

APPENDIX B

De-Delegation Consultation Results

Q1- Which area is your school located?	Blaby-3, Charnwood-8, Harborough-7, Hinckley & Bosworth-13, Melton-5, North West Leicestershire-22, Oadby & Wigston-3					
	Headteacher	Other	No response			
Q3- In what role are you responding to this survey?	56	5				
	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'	29	25	3	1	2	1
	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?	10	27	14	5	4	1
	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	47	12		1	1	

Effectiveness Partner (EEP)						
Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools	44	9	4	2	1	
Participation through a Collaborative Committee for maintained and academy members schools	33	17	6	2	3	
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)	43	16	1	0	1	
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	35	16	6	0	3	
Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service	29	25	4	0	3	
Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.	38	11	7	3	1	

Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance	24	21	11	1	4	
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)	37	14	5	2	3	
Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support	26	14	15	3	3	
Funding support with evidenced-based research projects in schools	25	20	8	1	6	
A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin	38	22	1			
Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring	19	5	15	21	1	
Regular meetings, seminars and webinars	29	26	5	0	1	
Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for managers and staff development – where appropriate (new for 2024-25)	27	21	9	2	2	
	Yes	No	Don't know			
Q8- Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the Local	50	7	3	1 blank		

Authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2023/24?						
	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?	57		3			

Comments

Q3. Other:

Executive Headteacher (2)

Chair of Governors (3)

Q4. Why do you say this?

- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) held a meeting with our collaborative group and explained the structure, functions, and limitations of LA support if school funds are not de-delegated.
- Information from the LA is very clear and transparent
- I understand the de delegation process and happy for the funds to be taken at source in order for us to receive the core and additional functions.
- Having had this explained at a _ Collaborative Meeting, I completely understand the statement outlined above.
- Meeting held with LA to discuss this explained well at briefing
- A comprehensive information session with the EEP with our collaborative group. A presentation was also shared via email.
- I am getting my head around funding/budgets and the role of the LA as a new headteacher and have had a meeting around delegated funding.
- I understand that without the DfE grant, de-delegation is needed to maintain LA services for schools.
- Explanation by education effectiveness department
- I agree that I understand the statement, however, I do not agree to the DfE's funding structure changing.
- Explained clearly by XXXX (Education Effectiveness)
- Not sure about the true cost and the impact of the support and how this will be measured and reported.
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) clearly explained this to my group of schools
- I understand that in order to fund school improvement services, the money will be taken from schools' budgets and paid to the local authority.
- Guidance from the Ed Effectiveness team on the matter.
- Fully explained by LA
- There seems no option, but the government should be paying this as an additional grant as budgets are already stretched
- This aspect has been fully explained to all Headteachers within our XXX Collaborative Group Meeting.

- Well-informed after thorough Ed Effectiveness presentation at collaborative committee / to XXXX group about de-delegation and implications for funding and support
- I understand the impact
- We had a meeting where it was explained to us very fully and our questions were answered.
- We have not been made aware of the impact of this proposal.
- I know what I have been told, but not seen this in practice, so far
- It has been outlined in communications from Education Effectiveness and school EEP.
- As this is no longer funded centrally, we understand (but don't necessarily agree that) unless this comes out of our school budget then we will no longer benefit from the support/services from School Improvement Services.
- I understand that without the funding important services will cease for our schools.
- Information provided as document and by being discussed in collaborative group
- We've had the opportunity to discuss this through our collaboration.
- As a maintained school I have appreciated the support.
- I have attended headteacher briefings where this has been explained to us.
- Our budget is already overstretched without losing more funds.

Q5. Why do you say this?

- I have not yet accessed all aspects of the AIF and therefore am unable to say if they are value for money. Those I have accessed and have been commissioned by the LA have been value for money.
- This school and many schools have benefited
- Very happy with the additional function offer and make good use of it.
- The school received a lot of support when I came to the school in order to raise standards quickly in anticipation of OFSTED
- Support for collaborative group very helpful.
- It does but does need high quality people to deliver that support.
- As a new headteacher at a school which is about to be inspected I feel I have had support from the LA in terms of EEP involvement, a health check, and various audits.
- I think that for some schools they would not need or have access to all the services offered during the year. Therefore, to be considered value for money the de-delegation should be more closely linked to what the school is actually receiving.
- We need some support including CPD
- Funding is bespoke to each school/partnership's needs.

