



SCHOOLS FORUM

De-delegation for School Improvement Proposal

14 February 2023

| Content Applicable to; | | School Phase; | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| Maintained Primary | X | Pre School | |
| Academies | | Foundation Stage | X |
| PVI Settings | | Primary | X |
| Special Schools / Academies | | Secondary | |
| Local Authority | | Post 16 | |
| | | High Needs | |

| Content Requires; | | By; | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Noting | X | Maintained Primary School Members | X |
| Decision | X | Maintained Secondary School Members | X |
| | | Maintained Special School Members | |
| | | Academy Members | |
| | | All Schools Forum | |

1. Purpose of Report

This report presents the consultation response on the proposal for de-delegation of funding for school improvement functions for Local Authority maintained schools.

Recommendations

- The Schools Forum is asked to note the changes to the way that Local Authority school improvement functions are funded.
- The Schools Forum representatives for maintained schools are recommended to approve the de-delegation of £18 per pupil for Local Authority school improvement functions from maintained schools' budgets.

Background (details in Appendix 1)

- The DfE implemented a policy to reduce the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and to remove it entirely for 2023/24. Instead, it is using the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 to allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the

approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives or by agreement of the Secretary of State.

If no de-delegation funding is agreed the capacity of the Local Authority to support maintained schools in a systematic and strategic way would be significantly at risk.

No alternative funding stream is available to support this work; therefore, the implications of not continuing would potentially leave schools isolated and solely dependent on the capacity of local leadership and governance. Whilst some higher performing schools may benefit financially in the short term, this approach would conflict with both national policy (for schools to be within strong groups) and local experience (that a proactive approach to school improvement ultimately achieves better outcomes for children alongside better long-term value for money).

Consultation

5. A consultation was undertaken with maintained schools over a two-week period. Details of the consultation are shown in Appendix 1.

The results show that of 29 schools who responded,

- 10 “strongly agree that they understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal”;
- 11 tended to agree that the core offer represents value for money, 2 did not know the answer to this question and 2 disagreed.
- For question 8, Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local Authority’s core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2023/24? 13 respondents agreed, 10 expressed that they don’t know, and 5 disagreed.

This suggests strong, but not unanimous support for the proposal. Comments received (from a limited number of schools) suggest a strength of feeling on both sides.

The full consultation results are shown in Appendix 2.

Resource Implications

No additional resource implications identified.

Equal Opportunity Issues

None identified.

Background Papers

[DFE consultation](#)

Officers to Contact

Rebecca Wakeley, (interim) Senior Education Effectiveness Partner
Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Schools and High Needs

APPENDIX 1

Consultation on the De-delegation* of funding to deliver Local Authority School Improvement Functions

**De-delegation effectively means the retention of part of a school budget by the LA before the total is calculated*

Introduction

1. On 11 January 2022 the DfE published the outcome of their consultation on reforming how local authorities' school improvement functions are funded. Since 2017, the Local Authority School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering grant has been allocated to local authorities to support them in fulfilling their statutory school improvement functions under Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and their additional school improvement expectations as set out in the Schools Causing Concern (SCC) guidance (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate
2. As a result of the consultation the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant will reduce by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and be removed entirely from 2023/24. Instead, the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 will allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives.
3. In recent years Leicestershire has received the following amounts:
 - 2019/20 £330,371
 - 2020/21 £339,189
 - 2021/22 £314,887
 - 2022/23 £139,000
 - 2023/24 and onwards £0
4. It was agreed by Schools Forum on March 23, 2022, that £9 per pupils be de-delegated from maintained school budgets in 2022/23 to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions.

Background

5. The DfE launched a consultation seeking views on a proposal to remove the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant (SIMBG) and instead allow local authorities, with the approval of their maintained Schools Forum representatives, to replace the funding for this function by de-delegating funding from maintained schools' budget shares.
6. The outcome of the consultation was published on 11 January 2022 when it was confirmed that the SIMBG would reduce by 50% in financial year 2022/23 and be removed entirely from 2023/24. The Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 were amended to allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares so that they can continue to carry out their core school improvement functions.

