the decision we took in Forum last year was not representative of significant numbers of Shropshire schools. (I wait to see how representative the challenge I have heard is of the whole school network.) I think the very limited options in this consultation are a mistake.

No mention is made of: the amount of extra grant funding from the DfE, the amount of Strategic School Improvement Fund Finance, any option for schools to indicate a desire to reduce the size of the service, any option to move to make increased use of SLAs.

I get no sense of a recognition that as the number of LA maintained schools reduce the staffing team will reduce. Many headteachers are confused that colleagues who are now academies receive one LA visit a year. This appears to be the same as a 'low support maintained school' but costs them nothing. Further clarity is needed on the balance between the 'statutory responsibilities' and 'school improvement'.

I suspect the returns you receive might not match the strong feeling of many heads about this issue. This is a hugely complex issue and I don't feel the level of communication has been as comprehensive as the other parts of the consultation. My instinct is still to try and have a high quality core team who has some capacity to provide 'extra' support, particularly at times of specific difficulty or challenge. To achieve this on a longer term basis I think the business model and level of transparency may need to change further.

MDT - school are happy to go with majority