

## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

EARLY YEARS DEGREE GRANT ?

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

WORRIES OVER S.E.N REDUCTION AT POINT OF SERVICE, WHEN INCREASING NUMBERS OF SEN CHILDREN ARE WITHIN THE SETTING.

TO COUNTERACT THE REDUCTION, FEES WOULD HAVE TO BE INCREASED IMPACTING ON FAMILY OUTGOINGS. ~~THIS~~ THIS WOULD ~~IMPACT~~ IMPACT ON THE ABILITY OF THE PARENTS TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN OUTSIDE OF THE 15 HOURS.

WILL QUALITY SUFFER?

SEWERE BETWEEN CUTS AND MINIMUM WAGE INCREASES - INCREASING STAFF COSTS.



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

∅ Is primary spaces for children the same as PVI (as in costs per child and funding)

∅ Do we get the same additional cost - i.e. SEN, training, support for children with SEN, as primary.

∅

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

∅ NEF-cuts loss of staff due to cuts by 270

∅ lack of fees no extra provisions to give good quality care - education or staff

∅ may have to limit NEF spaces as this does not cover our costs, we loose money per child.

∅ having less training that has to be paid for will be impossible as we will not have additional or surplus fund.

∅

It is impossible to sustain the nursery on the cuts. WE WILL CLOSE!





## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

- As a <sup>small</sup> community setting struggling financially already a cut to nursey funding will force to <sup>us</sup> reduce the number of 3 & 4 year olds we take.
- Cut to SEN budget will have huge impact. at present 9 out of 50 in my setting access this grant & with Autism.
- Charges for training will have a reduction of quantity in the setting.

Handwritten text, possibly a title or header, located at the top of the page.

Main body of handwritten text, consisting of several lines of cursive script.

Small handwritten mark or character on the left margin.

Small handwritten mark or character on the left margin.

Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

My concern has been on the decrease in quality that Early Years providers offer. With the cuts I am interested to know where can children & families find the support if it is not available within settings? What is the plan that quality relating to ECH are met.

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

Major impact from lack of funding for training staff.  
Some training is safeguarding / first aid / food safety  
essential within settings.

Cost for training will have major impact on budget  
for setting, therefore resulting in not being able to send  
staff on training - being updated on info/knowledge  
therefore impacting upon Ofsted grade?!

Quality of provision will then be impacted and  
also could result in new parents looking at setting!

If further cuts on NEF - again resulting in parents  
being able to afford fees + also attend setting -  
lacking in numbers.





## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

What rate do Schools get for SEN as we already ~~have~~ ~~to~~ incur a loss in funds as it does not cover salaries at present!

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

May need to withdraw or reduce NEF places

Lack of quality - lower ofsted grades

Children starting school with less EY support/input





## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

Are the cuts really in proportion to S+ when we are effected by reorganisation of EIG grants & EYES.

what rate is SEN funding paid to schools as bands 1 & 2 are now within school budgets - we do not get any money in our budgets.

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

- \* May need to withdraw or reduce NEF places.
- \* lack of Quality - lower Ofsted grades
- \* children starting school with less EY input and struggling



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

The 15 hours is a statutory requirement & the 2% cut means this can't be delivered as settings cannot charge top up fees. How is this discrepancy going to be tackled?

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

- cuts in salaries of top tier managers & leaders
- less frequent training i.e. every other month.
- use empty classrooms/childrens centres for training



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

- Why are there only 2 representatives on the schools forum?

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

- Reduce the frequency, but maintain the quality of  $I_2O$ , using outside speakers etc.
- Agree with ~~item~~ item H.
- Item J - Funding has not increased since 2007, which has already been a reduction year on year.

As increased to 15 hours, sessional sessions now have less extra hours that would normally be paid for, so cannot recoup losses.





Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

- ① Training reduction
- ② Increase cost of fees
- ③ Administration costs - staff collating sending out NCF, postage, time form filling for grant.
- ④ Where does Hereford LEA lie in relation to charges for NCF?
- ⑤ What support will I receive from EY team?
- ⑥ Make the playing field level between schools / PVI settings - requirements have increased/making qualifications closer.

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

- ① Impact would be unlikely to afford cost + supply cover.
- ② Poor wages -
- ③ Pay supervisor/managers directly from LEA
- ④ If reduced would question sustainability
- ⑤ Will anyone have time for hands on advice!
- ⑥ I have completed Foundation Degree & Manage nursery (same as a head of LEA - staffing, planning etc) - but earn 1/3rd of a foundation stage teacher with 27yrs experience.



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

- ① Sufficiency + sustainability are main issues. Most families couldn't afford to use childcare. If settings withdrew from NCF, + many settings running at a loss.
- ② Not a level playing field between schools + early years on training front - our staff start as volunteers + progress via training. So training is essential + the training provided by EYES better + more affordable than commercial providers which will be the alternative if EYES training cut, + we can't afford that.
- ③ What is the £20k per EY child compared with school child?
- ④ Advisory services offered by EYES are excellent + essential in what is still to a

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

large extent a voluntary sector.

- ⑤ Early Years is already a Cinderella service run on minimum wage + voluntary efforts without capital or infrastructure in most cases; it can't afford to take cuts. (compare teachers' pay + pay of staff in early years). There's a lot of hot air about the importance of early years provision for life outcomes, but + many wonderful + skilled practitioners, but without support the whole sector could collapse.





## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

12.5 hrs instead of 15 hrs - why was the requirement increased simply to cut the funding?

Our setting is already subsidised by our charity shop. We would have had to close 3 yrs ago if we didn't have this. We believe in good quality childcare with high ratios of staff: children. If the 3% cut goes ahead it will mean we no longer can do this = reduction in quality. This will then result in problems for primary schools to pick up later.

Our setting has 11.3% SEN children (way above average) these cuts will mean these children receive less 1:1 time and therefore build up issues into primary school

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

It is the most vulnerable children that would suffer.



Leaders/managers feedback re DSG budget proposals  
Feedback from the leaders/managers on the options presented ( including  
the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families )

1. Funding would not match the hourly rate of the nursery.
2. We are unable to cut staff costs due to the adult to child ratio
3. We would not be able to consider increases to direct staff wages, therefore there would be a risk of losing good staff.
4. There would be a bigger gap over time between funding received at the progressively reduced rate and the increase of costs due to inflation and cost of living.
5. There would be a reduction in the quality of resources if budgets were reduced and this could lead to reduction of quality to the education provided.
6. We are in an area of deprivation and the users of our provision rely on the NEF. Therefore putting the provision in an extremely vulnerable position.
7. There could be the real possibility of the provision closing if we were unable to offer funded places due to it not being able to meet our hourly rate.
8. We are already cutting back on our provision due to the economic climate and have identified the majority of our users are only accessing funded places.
9. If PVIS closed there would be a gap between the required number of places and the number of places available. Therefore money would need to be found by the authority to set up new facilities to accommodate the need.
10. As we are in an area of deprivation we would also suffer if the social deprivation is cut therefore compounding the issue.
11. Reducing training budgets may effect the quality of service the provision offers, however cuts in training could be made by reducing wastage and consolidating courses offered.

Suggestions of savings elsewhere

1. Reduce the number of children's centres in the south Wye area as not all centres are used to there full capacity. This would then reduce running costs and salaries.
2. Consider more competitive contracts for training, premises, maintenance and outside services.
3. Streamline administration costs and systems in place for claiming funding.





## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

(H) Cutting the grant by 2% will lose our setting.

(J) £4000 per year. This is used to enable us to provide high quality provision allowing us to work closely with families to support them. If these cuts are to be made we will no longer be able to employ a supernumerary member of staff to offer such support. We will need to re-consider how we raise money to pay for resources, time to do Learning Journeys etc.