- I do not feel that audits, which appears to be the primary offer, is a comprehensive offer. As a new headteacher in a maintained school, I feel we get next to no support.
- As a maintained school we would not be able to get the services for such value for money
- A lot of school improvement now comes from Academies /Trusts or from local specialised Hubs. As more schools convert to academies, I believe the LA school improvement offer will unfortunately become redundant.
- On the face of it, last year we had a School review, a Safeguarding audit and an EEP visit. We also had a website review. At £18 a pupil this means we paid around £7k. We felt the need to buy in additional advisor visits to work with leaders and also looked elsewhere. This means we paid £1500 out of school funds and the LA possibly paid £1k for advice to the school. So on that basis I tend to disagree.
- It is value for money should you need the support but if you are ok then you get less support
- At the briefing, costs were outlined to school leaders to help them to understand whether it was value for money or not.
- Support appropriately provided to schools that require it.
- I think the offer in principle represents value for money for maintained schools as a group. My hesitation is what this can look like on an individual school's basis.
- After the services were fully explained it was easy to understand. I think all governors would benefit from knowing just what is on offer perhaps as a GSD course.
- It looks good on paper but the detail of the amount of support is not quite clear.
- We do not know the impact and if this will represent value for money. We do not know which services will be offered to schools.
- If you are good or outstanding, you get less support. So, you are paying into a pot, for someone else?
- Over the past year our school has received many of the described audits and activities. This was due to the unique set of circumstances that we were in with an acting head in place and a subsequent RI grading in our most recent ofsted inspection. At times it felt too much but also some of the areas identified for development were not able to be funded, despite using LA approved staff to facilitate CPD and support for staff. This was quite frustrating.
- As a Collaborative group of schools, we met with the EEP team, we agreed to continue with the LA support for an academic year whilst monitoring the effectiveness of the support. We are still within this process and have been evaluating alongside our Governing Bodies. We have approached the LA to help fund school improvement across the Collaborative this year and will be discussing the impact vs cost at a later date.
- This is tricky! As a school we have benefitted - without a doubt - and from experience with other LA's/CC's I know that parts of the offer in Leicestershire are second to none! For example, the work of GSD and commissioned support through

the EEP team. However, as CoG I had to really push for a health-check in summer 2023. We were (are again now) an outstanding school and self-evaluated at the time to be 'Good'. We appointed a new HT in the middle of the pandemic who responded well to a health-check in 2021. However, we were desperate, as a Board, to secure reliable, external validation of this work in 2023 but were told that we were not eligible for further commissioned support at that time. Following a 'push' XXXX WAS booked for June 2023. As a Board we ensured her findings were acted upon and Ofsted then validated this work and awarded an Outstanding grade. My worry is that other schools may not/are not in the position to fully appreciate how crucial this work is to rapid school improvement. Furthermore, what we have also secured as a collaborative of schools, is our own investment in regular audit/QA as we feel that we need to supplement the current offer from the LA.

- We can do this as we are financially ok - many schools are not.
- As a special school we seem outside-some of the support offered on occasion. However, on request our EEP has been very responsive.
- Overall good for LA maintained schools. For my individual school, it is an expensive service in terms of amount of consultancy support.
- I agree the support offered is valuable, but I still believe that as a maintained school it should come from the DFE. However, I still stress that the support is very valuable.
- It's value for money will depend on how much of the additional improvement support we access.
- Again, we are struggling to maintain our own services with our current budget never mind losing another £18 per pupil.

Q7- What, if anything, else should we consider as part of our Additional Improvement Function?