7. To maintain the status quo, it was proposed the offer be extended into following years when there would need to be an ongoing de-delegation of £18 per pupil to cover the same level of per pupil funding.
8. Funding forum is only being asked for a decision relating to 2023/24 at this time.

Statutory School Improvement Functions for the Local Authority

9. Local Authorities have statutory school improvement functions under [Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#) and additional school improvement expectations as set out in the [Schools Causing Concern \(SCC\) guidance](#) (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate.

The Use of this funding in Leicestershire

10. This funding is used to fulfil Leicestershire Local Authority statutory responsibilities around maintained schools including:
 - An Education Effectiveness Partner linked to each school developing a relationship between the school and LA offering advocacy and oversight: a watchful eye and critical friend giving support and somewhere to go in challenging times; ad hoc responses and signposting; knowledge of the position of schools and if and when intervention is needed.
 - Partnership development to support collaborative groups to become self-supporting, sustainable and robust “strong families of schools”.
 - Commissioned health checks and audits as appropriate; support in preparation for, and response to, inspection.
 - Development support around safeguarding, financial planning and governance, and support with working with a range of linked LA and wider services.
 - Commissioned school improvement support, from former Teaching School Alliances, MATs and other quality assured providers.
11. Maintaining this service and engagement with schools strengthens the ability of the Education Effectiveness Team to add value to all schools and academies through its universal offer, funded via County Council funding, (Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership strategic improvement activities, communications, advocacy for schools and signposting) and insight into the education sector in Leicestershire.
12. The core offer for LA maintained schools currently includes the following:-
 - a. Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP), providing a single point of contact, help & advice, support & signposting (local authority, localised and Hubs), advocacy and confidential conversations
 - b. Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools
 - c. A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback including.
 - i. Health-check and evaluation (quality of teaching and learning)
 - ii. Safeguarding audit
 - iii. Pupil Premium review
 - iv. SEND review

- v. External Review of Governance
 - vi. Web site audit
- d. Next steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support
 - e. Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.
 - f. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes
 - g. The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance
 - h. Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas, recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum and ARS (Audience Response System) Training
 - i. Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support
 - j. Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools
 - k. A range of regular communications
 - l. Full day local authority induction for new headteachers
 - m. Regular meetings, seminars and webinars
13. It is proposed that this core offer continues to be delivered through the de-delegation.
14. The Education Effectiveness Team engages with and supports all schools and education settings in Leicestershire through strategic planning and partnership (including the Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership (which acts as a hub for this activity); managing communications such as the headteacher briefing, social media and meetings with headteachers; and fulfilling statutory duties around safeguarding, moderation and SACRE. The team identifies opportunities to make appropriate connections for the benefit of children in Leicestershire. **This activity is funded separately**, and alongside the de-delegated funded activities for maintained schools. This proposal sets out the proposed use of the de-delegated funding from maintained schools.

School Improvement Budget 2023/24

15. The regulations allow for LAs to deduct the funding from maintained schools budget shares as an Education Function for services relating to maintained schools only in much the same way as for de-delegated services if approved by the Schools Forum. If the maintained schools' School Forum representatives agree that this funding can be deducted from school budget shares, £18 per pupil will be de-delegated in 2023/24.
16. It should be noted that if the Schools Forum maintained schools' representatives do not approve to de-delegate funds for this function that the Secretary of State retains the power to approve the de-delegation contrary to the decision of the Schools Forum if it is deemed necessary to ensure that the local authority is adequately funded to exercise its core school improvement functions.

Consultation Questions

Consultation on De-delegation of Funding for School Improvement in Maintained Schools

Q1 Which area is your school located? Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley & Bosworth, Melton, North West Leicestershire, Oadby & Wigston

Q2 Please provide the following details:

School name:

DfE number:

Q3 In what role are you responding to this survey? Headteacher, Other (please specify)
Please specify 'Other':

Q4 - The DfE has now outlined that funding for school improvement and monitoring will no longer be allocated to the local authorities in the form of a grant. This should/ could instead be funded through the de-delegation of funds from the maintained school budget share with the approval of their Schools Forum maintained schools representatives

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

'I understand the impact of this proposal on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools'

Strongly agree, Tend to agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Tend to disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know

Comment

Q5

Do you agree that this represents a comprehensive core offer which represents value for money?