(I) Training has had a major impact on the way we facilitate CPD in our settings. In order to help children to achieve the 5 outcomes, fully trained and competent practitioners need to develop and progress their knowledge.

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

With many of the services being cut we are finding that much of our time is spent supporting parents through many diverse situations within their lives. We believe that in order for children to develop emotionally, practitioners need to be available to support such families which have a major impact on children's lives. We can sign post some families but not all, <sup>and</sup> ~~as~~ if any more services are cut, children will feel the impact.



Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

Questions/issues raised by PVI leader/managers related to the DSG consultation paper

(J) Do we still have to offer  
15 hrs free funding place  
when we are taking 2%  
cut - This means we are  
running at a loss as there  
is no ability to make any  
extra money -

Do you expect us to survive  
or pull out of NEF !!  
The 15 hrs has caused us huge  
problems.

Feedback from leaders/managers on the options presented (including the likely impact of the reductions on EY settings and families).

The impact is - how long can  
we run at a loss.  
we have a three yr. waiting  
list but this free 15 hr  
funded place will break us.

Angela Curry  
The Red House Nursery School

over →



It would be so unfair to put out  
of NEF because the children that  
really need a nursery school place would  
not be able to afford to pay!  
I want to continue to give the  
children the quality the setting has  
always provided.  
I want to pay my staff a fair  
wage for all the support +  
enthusiasm they put into the school.

# Response to Budget Consultation

## St Paul's Nursery

### Changes to Funding

Having read through the consultation document and in view of the current economic climate I feel that it would be wrong of PVI nurseries to expect to be protected from any inevitable financial cutbacks that will need to be made. I can see that the points that I wish to make have all been considered in the report but I would draw attention to them again as I hope that they have been carefully discussed at all levels.

1. The extension of 15 hours funded education for 3 and 4 year olds has inevitably been well received by parents and the majority have chosen to take up the extra 2 1/2 hours now available to them. As the amount of children who can attend nursery at any one session (as dictated by Ofsted) has remained unchanged the knock on effect has been that we now have less children on our role although we are as full as ever. To some extent this should level off but as a PVI nursery we are actually offering less support for parents in the local area than we did two year ago.

On role January 2009 101

On role January 2010 93

On role January 2011 84

You may feel that this is unimportant given a falling birthrate but this is not the case in an area such as ours with good feeder schools and a successful secondary school as this area will always be full of young families. Moreover there is more evidence to support this.

January 2010 9 new children started at nursery

January 2011 13 new children started at nursery

January 2012 we already have 18 children on the waiting list to start then

So you can see that a need is out there.

2. The extension to 15 hours has meant that the additional 2 1/2 hours have been paid at a rate of £3.41 per child. (plus a small flat weekly rate which shared between the children only has a minimal effect.) We currently charge an hourly rate of £3.60 so we are only a little worse off. However in September when we review our fees we are likely to put up our fees (possibly only by 10p. per hour) but by then the single funding formula will have dropped (April 2011) to £3.21. At that stage there is a greater differential between those non funded children or those funded children paying for a 16th hour and those 3 and 4 year olds who are funded. When the SFF drops in April 2012 to £2.91 our hourly rate could be almost £1 more. This does not provide for a fair system as the education and care we provide will be equal for each child at the nursery but one family will be paying more to subsidise the funded families. As a political debate I wonder at what point families will stop sending their 2 year olds to nursery? I wonder if this is what is intended both locally and nationally? Is this really offering parents choice? I can see some PVI nurseries becoming financially unviable to run and being forced to closed. (Clearly this has been discussed by the LA as there is a contingency provision in the consultation document as there is a recognition that an alternative may need to be set up.)

