

**HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2012/13 - BUDGET CONSULTATION  
BUDGET PROPOSALS – CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

1. A summary of the feedback to be consultation is detailed below – in broad terms the response from schools was low and almost uniformly in favour of the proposals. Feedback from the governor consultation meetings indicated a higher level of concerns amongst governors about ensuring that the delegation of SEN funding would be properly allocated and monitored so that SEN pupils continued to have their needs properly met.
2. The budget strategy cannot be finally confirmed until the DfE Schools funding announcement in December sets out the rate of unit funding in the DSG and the rate of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. It is also possible that announcements regarding the National School Funding Formula will also have an impact on the budget proposal and require small changes in the Herefordshire proposals. The January pupil census will determine the level of DSG that will be received.
3. Latest expenditure forecasts indicate that the SEN Complex Needs (CNS) budget for 2012/13 can be held at the same level as 2011/12 and that the £200k provisionally set aside for CNS can be reallocated. Depending on the DfE funding announcement, this could be provisionally as follows;
  - to support the delegation of Band 3 and Band 4 by reducing the impact of the savings in the MFG (£100k)
  - to providing some further training for schools and governors in meeting their SEN responsibilities (£30k)
  - to provide a budget for in year funding for out-county pupils (£50k)
  - to reduce the impact of the budget cuts on PRUs, say by limiting their reduction to -1% i.e. broadly in line with schools (£18k)

Malcolm Green  
24<sup>th</sup> November

Note: At the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> November the BWG preferred an option of using some of the budget to provide an fund for in-year out-county pupils transferring to Herefordshire schools rather than a suggestion to provide an incentive for schools managing their SEN budgets well ( Bullet point 3 above refers)

Option	Description	Savings (after MFG protection) £'000	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Responses from Schools	Responses From PVIs	Comments
B(i)	Reduce small schools protection by £100k  (i) <u>either</u> by lowering the primary schools thresholds to 600 pupils for high schools and 175 pupils for primary schools  (ii) <u>or</u> by a cash reduction of £100k applied equally to all high schools and primary schools	70	Yes	Yes 22 No 3  8-2 in favour of (ii)	Yes 8 No 2	Reluctantly – too many small schools – need to be strategic More savings from a reduction to a threshold of 150 pupils Comment from small schools not in favour Prefer cuts to small schools protection to reductions in SEN Support for “narrowing the funding gap” i.e. reducing disparity in unit costs per pupil Lower secondary threshold so that the percentage of Schools receiving protection are the same
C	Reduce social deprivation by £500k – to be offset by increase in pupil premium	233	Yes	Yes 21 No 5	Yes 7 No 2	Agreed but only if really offset against pupil premium Unwelcome but savings needed Greater savings needed instead of cut to small schools Specific comment from three schools in deprived areas that the pupil premium should be extra Schools with the highest need will find the overall formula dilutes the funding available and that Herefordshire Council has simply “robbed Peter to pay Paul”
D	Reduce personalised learning by £500k – to be offset by increase in pupil premium	168	Yes	Yes 21 No 2	Yes 10 No 0	
F	Reduce per pupil funding by 0.25%	125	Yes	Yes 17 No 10	Yes 8 No 1	
H	PVI nurseries – no reductions in 12/13	0	Yes	Yes 16 No 6	Yes 24 No 0	One small primary wanted more cuts to PVIs
J	Reduce central DSG by -3%	172	Yes/Early Years Mixed	Yes 23 No 2	Yes 5 No 7	PRUS concerned about the 3% cut – equivalent to £27k – asking for comparability with schools. Separate letter received.

		Savings (after MFG protection) £'000	Agree with savings propose d Y=Yes N=No	Responses from Schools	Respon ses From PVI's	Comments
<b>GRANT REVIEW OPTIONS</b>						
A	Do you support the proposed grants review to be implemented over a three year period		Yes	Yes 24 No 1	Yes 9 No 0	
E(i)	School Development Grant - Phase in changes to the basic grant over a three year period		Yes	Yes 25 No 1	Yes 9 No 0	
E(ii)	Excellence cluster funding - Further consultation re funding on a wider county wide basis to be implemented in 13/14 and 14/15		Yes	Yes 23 No 2	Yes 8 No 1	About 1/3 <sup>rd</sup> of replies expressed concern that the implementation of changes to excellence cluster funding was delayed until 13/14. Suggestions include sharing out to all schools on a per pupil basis and sharing out to all schools with high deprivation across the county.
E(iii)	Lunch Grant – allocate to primary schools only		Yes	Yes 22 No 3	Yes 8 No 1	
E(iv)	Specialisms – further consultation through HASH for implementation in 13/14 and 14/15		Yes	Yes 22 No 1	Yes 8 No 1	Money should stay with the school that earned it
E(v)	School Standards Grant implement the DfE formula and use any surplus to add a percentage increase		Yes	Yes 24 No 0	Yes 9 No 0	
E(vi)	Advanced Skills Teachers – pay £6,840 for actual ASTs employed until March 2015. Share balance (approx £100k) by pupil numbers		Yes	Yes 22 No 4	Yes 8 No 1	Should be shared out fully in 12/13 and rebranded as an SLA
E(vii)	School Standards Grant (Personalisation) – allocate by deprivation formula all in 12/13		Yes	Yes 25 No 2	Yes 8 No 1	One comment that free school meals is not a true reflection of need
E(viii)	Disadvantage Subsidy – allocate by deprivation formula all in 12/13		Yes	Yes 25 No 2	Yes 7 No 2	
E(ix)	One to One tuition – allocate by deprivation formula all in 12/13		Yes	Yes 25 No 7	Yes 8 No 1	
E(x)	Extended schools sustainability – allocate by per		Yes	Yes 26	Yes 9	

	pupil all in 12/13			No 0	No 0	
E(xi)	Primary and secondary strategy funding – allocate by per pupil all in 12/13 within phase		Yes	Yes 25 No 0	Yes 9 No 0	

		Savings (after MFG protection) £'000	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Responses from Schools	Responses From PVIs	Comments
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------	---------------------	----------

### FURTHER DELEGATION of BANDED FUNDING

8	G(i)	Delegate Band 3 and full band 4 to high schools	100 (est)	Yes	Yes 17 No 6	Yes 3 No 4	No reductions in funding, concern that SEN pupils would not be welcome, wrong that SEN funding is not ring fenced Reduction in admin/paperwork most welcome Concern about extra costs in a small high school e.g. hearing impaired pupils Budget principle “don’t cut SEN” but there are cuts due to the MFG protection being eroded by the new money Want a central contingency to meet unexpected high needs Not savings at the expense of the vulnerable
	OR G(i)	Delegate Band 3 and retain top-up funding (above Band 3) for high schools		No	Yes 6 No 12	Yes 7 No 1	
	G(ii)	Delegate Band 3 according to the sliding scale for primary schools	50 (est)	Yes/Mixed	Yes 12 No 8	Yes 4 No 4	
	G(iv)	Retain Band 4 centrally for primary schools		Yes	Yes 20 No 1	Yes 7 No 1	
	G(v)	Amend the sliding scale – please explain how in the comments box.		Mixed	Yes 5 No 7	Yes 4 No 2	Sliding scale not fair as it correlates SEN need with the size of school.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the proposals as set out in the consultation a paper

“ A continued effort to ensure equitable funding for all schools”

Schools Yes 18 – No 4 and PVIs Yes 14 No 3

One savings comment received - Extend Christmas holiday into January by 1 week to save on utility bills and weather problems - presumably offset by a 1 week reduction elsewhere in the year