Strongly agree, Tend to agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Tend to disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know

Comment

Q6 - How likely, if at all, is your school to access the following areas of the Local Authority's core offer?

The LCC Core Offer for maintained schools includes:

| | |
|--|--|
| | Very likely, Fairly likely, Not very likely, Not at all likely, Don't know |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP) | |
| Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools | |
| A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback (including a health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit) | |
| Next steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support | |
| Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection. | |
| Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance | |
| Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas (recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/SDP Best Practice, Inspection Skills training as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum training) | |
| Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support | |
| Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools | |
| A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin | |
| Full day local authority induction for | |

| | |
|---|--|
| new headteachers and mentoring | |
| Regular meetings, seminars and webinars | |

Q7 What, if anything, else should we consider as part of our core offer?

Q8 Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local Authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2023/24?

Yes, No, Don't know

Why do you say this?

Q9 Do you understand that the final decision around the de-delegation of funding to support these functions is retained by the Secretary of State for Education?

Yes, No, Don't know

Why do you say this?

Q10 Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

APPENDIX 2 Consultation Results

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | |
| Q1- Which area is your school located? | Blaby-3, Charnwood-7, Harborough-4, Hinckley & Bosworth-3, Melton-2, North West Leicestershire-9, Oadby & Wigston-1 | | | | | |
| | Headteacher | Other | No response | | | |
| Q3- In what role are you responding to this survey? | 27 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Strongly agree | Tend to agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Tend to disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
| Q4- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? 'I understand the impact of this proposal on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools' | 10 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | Strongly agree | Tend to agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Tend to disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
| Q5- Do you agree that this represents a comprehensive core offer which represents value for money? | 3 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | Very likely | Fairly likely | Not very likely | Not at all likely | Don't know | |
| Q6- How likely, if at all, is your school to access the following areas of the Local Authority's core offer? | | | | | | |
| Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP) | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools | 11 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| A rolling programme of independent checks and | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|---|---|---|--|
| audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback (including a health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit) | | | | | | |
| Next steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support | 12 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 1 | |
| Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection. | 15 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance | 10 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | |
| Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas (recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice, Inspection Skills training as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum training) | 15 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | |
| Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and/or targeted peer support | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 1 | |
| Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools | 8 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 3 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|------------|---|---|--|
| A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin | 19 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring | 7 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 5 | |
| Regular meetings, seminars and webinars | 14 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Yes | No | Don't know | | | |
| Q8- Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local Authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2023/24? | 13 | 5 | 10 | | | |
| | Yes | No | Don't know | | | |
| Q9- Do you understand that the final decision around the de-delegation of funding to support these functions is retained by the Secretary of State for Education? | 28 | | | | | |

Comments

Q3. Other-

School Business Manager

Q4. Why do you say this?

- We have been consulted in this last year
- If no funding to LA then no core services?
- aware of support packages available I understand this will cost us - not sure which category to tick
- Without the funding the school improvement opportunities as a maintained school cannot continue.
- The DfE are no longer providing additional funding for LA school improvement and the LA wants to fund this by the de-delegation of funds from the schools budget.
- I appreciate that without the funding from the DfE the support offered through EEP will not be possible to maintain.
- We recognise that the grant will no longer be given to the LA

Q5. Why do you say this?

- It is not clear what the charge will be for this
- If we have access to all CPD and it is offered to all maintained schools, without having to seek it, then this seems like a comprehensive offer and good value for money.
- The proof is in the delivery of the services.
- unaware of cost implication to school
- I am unsure how the offer and how much you are able to access on a yearly basis and whether you are able to have more of a bespoke offer - if that is what your school needs. A number of inconsistent experiences had in school of 'external' support as part of reviews brings in to question the value for money statement. Having 'external' support by experienced professionals is always welcomed but some has not happened or in some cases the person sent in to evaluate is not experienced enough in that area or phase to draw outcomes or offer support in moving forward.
- The quality of support - needs to massively improve and have a better structure EEPs need to prepare for meetings - provide a format/agenda/health check document/format in advance of the meetings. Reading documents sent in advance of meetings then helps to make meetings more productive. Meeting with EEPs to go through previous reports from other checks months afterwards is pointless - actions will have been taken Reports from EEPs need to come out more quickly - my meeting last year with the EEP was apparently written within 3 days of our meeting I received it in April - cold and out of date! Safeguarding check was useful - there was a format and feedback was received quickly and allowed us to act on and feedback to the person conducting the review Online meetings need streamlining we seem to have a lot that come from different groups that repeat - less of them and more streamlined and relevant. we need to meet other HTs in real life- LPH as a large group of schools and allows us to discuss and meet with colleagues from a wider area. The post Covid era seems very insular - we 'don't get out' and meet and share which is not healthy I need to see better value for money
- I would welcome a meeting to discuss what this looks like and the value for money that our school and pupils will be getting.