3. The introduction of SFF was debated long and hard a few years back and we made most of these points then although we were not in a position to see what the real impact would be. I was really disappointed last year when it was announced that although it's introduction was to be delayed Herefordshire Council felt that it had invested so much time and effort into the process that they were going to press ahead with it's implementation. Whilst accepting why a SFF has been wanted it is the inability to charge a top up which has led, in part, to the issues above. I recognise that PVI nurseries have tight guidelines by which to conform but I can see why some are thinking "outside the box" to try to charge for different things in order to boost their income. I am worried about the financial future of the nursery. If I were a private individual I would be really looking at the future of the nursery as a going concern. Thankfully I am personally employed by the Church PCC who have always recognised the important social role the Church plays in the local community. Indeed historically the Church has often been at the forefront of social change.





4. The extension of funding has been "sold" to parents as "free nursery provision" for their children. Whilst this is true for them the word free to us actually means " at a rate set by the LA". This rate is the same whether the provision employs well qualified staff over and above the minimum ratios required by EYFS or whether it employs only the bare minimum of qualified staff. It takes no account of the size of provision, available resources, quality of care etc. Clearly it can not and I am not suggesting that it is unfair in itself. What I object to is the suggestion that all PVI nurseries can provide good or outstanding care on a SFF dictated to by LA. Only when I hear this point acknowledged more by politicians and councillors do I think that parents will begin to see what they are actually being given free. Of course we can provide a service on SFF but if we want to pay for good quality resources (both staff, training and equipment) we have to be able to raise income elsewhere. In January 2011 we had an Ofsted inspection (the report is in the process of being published). It rated us as Good with some outstanding features (4). How will we be able to convert these good into outstandings if financial support for improvements is being withdrawn or reduced? Presumably the LA wants to move nurseries onto outstanding (given the title of its current support programme Journey to Outstanding) or is it going to have to accept that good is good enough. How many PVI nurseries, if not forced to close due to lack of financial support, will cut down on staff/resources etc. and potentially be looking at being satisfactory? I personally don't have a problem with a satisfactory grading on paper but is this what the LA wants?

### **Changes to Inclusion**

The 4 outstanding areas of our recent Ofsted (January 2011 but still waiting to be formally published) are:

The effectiveness with which the setting deploys resources

The effectiveness with which the setting promotes equality and Diversity

The effectiveness of partnerships

The extent to which children make a positive contribution

Comments were made as follows:-

"exceptional partnerships with other agencies and professionals ... (ensure that) .... excellent provision is made for children with special educational needs and disabilities"

"a particular strength of the provision is the use of activities and resources to support children with special educational needs/or disabilities"

"outstanding arrangements are in place for partnership working ..... (which ensures that) staff receive a high level of support ..... for dealing with concerns and addressing the specific needs of children and parents"

We are obviously delighted that this hard work has been recognised but also feel that the LA Inclusion team should also take a pat on the back. Their unfailing support and guidance has been invaluable to us over the past 18 months. We would not have achieved these outstandings without their help, and without singling anyone out we would like to say a huge thank you to Cath Davenport for her unstinting patience with us.

However I have a real concern that the proposed future financial cutbacks with regard to Inclusion is short sighted. I hope that we will be able to use our new found Inclusion knowledge to continue to provide outstanding care. The cutbacks will however make it harder to press on and convert our goods into outstandings. It will also make it harder for other settings to move on. In part our outstandings have been because we have been able to provide some good 1-1 support for the most needy children as well as free up staff to do small group works. We have already seen a drop in our Inclusion grant this term which jeopardises the things that we do over and above basic responsibility ie. observations and attendance at CDC meetings, training courses, leading CAF meetings. I know that these are all good practice but such things will become financially more difficult to maintain in view of the cutbacks referred to above. There is strong evidence that early intervention is successful and this should be the last area to suffer cutbacks.



FINALLY I WISH TO EXPRESS ONCE AGAIN THAT THESE VIEWS ARE MY OWN PERSONAL VIEWS AND IN NO WAY REPRESENT THOSE OF THE CHURCH OR PCC OR ANY OF MY OTHER COLLEAGUES WITHIN THE NURSERY.