- Would like post Ofsted support guaranteed and actually provided
- I think the quality of the standing list needs to be reviewed and quality assured as well as the opportunities to work with other providers i.e., EEF etc. There should be opportunities for this as I don't think the standing list is always the highest calibre or the newest thinking
- High quality experts in their field sent out to advise.
- Some answers to Q6 are 'don't know' as they are not relevant at the minute - e.g. Ofsted and new HT) or I don't have enough information e.g. the last question We do need to see change with finance systems which are out of date in the light of payroll changes and SIMS which is also out of date and won't communicate effectively (without duplication of work) with Dataplan and online banking- I don't need anyone to carry out a finance audit if you are just going to tell us there are lots of things we have to change and systems at County hall don't support us and LCC won't help us to correct - we have no money
- Funding group CPD

- As a small school I feel that what I will gain for the money paid is more than reasonable. However, I do feel for very large schools who have to pay a significant amount when based on £18 per pupil. I appreciate that their budget is greater but I wonder if the amount paid by very large schools should be capped.
- Full day local authority induction for new headteachers and mentoring, plus an onsite safeguarding visit for all new to headship headteachers from LCC Safeguarding and Compliance: I did not find this useful as a whole as it was a lot of information 'dumping'. Support is just not there. I would like ongoing support.
- Draw up an action plan with schools ahead of commissioning support for the next academic year (Cost out the support the school is entitled to.) Follow-up to the School Reviews by a qualified EEP rather than having annual school reviews. If these cost £500 a time, surely there are quicker and more cost effective ways to check on the recommendations of the initial school review? REVIEW by and INSPECTOR- FOLLOW-UP by an EEP. THEN IF NEEDED ANOTHER REVIEW!
- Fairness for all schools - funded support for all
- It feels like a challenging time, where many schools are part of academies and providing effective support is hampered by changing landscapes. At the moment, we are on a journey where we feel confident with our CPD and school development, whilst it would be nice to have wider external support, we have not felt that the authority has really be able to provide this and have in fact, found more useful advice and challenge within our own headteacher networks. To be able to provide any CPD offers that really meet the needs to a diverse range of schools is also challenging, as we are all on different journeys, so the equity of this offer doesn't always seem quite right. Whilst we have valued the support
- to develop our collaborative partnerships more, I'm not sure being allocated any funding for projects would be any more beneficial that us as a group of headteachers working to share CPD and put together plans to work collegiately to save on costs and where we have aligned school development priorities. As we continue to work more closely as a collaborative group, we feel this will almost run itself (for the time being). Things like audits are valuable, but we could still pay as you go for this, and it would be more cost effective to do so. Finally, with budgets so incredibly stretched, we cannot see how we can continue to afford anything beyond just paying staff at the moment - so we really need to manage every penny.
- Only the course as suggested. There is so much for governors new to education need to understand so anything that helps is appreciated.
- Knowing how much we have contributed and how much we are getting out of it in terms of services and value for money. It would be helpful to request money in such a way that it is beneficial for our school. If school has a successful OFSTED, is the earmarked money for OFSTED inspection support available to be used in an alternative way. More transparency about the service and packages available rather than only finding out from other schools and then having to request it.
- How this is allocated, we have not received everything that is listed. Some things that we have requested have not been allocated (eg SEND review & Safeguarding review).
- The ability for a more bespoke approach and some flexibility in funding - see previous comments.

- Potentially more thought as to the frequency of audit activities and the impact these have on smaller schools - having had an Ofsted, H&S audit, safeguarding audit and health check all within a very short space of time has had a big impact on workload of a very small team. A better degree of communication between the parties who arrange these would ensure that they are spread out to allow time to focus on next steps and to allow enough time to research and embed new strategies fully.
- Compensating schools in some way for peer-to-peer support in Collaborative Groups school improvement (as a well-established Collaborative Group we are being asked by a number of groups to give up our time to support them through establishing their groups)
- This is so important and 'word on the street' is that many schools are considering academisation as they feel that the offer from the LA is 'patchy-at-best'. In my work as an education adviser, this pains me!!!
- More support with GDPR matters Some elements of support are not relevant to special schools and we appear to need to pay towards website checks, HR checks, SCR check through LA commissioned services. There is no discount or subsidy for maintained schools
- Applying pressure to the finance department in LA, because all of this is fairly immaterial if schools have significant deficits. I know of no school without financial problems. Information is supplied late and inaccurate and makes decisions very difficult
- I feel very supported by the LA with the current offer. Currently we feel supported to remain maintained; I don't feel there would be any additional benefit to us as a school to join a MAT.