- I do believe it represents value for money - I would also support an additional premium for support as a RI (or lower) school in order to bring about the change needed to get a school back to good. E.g. a higher per pupil de delegation fee for those schools needing additional support. At this, I still feel the LA support from the EEP team and commissioned work would still be value for money.
- Our proposed group does not work well as half of the schools are situated a significant distance away and in our old collaboratives, we have already been accessing most of these services.
- As a small school I see that what I will receive is value for the amount that I currently pay per pupil at my school. However, I'm not sure what the cost will be going forwards and whether it differs depending upon your school size. Will the cost be double what we paid during 2022-23 or will it go up? If I were running a large school, I would wonder whether getting the same as all other schools would represent value for money.
- I believe that this has the potential to represent a comprehensive core offer which could represent value for money. However, I am aware that we have already made use of some of these services, such as a Safeguarding check in July 2022, but we were charged for them at the time

Q7- What, if anything, else should we consider as part of our core offer?

- Support for our SEND Pupils and assistance with ways forward. We are struggling!
- As a new Headteacher taking up the role in the pandemic, I would have appreciated a more comprehensive induction and mentoring programme. I have had to use HR and the legal team this year and I had no experience in this area before and the situation was overwhelming at times. We have a supportive collaborative group within the XXX group, but I would appreciate more CPD for Headteachers and CPD for staff which multi-academy trusts have access too - more evidence-based research would be fantastic.
- SLE's
- Headteacher Performance Management support, rather than having to pay an external consultant each time
- Clarity of offer, who provides what service, key contacts (not always apparent with constant changes to staff and contact numbers at LCC) i.e a published directory on LTS, booking for reviews etc on LTS alongside training options
- Curriculum development or subject leader network meetings.
- I have answered "Don't know" to some of the questions above as I am not sure whether this is something we are able to access?
- we can organise our own collaborative group and have done for years - we don't need patronising and someone being paid for chairing a collaborative group many of us have done for years on top of our day job Reviews - useful if there is a format and we know what it is and if feedback is provided in a useful and timely way we need to know what CPD is available I don't need to EEP to tell me fully funded CPD - yes please subject to relevance to our school priorities at the time financial support - we read the documents sent and we are very aware of managing finances well - we just don't have enough HT Teacher induction useful - for new HTs so long as it amounts to more than a sandwich at County Hall Regular meetings etc - yes if a good use of time and allows for sharing and meeting as well as getting up to date information in a timely way - a range of ways - some online and some face to face- Maybe a 'must attend' annual day conference with inspiring speaker - which we have to pay for - if good value and useful people will come

- We are not expecting a change of head but should there be one we would want the head's induction and feel it is important that headteacher induction is always available and should be funded by all schools to enable this to happen
- Possibly opportunities for schools to come together (if they wish) to look at school improvement areas with the aim to support schools to share ideas / best practice with each other - e.g. a hosted forum or areas such as reading / writing / GPS / maths / PP / SEND / EAL. Happy to discuss further.
- See my response as X headteacher
- Specialists available to support special provision, such as special schools and mainstream schools with specialist units.

Q8- Why do you say this?

