

HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSES FROM SCHOOLS

Appendix 2

SAVINGS OPTIONS - SUMMARY

Please complete the response form by filling in the columns below indicating whether the proposed savings are high, medium or low desirability. If you think more or less savings are possible then please enter the financial value in the appropriate column. An example is set out as the top line in the table.

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes						
A	<p>Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k</p> <p>Desirability</p> <table> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </table>	Low	30	Medium	11	High	9	121	<u>17</u>	<u>29</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs council policy re small schools – not cuts Increase savings to achieve full £250k No –prefer savings on per pupil funding and grants Harsh but necessary All schools need to be financially viable Need small schools by design as pupil numbers falling Affects too many schools with low numbers Concerned MFG will not be kept at current level Accept may be necessary but small schools with falling rolls will find this acutely difficult to absorb Small schools provide a personalised curriculum and they are at the heart of communities and have always struggled for funding, therefore should be protected May be necessary – the overall situation and working of schools is changing and we will have to accept different approaches to provision – outside the established LA funding
Low	30										
Medium	11										
High	9										

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes
B	<p>Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k</p> <p>Low 12 Medium 11 High 28</p>	188	<u>37</u>	<u>8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase savings to £1m as pupil premium is worth £1m. Makes sense to reduce this area. Pupil premium will help offset. • More savings needed +£50k; More savings needed +£100k • This will have a big impact on our school • A lot has already been spent on this • Deprivation grants were introduced for a purpose – to enable increased allocation for children where the support was needed. The increased allocation enables children to have opportunities that wouldn't exist at home. The additional resources enables increased creative engagement – arts, books, drama, dance, access to toys, drawing equipment, ICT – the list is endless. “Narrowing the gap” • Continues to be a national and local priority yet Herefordshire is considering taking this level of funding away. All children simply don't have the same starting point in life – we need to improve their life chances and choices to enable them to break away from the deprivation culture into which they are born. • The ‘double funding’ issue remains with the introduction of the pupil premium. I think this should be offset further.
C	<p>Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k</p> <p>Low 14 Medium 20 High 16</p>	156	<u>32</u>	<u>12</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil premium will offset this. • We don't need both social deprivation funding and personalised learning. • This would have too big an impact on the children's curriculum. • Concern that schools that have above average free school meals will potentially lose out twice if this is reduced further – suggest £200k not £250k. • Appears to be additional “icing on the cake”. • Are there figures showing the effectiveness of this? • Easier to cover gap in small school • Unwelcome but agree savings are needed.

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes
D	<p>Reduce SEN funding by an average 5%</p> <p>Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only</p> <p>Low 19 Medium 17 High 12</p> <p>Option (a) 9 Option (b) 2</p>	99	<u>20</u>	<u>25</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No savings as early intervention works • Nobody has banded funding unless it is really necessary. They are the most vulnerable group of children. • Look at process for how funding is allocated many efficiencies for cost savings here • If schools are required to continue to operate the policy of inclusion, then the SEN children need to be funded at the appropriate level. • This would have a negative impact on the support we are able to offer our pupils. • Option B would be fairest. • Not desirable given it raises serious issues regarding equality of access to the curriculum and could add to the disadvantage already experienced by some children with SEN and their families
E	<p>Reduce school grants by 1.5%</p> <p>Low 7 Medium 20 High 20</p>	144	<u>36</u>	<u>7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review grant allocation • Increase savings to reduce onus on small school cut • Fair to all; At least it's a fair option. • All schools take this hit • But should not be year on year • Reduce school grants by 1.25% - subsidised by cuts in central services • Some of these grants were put in place to meet specific needs.
F	<p>Reduce AWPU by 0.5%</p> <p>Low 9 Medium 17 High 21</p>	200	<u>33</u>	<u>8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be higher across all schools • Increase savings to reduce onus on small schools savings • No – better option to alter funding per pupil to be more equal • Affects everyone therefore fair approach

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes
G	<p>Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG</p> <p>Low 10 Medium 15 High 21</p>	137	<u>33</u>	<u>8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disperse this amount amongst early years savings • If option A (above) implemented small schools may not have enough funds to buy into SLA/SEN services. • Concerns small schools will lose out. • Schools could buy back the service they require – BUT would this then hit schools with high levels of SEN more disproportionately than others? • Small schools relying on MFG could lose out too much • Not sure • Amount delegated should be tied to cost of buy back.
H	<p>Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only</p> <p>Low 3 Medium 10 High 38</p>	172	<u>44</u>	<u>1</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we be aiding the placement of children in settings from such an early age? • Should we be encouraging families to leave very young children in settings for longer hours?
I	<p>Charge for early years training</p> <p>Low 3 Medium 8 High 37</p>	100	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge at same rate as schools/increase these for all • We should not fund training for private concerns • Fair • Increase savings by £50k • Schools will have to pay for training so it would seem fair that both settings do. Perhaps we should consider more opportunities for training together.