Kind Regards

Karen Bishop.  
Manager  
St Pauls Nursery  
c/o St Pauls Church Community Centre  
Church Road  
Hereford  
Herefordshire  
HR 1 1RT

Tel: 01432 379363

E-Mail: [stpnersery@googlemail.com](mailto:stpnersery@googlemail.com)





# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	Low	No			Will effect smaller, rural settings like o.w.s.
I	Charge for early years training	100	Low	No			Will restrict training availability to all settings. – only those who can afford it will pay.

- J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72
- K Reduce contingencies 100
- L Reduce central DSG by -3% 118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

LOW NO

Small pre-schools will suffer due to lowered income

**Additional Comments**

**Final Question:** Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO

**NAME** Mison Bowles.

**SCHOOL** Avon Harold Pre School **DATE** 10.2.11.

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

Additional Comments

use understand that cuts do need to be made over all sectors, but feel that the PVI Sector will see major changes to the way Early Years settings facilitate their service to families. Both our settings are in a deprived area and are heavily relied on by families living in the community to offer high quality provision, but cannot foresee sustainability in the future if cuts to NEF ~~and~~ continue to be cut.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO

NAME

NICKI OVEL, Karen Robinson, Sharon Evans, Sharon Parham.

SCHOOL

Merry-go-round @ Green Copp DATE 8/2/11  
Merry - 50-round @ Our Lady's.

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or		Comment
					Increase savings by amount £'000	decrease savings by amount £'000	
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	L				
I	Charge for early years training	100	L				



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	M
K	Reduce contingencies	100	
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

Reference H, I, J, S - ~~strongly support~~ On their own they rate low/medium, but all 3 together have a much higher impact (knock on effect). The cuts for us would not directly leave our setting at a closure point, but our money is invested within our staff, resources & supporting professionals, which means our service is outstanding. This too increased our business & we are providing neighbouring schools with children who have had a very positive impact to learning & development. This is supporting the values of ECF. If this service declines the outcomes would be harder if not possible to meet. Therefore I am very concerned with the quality of our service being compromised and children, families and schools will be impacted. Can schools pick up the quality if it is not available at early years.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO  NO

NAME Sarah Price

SCHOOL Kirkbolton Nursery Group DATE 7/2/11

# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPUP by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M Reduce paper work around sending NCF -

N

Additional Comments

see food back sheets,

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO

NAME Stanton on wye pre school - Joy Holloway

SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_ DATE 7.2.11

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	Low				
I	Charge for early years training	100	Medium, Low				

Perhaps reduce hrs rather than grant funding.  
Keep costs to minimum, small settings cannot afford these.

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	Low - NO!
K	Reduce contingencies	100	Low
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

Reduce but not  
 funding.  
 why such a large  
 % cut to those that  
 need it most? (SEN)

M  
 N

Additional Comments

These cuts would result in huge equality - the poorest children are the ones that would suffer most.  
 We need to maintain quality in EY - reduction in funding = ↓ in quality which in turn means problems stacking up/accumulating for primary schools to pick up later.  
 We have very high % special Ed needs (11.3%) reduction in funding will affect them most - we have really seen the improvement + value in high ratios + specialist work with these children. Cuts would prevent this and lead to the children suffering.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES  NO

NAME Aisling Hume

SCHOOL HOPE Family Centre DATE 7th February 2011

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or		Comment
					Increase savings by amount £'000	decrease savings by amount £'000	
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	LOW	No			Will hit vulnerable children most Need thus to keep quality in settings
I	Charge for early years training	100	LOW	No			

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	low	NO	NO	NO
K	Reduce contingencies	100	low			
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118				

will hit vulnerable families

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M Return to 12 1/2 hours, keep funding same as before