Q8- Why do you say this?

- In order to access the programmes of support, these will need to be funded.
- The school has received a high level of support in the past which contributed to the good ofsted
- For our school it provides value for money.
- I would not want to lose the services provided by the LA as a maintained school.
- I feel that there should be a fixed price for the core offer, which is lower, so represents better value for money for those schools not accessing the Additional Improvement function. The Additional Improvement offer should be an additional cost for schools that access this service.
- Because I do not see the value for money. I already pay into a collaborative, so this is on top, of that and only pays for school improvement work, not any wider systems.
- Good value for money
- As previously mentioned, LCC's school improvement offer will likely become untenable due to academisation.
- Depends on the changes as outlined in previous answer.

- The Governors have decided that it is important for me, as a Headteacher of a maintained school to have support
- The cost should more than cover the expense of buying services in separately.
- Yes, but only because we are not additionally funded by the government
- As a 'Collaborative Group' we have all agreed to support this de-delegation of funds.
- I think that funding needs to match school resources especially if schools are in deficit. £4,500 is a lot of money if a school budget is not balanced.
- Although I have selected yes, I feel the £18 is too high. I want to support the LA. Being a maintained school is important to the leadership team and governors at my school. However, we are in a deficit budget this year and likely to be again next year and the payment to the LA is a substantial amount.
- I appreciate the services offered especially the governor help. Headteachers also need somewhere to go for advice as it is a lonely job at times.
- Yes, as long as: all of the services listed are provided, there are staff available to support schools, the service is not reduced once this has been agreed.
- I feel it should be funded by central government. I feel services are targeted towards RI schools, but all schools will benefit regardless of their current OFSTED grading.
- £7470 would be the total for our school. We will have to monitor the support we receive to check that this is value for money. We do want the LA to continue to be available to schools and we realise this can only happen with de-delegation.
- As stated, I will not get much as an outstanding school, so why pay anything? Could be one question.
- If schools need extra support the LA should help them, not penalise others.
- Depending upon the outcome of the effectiveness of support gained from 2023-24 and with increasingly tight budgets to consider this becomes even more paramount.
- I feel that I don't have a choice!! We also top-up with additional funds - as outlined before
- Overall good value for majority of maintained schools
- I don't actually see that we have any choice. We need the LA support as a maintained school and without this per pupil funding, we wouldn't receive the support needed.
- £18 seems a reasonable sum per child, however if it is will be dependent on how successful the proposed functions are and how equitably they are shared amongst schools.
- Collaborative group decided we all would.

Q9- Why do you say this?

- Explained clearly at the meeting.

- Yes - there is no choice - if we say no DFE will just do this
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) told us at a collaborative meeting
- I had all my questions answered and I was able to explain at the governor meeting what was happening and the reason why. This was important as we had scrutinised the budget and the clarification of the 100% increase was the reason why was explained.
- Because I was told this information at a meeting. So assume this is a fact?!!

Q10- Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

- None, thank you!
- Grouping some of the training so it can be delivered to a few of us in one go e.g., Pupil Premium
- Thank you for all the work you do.
- Referring back to the question on funding around Governor Development; we already subscribe to GDS to provide similar support at the moment and would need to understand how these two services would function. Referring back to the question on finance audit support, this is currently provided without cost for maintained schools. If a new HT was in place, then we would probably access the induction service.
- To see the work of the Ed Effectiveness Team and GSD become increasingly aligned is super. As a school we are doing well - this is ultimately because we have great people in leadership roles.
- I have been really impressed with Safeguarding support from XXXX and our EEP XXXX. Both really professional and added value in terms of supporting our ethos of continuous
- improvement through their collaborative, informative and responsive approaches.
- XXXX (Education Effectiveness) is being proactive at promoting the benefits of collaborative working and being approachable. This is welcome and appreciated.
- No, thank you