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes
J	<p>Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%</p> <p>Low 11 Medium 16 High 16</p>	72	<u>32</u>	<u>8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on local authority school nursery class. • Equitable across the services • Nursery disadvantaged funding is not fairly distributed with what seems inconsistencies, the system for calculating this needs to be looked at. • Early years has historically been very favourably funded and has capacity for these reductions at least. • Like schools, they should take some of the cuts burden
K	<p>Reduce contingencies</p> <p>Low 2 Medium 15 High 33</p>	100	<u>43</u>	<u>1</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could it be larger?
L	<p>Reduce central DSG by -3%</p> <p>Low 5 Medium 14 High 28</p>	118	<u>39</u>	<u>3</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase central DSG savings to 5% like SEN • Increase savings by £50k • More cuts – suggest £200k minimum • Higher cut e.g. -9.5% • PRUs object to 3% cut and seek parity with schools. • 3% can make a huge or negligible reduction dependant on overall budget, needs finer tuning • Fair • Equitable • Take more from here. No to TU costs, 10% off early years central costs, 10% off admissions and school planning, 20% off primary heads forum, 50% off LMS review – would still allow review of grants, No to PRU additional funding should come out of high schools.

Option	Description	Savings £'000	Yes	No	Common Themes
M	Surplus £50k from the Governor Services reshuffle Reduce amount paid to Trade Unions Early years staffing reductions Music Service Freeze staff salaries except NQTs Closure of 8 smallest schools with less than 49 on roll would save £1.6m				
N					

Additional Comments

- Could restructuring of Children's Services have had more of a financial impact?
- Needs to be a strategic review which balances need and human resource use, to enable effective practice and a relationship with schools that impacts upon school performance and is not focused on administration
- Maximise savings from small schools protection and social deprivation
- Secondary heads – consensus – cuts unwelcome but general acceptance of the proposals – seems like reasonable distribution
- Please will you ensure that an analysis of all these comments is provided in order that the purpose of this consultation demonstrates transparency – this is particularly important because I have concerns that the final question could negate all of the above responses and there have decided not to answer it.
- I agree in principle however I do feel that there is significant disparity between schools across Herefordshire and this must be addressed.
- Central services should face more cuts in order to retain front line educational services

- Whilst we appreciate the need to offer reluctant support for these urgent budget cut proposals we continue to be extremely concerned about an apparent lack of leadership and strategy for primary schools in Herefordshire. We look forward to feedback on this.
- The governors are pleased that Jo Davidson is due to be meeting with HAG and that governors are to be a part of this consultation.
- The school closure policy needs to be reconsidered. There are a number of schools in the authority with under 50 pupils – are they sustainable?
- The whole picture is a challenge but I think we can be more creative around pupil premiums and deprivation funding to maintain the status quo until the council makes their decisions.
- As you would expect, I disagree with the proposal to take away funding from deprived groups so we can be seen to be more equitable.
- Could all heads receive an analysis of all responses – I would like to believe consultation can make a difference
- Once again, we are disappointed at the insufficient time given for consultation when this was discussed with Head teachers on 3rd Feb with consultation deadline for 11th February.
- No easy choices, am in favour of sustaining highest possible per-pupil funding figure. Schools with genuine high levels of social deprivation need additional resources but broad brush funding leads to significant inequalities e.g. between north and south.
- This process highlights how desperately the need is for a strategic plan on school provision. We appear to be perpetuating the status quo when there was broad consensus this was untenable two years ago.
- This is not a consultation process – superficial at best. Not a clear vision for the reductions nor a strategic vision for education.
- Small schools policy should be reviewed.

Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper?

Yes	30
No	11
Don't Know	15