N Able to change top-up

Additional Comments

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO

NAME STEVEN DAVIS

SCHOOL HORE Family Centre

DATE 7th February 2011

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172		Y			
I	Charge for early years training	100		N			will reduce quality in settings



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	
K	Reduce contingencies	100	
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

N  
N

*Serious implication for voluntary settings who are already struggling. Means us cutting down on the amount of children able to attend with SEN.*

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

**Final Question:** Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES  NO

**NAME**

**SCHOOL**

**DATE**

Response Form **MUST** be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)

# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					<i>Close some of the very small schools</i>
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					<i>Most groups will be able to afford it &amp; therefore standards will go down.</i>



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

- Sustainability of settings is at risk - many will close or give up. Costs have already risen & settings are struggling now.  
 - Huge issue for equality of quality - vulnerable children will be the one to lose out & quality will go down. PVI save the CA money & have been very cost effective because of low wages for staff. Quality will be diminished as settings won't be able to afford training. Level of quality in settings a driving good & obtaining will fall & standards will drop. Housing standards for settings is lowering standards for the L.A.  
 - Is the proportion of cuts for Early Y's the same as that for primary?  
 - The CA has a statutory requirement to provide training, advice & support - this will maybe in jeopardy  
 - The importance of Early Years is always talked about but is not backed up by money  
 - Early Years has already had a cut with a previous structure & this is not reflected in this DSG budgets as we are affected by other cuts in other budgets i.e. sure start.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)  YES  NO

NAME Tasha Tweedale

SCHOOL Childrens Gate Teacher DATE 7/2/11



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	Low	Y			Reduce frequency, but maintain quality
I	Charge for early years training	100	Low	N			

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	High
K	Reduce contingencies	100	Low
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

Funding was not necessary since 2007, which has already been a reduction year on year. Continued training to make well qualified employees in settings

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

Funding hasn't been increased for 3 years, relatively higher than 28. As it has been extended to 15 hours, sessional settings are now having less extra hours that would normally be paid for, so cannot recover losses, so we then are having to have more children, staff on basic pay. Council state still getting salary increases.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly) YES/NO

NAME Janet Graves

---

SCHOOL Rainbow's Nursery DATE 7/11/02

---

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk

PVI's are providing a service, so the council has a duty to the settings, not the other way round.



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

*If our standards drop because we are no longer able to afford to attend all the training we would wish, this will have an implication to the Ofsted inspection - outcome per*

- J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72
- K Reduce contingencies 100
- L Reduce central DSG by -3% 118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

The rate is already below our hourly rate  
how much lower will it get before the  
needs arises for me to opt out of the DSG system

Additional Comments

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly) YES/NO

NAME Lyrene Marsden (Approved Governor)  
 SCHOOL Quilshinburn DATE 7-2-11

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

**Additional Comments** I think the board should consider that early years settings are extremely diverse, and therefore a blanket approach towards budget cuts will have significant impacts on the outcomes for children. Staff training needs to be maintained without impacting upon the effectiveness of settings, but may be streamlined to be more cost effective. The management (senior) are they facing cuts - as the early years has already undergone a significant reduction already

**Final Question:** Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)  YES/ NO

**NAME** Tracey Dutton

**SCHOOL** Celebrage the school. **DATE** 07 Feb/11.



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPUP by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

- \* IN RELATION TO I,J,K;
- WITH RISING COSTS IN GENERAL RUNNING OF A SETTING I.E UTILITIES, IT IS GOING TO GET HARDER + HARDER FOR SETTINGS TO REMAIN SUSTAINABLE, SETTINGS ALREADY STRUGGLING FINANCIALLY.
- GOVERNMENT'S AGENDA FOR HIGHER QUALIFIED STAFF + HIGH QUALITY EARLY YEARS WILL BE HARDER TO ACHIEVE IF FUNDS ARE REDUCED AS SETTINGS WILL NOT BE ABLE TO AFFORD TO RELEASE STAFF FOR TRAINING, LET ALONE COVER TRAINING COSTS. THEY ALSO WILL BE UNABLE TO SUSTAIN THE WAGES FOR STAFF TRAINED AT LEVEL 5 + ABOVE AND MAY OPT FOR LOWER QUALIFIED STAFF WHICH COULD ALSO IMPACT ON THE QUALITY OF PROVISION.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