- I don't believe my school will get value for money from this. As a 'good' school I currently get very little support and that equates to a cost of £5,500 for my school which at a 'day rate' of £350 should equate to us having around 15 days of support - we currently don't even get a visit per term or access enough of the core offer to justify the expense.
- The amount would be around £1800 for our school, whilst I had some audits etc, I'm not sure we had that level of support??? I would be interested to know if I did
- I don't feel we receive £10,000 worth of support. I feel the £9 per pupil we de-delegated last year was more appropriate for the support we received. I would like to see a breakdown of what we received evaluate value for money. We subscribe to DRB Ignite as well as TELA - the latter of which seems to be more organised and Teaching and Learning related. I don't wish to be rude or overly critical, but £10,000 is a lot of money when schools are already at breaking point in terms of budgets. I would like to see some of our de-delegated funds go into SEND support.
- I am clear that this is for maintained schools but does this include academies? In the past the LA has supported all schools and will this continue and will the academies pay for support too or do LA maintained schools pay for them?
- Will school's see a return on this investment annually and not just when expecting OFSTED
- Maintain the integrity and support of the LA
- this seems a reasonable amount for those services if all available without too much extra cost
- With our pupil numbers this would be in excess of £8,000 for our school. Whilst I understand we need to support services for the greater good of the local area I am sure the Governing Body here would want to be certain that this represents best value for our school.
- is this inclusive of the de-delegated funding 22-23 we have paid this financial year or on top of this
- I think the LA offers some really valuable support that really benefit schools. However, I am not sure how much of this offer you are able to access and whether the position of your school drives the amount of support you are able to access. For example, would we be able to have a health check every year? Do we have a set amount of hours of support that we can access throughout the year and we decide the best type of support those hours are spent?
- This is something that if we wish to remain as a LA school, we need to support so at this moment in time I do not feel that there is much of an option as we do not wish to join a Multi- academy trust

- I think £18pp is too much. We are an average sized primary school and we would be paying £4338. I doubt the school would be using the offer enough to warrant this amount.
- I do not have the available funds
- NO too expensive with what I am getting for my money
- The school improvement offer has to be effective, robust and value for money
- Chair of Governors feel it is good value for money
- I do feel this is value for money for what is on offer. However, it would be beneficial if the core offer is truly honoured that there is some engagement with schools showing an indication of when reviews will take place and it not feeling like asking the moon on a stick when requesting something that is indeed on the list of what is offered.
- Absolutely - see previous comments too. As a school needing further support, I also feel a higher proposal would also be value for money to bring about the relevant change to raise standards.
- I am unsure as to what I am getting in addition to what I am able to access through my old partnership working.
- As I small school I see this as essential and valuable support. However, I could imagine larger schools preferring a cap to what they are expected to pay because essentially, I don't envisage the support differing greatly from school to school.
- I believe that it is important that these services are made readily available to maintained schools to maintain high standards across Leicestershire.
- We understand the need for the core offer. We recognise that there is a need to support the LA

Q9- Why do you say this?

- I know they will just do it anyway- so no discussion - But the LA needs to show HTs that this is good value for money - Which I believe with the right people and right events it could be
- From reading Schools operational guidance

Q10- Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

- I still feel that £10,000 is a great deal of money and I want to ensure that I have access to ALL resources that I am de-delegating for. I just don't feel that I am getting value for money.
- If possible, it would be lovely to have people who have had experience of primary headship and its challenges in the EEP roles.
- The post Covid Era and the 'closing ranks of ' academies has left us feeling isolated- this isn't healthy and I do want to remain an LA school, I value the services and support I get from safeguarding, H/S, HR etc However the core offer you propose and what we receive in practice needs to be looked at carefully - it doesn't match
- We believe it is important to have some things available should they be needed and it is like an insurance when you need it you need it and have to pay all the time.
- I absolutely champion the EEP team and their offer and appreciate having the likes of X at the end of the telephone to ask a question to. I think some of the recent training offers have been great - it is just the very short notice that is causing issues in order to be able to take full advantage of those opportunities. Would it be possible for this to be a little more strategically planned - a term in advance so that we can get the most out of it? Training like the Ofsted inspection training was fantastic - advertising what the actually cost of this would be (I know it was around

£420 a person through XXX) would show heads the value of the de-delegation of what's being offered. I think some more 'national' training / perspectives would be great to really drive leaders knowledge and school improvement.

- See my comments as X headteacher