



SCHOOLS FORUM

De-delegation for School Improvement

12 February 2025

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 Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	

1. **Purpose of Report**

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

2. **Recommendations**

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.

3. **Background** (details in ***Appendix A***)

The DfE removed the former School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant in 2023/24. This was replaced with the ability within the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations to allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum

maintained school representatives following consultation with schools and if not approved or by agreement of the Secretary of State. De-delegation applies to maintained mainstream schools only, a different funding framework applies to maintained special schools

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 could potentially leave maintained schools isolated and solely dependent on the capacity of local leadership and governance

Consultation

A consultation was undertaken with maintained schools over a two-week period (19th November- 6th December 2024). Details of the consultation are shown in Appendix 1.

The results show that of 47 schools who responded:

- 26 “strongly agree that they understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal”.
- 17 tended to agree that the core offer represents value for money, 2 neither agrees nor disagreed 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 2025-26? 35 respondents agreed, 8 expressed that they don’t know, and 4 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 B**.

4. **Resource Implications**

The school funding regulations make provision for de-delegation as the prime funding methodology to continue school improvement activity in mainstream schools, without this the service offer would need to be significantly reduced.

5. **Equal Opportunity Issues**

None identified.

6. **Background Papers**

[Schools Forum Report 13 February 2024 – De-Delegation for School Improvement](#)

7. **Officers to Contact**

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

APPENDIX A – 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 2025-26 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. Safeguarding training and advice commissioned with LCC Safeguarding in Education
 - g. Moderation training commissioning through LCC Moderation (Year 6 and writing)
 - h. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes
 - i. The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance
 - j. 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
 - k. Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support
 - l. Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools
 - m. A range of regular communications
 - n. Full day Local Authority induction for new headteachers
 - o. Regular meetings, seminars and webinars
13. It is proposed that this core offer continues to be delivered through the 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 2025-26

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 2025-26.
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, Northwest 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 and Additional Improvement Function offers for maintained schools'?

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

Why do you say this?

Q5 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the comprehensive Additional Improvement Function offer (described in the introduction) represents value for money?

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

Why do you say this?

Q6 How likely, if at all, is your school to access the following areas of LCC's Additional Improvement Function 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	
Participation through a Collaborative Committee for maintained and academy members schools	

<p>The rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback</p> <p>(including health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit)</p>	
<p>Next steps support with recommendations from the check and audits, from support commissioned in partnership between school leaders and their EEP and brokered by the LA</p>	
<p>Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service</p>	
<p>Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection</p>	
<p>Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance</p>	
<p>Fully funded centralised CPD opportunities</p> <p>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</p>	
<p>Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support</p>	
<p>Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools</p>	
<p>A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin</p>	
<p>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</p>	

Regular meetings, seminars and webinars provided by the LA and associated partners	
Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for managers and staff development – where appropriate (for 2025-26)	

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

Q8 Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver LCC's Additional Improvement Function and Core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2025-26?

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 B – Consultation Results

Questions	Answers					
Q1- Which area is your school located?	Blaby-3, Charnwood-7, Harborough-7, Hinckley & Bosworth-9, Melton-3, Northwest Leicestershire-17, Oadby & Wigston-1					
	Headteacher	Other	No response			
Q3- In what role are you responding to this survey?	43	3	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 and Additional Improvement Function offers for maintained schools'	26	17	2	2	0	0
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Q5- To what extent do you agree or disagree that the comprehensive Additional Improvement Function offer (described in the introduction) represents value for money?	14	21	10	0	-	-
	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 LCC's Additional Improvement Function offer?						
Partnership working with a dedicated	38	8	0	0	1	

Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP)						
Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools	31	13	1	1	1	
Participation through a Collaborative Committee for maintained and academy members schools	27	12	6	0	2	
The rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback (including health-checks and evaluation, safeguarding audit, Pupil Premium review, SEND review, External Review of Governance and Website Audit)	37	6	0	2	1	
Next steps support with recommendations from the check and audits, from support commissioned in partnership between school leaders and their EEP and brokered by the LA	28	13	2	2	2	
Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service	25	19	1	1	1	
Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection	25	15	2	3	1	

Commissioned specialised audits for HR and Finance	18	20	5	2	2	
Fully funded centralised CPD opportunities (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)	26	17	2	1	1	
Commissioned School Improvement Partner (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support)	19	14	10	1	3	
Funding support with evidenced-based research projects in schools	23	14	6	1	3	
A range of regular communications, including the headteacher bulletin	34	10	0	0	1	
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	16	3	13	12	3	
Regular meetings, seminars and webinars provided by the LA and associated partners	25	19	2	0	1	

Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for managers and staff development – where appropriate (for 2025-26)	23	16	6	1	1	
	Yes	No	Don't know			
Q8- Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver LCC's Additional Improvement Function and Core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2025-26?	35	4	8			
	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?	46		1			

Comments

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

- Governor

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 and Additional Improvement Function offers for maintained schools'?

Why do you say this?

- to access the following areas of LCC's Additional Improvement Function offer?
- explained well
- Services will not be able to be offered without it.
- I agree with the statement
- We appreciate that the LA have allowed us to have a dialogue about the support we need, so we feel we have co-led the SI for our school
- Fully explained
- the functions need to be done - DFE should fund all schools properly

- I value the EEP work and feel it is necessary for development of schools particularly those with new heads. I understand that it therefore is necessary for schools to pay back into a pot to support school improvement work.
- It is clear that this service could not be provided without a de-delegation for schools. However, I feel that there should be a fairer tiered system as schools that do not need as much support are not gaining value from the way the de-delegated funding system currently operates.
- lots of information available
- I understand that the LEA needs further funding to offer support to maintained schools
- This has been clearly communicated to schools.
- The support through our XXX Collaborative has been very productive.
- While I understand the impact of the loss of grant funding, we are in no position at all to de-delegate funds in response. Due to inadequate funding, low pupil numbers, high costs and an explosion of SEND needs, we have a high "in year" deficit and will be in "absolute" deficit within a few months. This proposal is totally unacceptable.
- I understand the Local Authority seeks ways to support Mainstream Schools through the best possible way and consults appropriately on what this looks like as an offer
- Understand this is a continuation as agreed last year. My chair of Governors also agrees
- It was explained to us last year in a meeting at school. We were able to have our questions answered.
- I have read the information
- Communication explains this and we have previously discussed as a board.
- School improvement is important, especially with being a small school as we relish the support and training that the LA gives us. Otherwise, this is not possible.

Q5 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the comprehensive Additional Improvement Function offer (described in the introduction) represents value for money?

Why do you say this?

- Mainly in the OFSTED window, the offer gives good reassurance to schools that they are doing the right things.
- Some services represent value for money.
- we need support from LCC
- Not clear on how it supports Collaborations e.g. Funding available and opportunities
- We have used many of the packages on offer Some of the services on offer are valued by school and governors The additional improvement function offer provides a range of support services that are valuable. However, schools not requiring the same level of support are paying the same amount even though they do not need to access the majority of the offered support. The support doesn't always meet the needs of the school and there should either be a tiered system of payment in operation or far greater flexibility and central decision making given to the school on what this money can be spent on. This would ensure better value for money as schools can shape the way their money is

spent to better meet their needs, rather than making a selection from a pre-agreed list.

- The number of courses offered have significantly increased this year.
- As a school we have accessed some of the improvement available
- We have received a lot of support over this year that justified the amount that we have paid as a school.
- Some provision has been excellent. For example, the provision of Talk for Writing projects had real impact on the school. I am also enthusiastic about the SPP project in our collaborative and how this might enable links across the county in future years. The commissioning of quality assurance (health checks etc) in schools can vary in quality and depend on who is commissioned. I would value having less choice and working with someone consistent across a number of years to see progress from one health check to another or one safeguarding check to another.
- With budgets so tight every penny counts and we do not agree that the offer we receive represents value for money.
- The signposting support provided by the EEP is helpful, always timely and clear
- Both schools have been part of the school partnership peer review program, had safeguarding audits and an independent learning walk
- Elements of the provision are very effective. Others do not meet minimum requirements
- This offer which is currently in place has been well received. The additional suggested improvements: Development and support of Governing Boards, in partnership with the Governor Support and Development service (I would welcome this as further support is needed as this is an area I have had to seek support from other Headteachers when I was new to headship and didn't know who to seek support from to support the board!) Support and development of safeguarding arrangements post inspection, audit or new headteacher one-to-one visit - an experienced headteacher/SIP to provide this support would have been invaluable as a first time headteacher. Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection - This would be welcomed if the support was given by an experienced, current Headteacher or inspector. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance - yes, as HR is an area which still needs so much support in a maintained primary school. Centralised 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 (These are all good examples. Another way would be asking for school's priorities and then grouping schools accordingly or giving collaboratives the money to commission CPD opportunities? - Commissioned School Improvement partner (SIP) support, mentoring and/ or targeted peer support with a school improvement consultant - This would be very beneficial to all schools. - Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools - I would be very interested in this area of support. - A range of regular communications including regular meetings, seminars and webinars - Full day Local Authority induction for new headteachers plus an onsite safeguarding visit for all new to headship headteachers from LCC Safeguarding and Compliance – This would

be very worthwhile and well-received. - Access to LCC online training tools as a resource for leadership and staff development – where appropriate (for 2025-26) - would be very well-received.

- This is very difficult to answer as we have never actually had to pay or had visibility of the associated costs. We do appreciate the support that has been historically provided.
- Both myself and Chair of Governors. Have been very satisfied with the level of support we have received this year.
- It is a lot of money from my non-existent budget so only value for money if I take up all the offers available
- Without all of this support, I as Headteacher, would not have been able to turn our school around in less than 2 years. the EEP and SIP support has been extremely beneficial.

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

- I feel the offer covers a lot already.
- Not found the training with Leicester useful due to not knowing what will be available.
- From my perspective I have had great support and feel like I have great value for money.
- Improved access to resources on LTS - very hard to navigate website and find relevant documents. Would like clearer guidelines on what support collaboratives are receiving.
- More bespoke specialist advice on our resource base. We attend the regular general resource base meetings and they are useful, but a specific Resource Base audit/health check with specific advice and also advice on how to use the high needs funding spreadsheets would really help
- Whole school training offer for INSETs and staff meetings
- As said in my previous answer, a smaller pool of trained SIP style leaders with a proven track record in school development would be desirable over a health check by a commissioned person that may never visit the school again. This would allow impact to be evaluated and work in a cyclical nature.
- I would be really interested in coaching or mentoring a new head teacher or a headteacher in need of support of this nature. I am not sure if this is something the LA currently offer or would consider offering. Some CPD around coaching would be really helpful and be beneficial for heads in various situations.
- Offer a professional coach for all leaders rather than just those new to the role
- Seems fine to me but recognise it is graduated
- A bank of finance support people for when problems with staff occur. Just like getting a supply teacher when needed, being able to access office staff short term would be invaluable.
- Providing some centralised back-office functions for business manager services/premises/H and S/ finance/complaints/SEND. Whilst not directly education improvements these issues are reducing effectiveness of educators.

Q8 Do you support the proposal of a £18 per pupil de-delegation to deliver LCC's Additional Improvement Function and Core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2025-26?

Why do you say this?

- We have to have the support
- It feels a bit unfair as we get the same 'offer' and yet I will pay significantly more with being a bigger school
- Sounds quite steep as I am heading into deficit. Cannot recall the figures for this year though
- As started earlier, there needs to be a fairer system of use to ensure this represents good value for money for all schools. I feel there should be a tiered payment system determined by use or a lower flat fee for all with top up payments for additional school improvement support.
- I support the need for these services and support to continue and if this is what it costs then I have to support it. £1800 per year for my school represents value for money with the CPD and wider offer provided. Pooling funds for buying power is sensible. Further conferences with engaging speakers would also be welcome and using these shared funds to enable CPD and speakers that schools my size cannot afford is value for money.
- I don't think we have much choice, even though we are asked to fill out this survey. I feel this is a lot of money for things we could access ourselves e.g. CPD - bespoke to our school groups, external reviews etc... with good quality Ofsted inspectors and HMIs without the need of the EEPs as 'facilitators'. On the two occasions I asked my EEP for support I was sent a link to DFE training on finance and a list of funding, none of which was appropriate to the question I asked and didn't solve my immediate problem. We are an SPP school and this has ended up being not quite what was sold to us and the SEND reviewers were also promised 3 days' supply costs and now it has been reduced to £200 per school (£400 per report). What will happen if a school refuses to send the report to the LA?
- I will go with what the majority decide, however 8K to a school which is in a 500k deficit is a lot
- We don't feel it is value for money for our school and with our budget heading into absolute deficit this money could be used more effectively elsewhere,
- Because it is necessary for the delivery of the work undertaken and for our school it represents a very good value for money.
- My school (like many) is currently running a deficit budget. Would the LA consider any flexibility with the price per pupils for schools in this position?
- I feel that the schools get back what we put in
- I would agree with this is the additional offer, which has been communicated to us, is added to the core offer.
- As noted previously, with our overall budgetary situation we simply don't have any money to pay! If this is taken, our deficit will simply get larger. There are no ways left to save money!
- Due to the changes in funding, the de-delegation of funds per pupil is an appropriate method of allocating funding across all maintained schools. The challenge for the Local Authority is that services are delivered to service level agreements all maintained schools.
- Value for money and we have trust built up. Headteachers do not have time to find suitable providers. This can be seen clearly with the problems that "pay roll" support and finding a competent company to help. We are still experiencing problems which takes time when the HT should be working on school improvement.

- I am not saying I disagree, but I don't really think I have a choice ... I will do it and take up the offers available to me and my school to try and get the most out of my funding!
- However, strengthening the core offer of useful support with finance / HR would be a better spend. It feels very isolated in schools now in particular around running our own payroll which has been so negative it may affect staff turnover for us, it is certainly negatively impacting on wellbeing / trust in relationships.

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?

Why do you say this?

- So if it happens, we just blame the SoSfE!!!!!!!
- As before it was explained to us.

Q10 Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

- None
- Thank you for all the support and hard work to establish collaborative working. It really feels like the LA and maintained schools have rapidly developed strength in this over the last few years.
- I have found our EEP to be very efficient and supportive when queries have been raised.
- No
- I am happy with the support and opportunities we have been given this year by the LEA. This has certainly had an impact on our pupils and staff.
- No, thank you!
- With the overall situation related to school funding I cannot believe that this is even being suggested! I do understand that the LA are also facing budgetary challenges but this is not the answer and will seriously damage relationships at a time when we really all need to be pulling together
- None
- Thank you for your support this year.
- See previous question

This page is intentionally left blank