NAME DONNA WILLIAMS

SCHOOL HUNDETON NEIGHBOURHOOD NURSERY+KIDS CLUB DATE 10/2/11

LTD

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

**Additional Comments**

I believe from making the proposed cuts to the PVI nursery formula funding and the reduction 5% in the SEN will have a profound effect on our setting which may even result in our setting closing. If these changes are made we will have to put up fees for our non funded children which will again result in children moving to other settings which are more affordable again resulting in closure of our outstanding setting.

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO  NO

NAME Paula Barnett

SCHOOL Nardon Pre-school DATE 10/2/11



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

*We will struggle to keep setting open.*

*N Y*  
*L M*

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	L	N
K	Reduce contingencies	100	M	Y
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118		

We are already losing over £1000 per yr.

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

Additional Comments

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

~~YES~~/NO

NAME ANGELA GURRY

SCHOOL The Red House Nursery School DATE 7.2.2011

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk

# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or Increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPUP by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	L	N			We will struggle to continue!! Essential training ie. not aid. Safeguarding should be paid for by MFS.
I	Charge for early years training	100	M	Y			



We are losing we £500 per week  
 still. Only access (industrial grant for mother  
 cut here, but into maintenance good  
 if there were more!

J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	L	N
K	Reduce contingencies	100	M	Y
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118		

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

- M <sup>cut</sup> costs in paperwork / correspondence.
- N capping staff wages in <sup>A.</sup> council

Additional Comments

\* Sustainability  
 \* how can we maintain equality + quality!!

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO  YES

NAME KATHIE JONES

SCHOOL Arbours 2000 Nursery School DATE 7/2/2011

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herfordshire.gov.uk



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 2.5% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					

- J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72
- K Reduce contingencies 100
- L Reduce central DSG by -3% 118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

**Additional Comments**

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)

YES/NO  NO

NAME HCT NURSERY

SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_ DATE 07.02.11

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)



# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99					
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144					
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137					
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172					
I	Charge for early years training	100					



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72
K	Reduce contingencies	100
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

A look at senior management salaries "Start at the top"  
 More training in the Education Centre rather than hotels etc.  
 Cutting paperwork especially NCF  
 "Impact on Standards" we have already seen cuts in our early years support teams

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly)



NAME JANE SCOTT

SCHOOL CHILTONER PRE-SCHOOL DATE 7/2/2011

# HEREFORDSHIRE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION – RESPONSE FORM

## 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	Desirability of option H=High M=Medium L=Low	Agree with savings proposed Y=Yes N=No	Or increase savings by amount £'000	Or decrease savings by amount £'000	Comment
E.g.	Example – open schools for 35 weeks in the year	100	Low		+50		Good idea – suggest only 30 weeks like universities – but unfortunately not legal.

## SAVINGS OPTIONS

A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121	low	YES			
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188	High	NO			
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156	low	YES			
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99	low	YES			
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144	low	YES			
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200	low	YES			
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	low	YES			
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	High	NO			
I	Charge for early years training	100	low	YES			



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	NO	HIGH
K	Reduce contingencies	100	YES	LOW
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	NO	HIGH

Please add any other proposals you would wish to be considered by Schools Forum

M

N

**Additional Comments**

Final Question: Do you broadly agree with the savings proposals as set out in the consultation a paper (please indicate clearly) YES/NO

**NAME** D. Stenley

**SCHOOL** Play & learn nurseries

**DATE** 9-2-10

Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to [malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk)