

# 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	LOW				

- J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72 **LOW**
  - 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

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** **SHEILA BEE**

**SCHOOL** **BURGLES NURSERY** **DATE** **8TH FEB 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 AWP/PU 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	High	Y			
I	Charge for early years training	100	Low	Y			It must be remembered that the impact is difficult to assess as other cuts have not yet been quantified.

J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72 High N

K Reduce contingencies 100 Low Y

L Reduce central DSG by -3% 118

M Remove the 2 year old funding completely & transfer that money to DSG for early years

N

This cut will mean that even more settings are not covering their basic costs for a NEF session with no other source of revenue to support it.  
This is in line with schools so is acceptable

**Additional Comments**

These new cuts come at a time when NEF has not been increased for several years and staffing cuts within the council may leave a lot of settings vulnerable. The cut back in early years does not support the Frank Field report or the governments emphasis on early years education and the savings it brings in later schooling.

It is important to look at what we are asking of people (teachers and childcare professionals) and then what we are paying them. A large % of childcare workers are on minimum wage and yet are expected to perform at a much higher level because the finance is not available to match salary with performance.

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 Rose Lloyd

SCHOOL Cabin Childcare Limited

DATE 08/02/11

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



Deleted: R

Deleted: 1

# 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.

Deleted: 1

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	High	Y			
I	Charge for early years training	100	Low	Y			It must be remembered that the impact is difficult to assess as other cuts have not yet been quantified. <u>This cut will mean that even more settings are not</u>
J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding	72	High	N			

by -2%

K Reduce contingencies

100

Low

Y

L Reduce central DSG by -3%

118

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

covering their basic costs for a NEF session with no other source of revenue to support it. This is in line with schools so is acceptable

M Remove the 2 year old funding

completely & transfer that money to

DSG for early years

N

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 Rose Lloyd

SCHOOL Bridges Childcare Limited

DATE 08/02/11 response Form

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

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 1



# 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	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188	<u>High</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156	<u>High</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99	<u>Low</u>	<u>No</u>			
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144	<u>High</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
F	Reduce AWP by 0.5%	200	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	<u>High</u>	<u>Yes</u>			
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	<u>Low</u>	<u>No</u>			
I	Charge for early years training	100	<u>Low</u>	<u>No</u>			

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

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

M

N

**Additional Comments**

To expect the Early Years sector to make a greater contribution to the savings as a % of their overall fund is unfair. Early Years childcare is essential and every child who receives excellent preschooling is likely to "cost less" in later life.  
 Do not deprive the Special Needs sector

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

NO

NAME	<i>Iris Prices</i> SCHOOL	<u>Ross Preschool Playgroup</u>	DATE
	07.02.2011		

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



- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, No underline
- Deleted: YES/
- Deleted: ¶
- Formatted: Font: Italic



# 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		Or		Comment
				Y=Yes N=No	Increase savings by amount £'000	Or	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 AWP by 0.5%	200						
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	Med					
H	Restrict former Early years extra	172	High					



	entitlement grant to 15 hrs only		
I	Charge for early years training	100	High
J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	Low
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

From a personal point of view, our setting has invested over the years in training and staff turnover is low. We had anticipated this proposal and have already begun to budget for future training needs. We will work in partnership with other settings and schools to reduce training costs.

A further reduction would seriously affect our sustainability and may mean we withdraw from NEF funding.

**Additional Comments**

I have answered the questions which are relevant to our setting.

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

YES/NO

*not indicated.*

<b>NAME</b>	<u>Mrs Jackie Bowen Nursery Manager</u>	
<b>SCHOOL</b>	<u>Trinity TreeTots Nursery</u>	<b>DATE</b> <u>04/02/11</u>
		<b>Deleted:</b>

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 AWP 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	M	Y			Affects quality of extended/flexible care provided
I	Charge for early years training	100	L	N			We may not be able to afford training, thereby risking lower quality provision. Council has statutory



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	L	N	duty to provide training, advice & support to early years settings We're likely to lose money as we are a small, rural setting
K	Reduce contingencies	100	M	Y	This may affect children with special needs in the future.
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**

The training that is currently provided is not well administered – we struggle to get staff onto a course and there have been cancellations without notification so there are definitely efficiencies to be made.

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

**NAME** M. Spinks (Chairperson of management committee)

**SCHOOL** Dilwyn Playgroup **DATE** 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 2011 Response Form MUST be returned by 11<sup>th</sup> February to malcolm.green@herefordshire.gov.uk

Deleted: YES

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 1

## 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	L				
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188					
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156					
D	Reduce SEN Banded funding by 5%	99	L	N			
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	N			
I	Charge for early years training	100	L	N			



Many small settings will be unable to afford training costs. If standards equality are to be raised or maintained training is essential.





Dreadful ideal! Many small or rural settings will not be viable

- |   |   |     |   |   |
|---|---|-----|---|---|
| J | Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% | 72  | L | N |
| 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**

Any reductions to Early Years funding will have major implications for PVI settings, especially smaller/rural settings, or settings such as Hedgehogs located in rented premises. With increasing costs as Hedgehogs located in rented premises we will see such as rent, minimum wage and long-term viability. Whilst we have to consider staffing costs and face cuts, we feel another 2% understand that all sectors already forced on the 'Early Years funding' is unfair on top of cuts already forced on the 'Early Years funding' that are formula. In view of all the issues surrounding safeguarding that are regularly in the forefront of the National News, it is an utter joke to talk about charging for all training. If you want a professional, dedicated workforce it HAS to be paid for by government.

NAME Jo Price / Dawn MERRIMAN

SCHOOL HIGHMORE HEDGEHOGS PRE-SCHOOL

DATE 8.2.11



# 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	M				
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188	L				Consideration needs to be given to whether this option, taken in conjunction with items H, I & J would prove too much to bear financially for some smaller settings thus resulting in their withdrawal from providing NEF or worse still the closure of the setting.
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156	M				
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99	M				
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144	M				
F	Reduce AWPU by 0.5%	200	M				
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority	137	M				



grant – reduces cost of MFG

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	L
K	Reduce contingencies	100	M
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	M

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

M

N

Same comment as for B above – this could contribute to a setting withdrawing from NEF provision or closing down.

No indication has been given of the likely charges. For smaller settings and accredited childminders the cost of training is a significant consideration. Further information is required regarding cost before settings and childminders can be expected to comment on this option.

A 2% cut for small settings where the majority of children are in receipt of NEF could threaten their viability. The combination of reduced NEF payments and being charged for training may result in many accredited childminders withdrawing from providing NEF.

**Additional Comments**

It is impossible to make constructive comments regarding option 1 (charge for early years training) without knowing the exact financial cost to my business of such a budget change. I am an accredited childminder and thus the cost of training could make a significant difference to the viability of providing NEF places. In addition, as a childminder who has been in business for some years my willingness to pay for training would also depend on the quality and nature of the training on offer. Accredited childminders within the Surestart Childminding Network are required to attend a minimum of 18 hours training per year. I would not be prepared to continue providing NEF places at my setting if the training was either too expensive or the training on offer was just repeats of courses I had already attended i.e. training would need to be affordable, original, of high quality and have a practical application within my business.

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

Deleted: YES/NO

**NAME Denise Stevens**

**SCHOOL Accredited Childminder**

**DATE 09.02.2011**

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



# 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 outstanding financial support for improvements is being withdrawn or reduced? Presumably the LA wants to move nurseries onto outstanding (given the title of it's 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 Early Years 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 outstanding 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: [stpnrusery@googlemail.com](mailto:stpnrusery@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		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 AWP 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	Yes			Can live with this as have had support to prepare for flexible funding Settings will still support with essential training, as staff need professional development still
I	Charge for early years training	100	L	No			



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

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

M

N

Setting sustainability put at high risk of closure, staff morale low, high risk of losing jobs.

Inclusion funding essential for some children who need extra support. We see huge amount of children with problems. Early intervention has a huge impact on children.

**Additional Comments**

I run as a small sessional nursery and classed as private, but we cater for families in an area of deprivation. We have 37 children and 32 of these are funded by NEF whether it is 2 or 3/4 year old funding. All our parents only use the 15 hours and reducing the single formula even further would have a huge impact that I think we would be forced to close. We have to be sustainable and I'm just doing this now. If we were forced to close the area would have less childcare, and children unable to claim 15 hours free entitlement.

Paperwork sent out could be reduced, email invoices, NEF to save postage. Reduce registers to just one per setting or just email, I'm sure cuts can be made but please consider that, all carers in childcare are poorly paid now, and parents would think that if you only pay less than £3 an hour that they would be getting poor childcare this isn't so. All childcare hereford is outstanding!

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

**NAME** Claire Hamer

**SCHOOL** Cut and Paste Childcare **DATE** 9/2/2011

# 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		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					
I	Charge for early years training	100					



*will hinder professional  
Developments of staff in  
many savings.*

M NO

Reducing PVI funding will result in many settings both large and small having to close or make redundancies.

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

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 Veronica Sims  
SCHOOL Curr and Paste Childcare DATE 9.2.11.

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 am unable to agree with all the savings proposals as we are only involved with pre-school children. I do feel that any of the proposals at "H" to "K" could mean that settings would be at risk and would have a great impact on the LA's sufficiency obligations. Item "J" would be the highest one to create the greatest risk, especially when already the Ne Grants funding is less than charges settings currently are making. However there are other large issues which can make settings at risk ie the number of parents/carers who are losing the jobs, their hours are being reduced or having to agree to working flexible hours otherwise their jobs will be at risk. As we have always tried to help working parents doing shift work eg Doctors, nurses, police etc this last item has not yet had a high impact on our two settings but there are signs that we will not be able accommodate such flexibility in the future. On top of all these points there are the increases everyone faces ie utilities charges, diesel for min-bus for after school care, food for the children's cooked meals and people not paying their fees, cheques being returned etc.

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

/NO

Deleted: YES

NAME H.W. Beeley

SCHOOL abc Nursery and abc Childcare Centre Ltd

DATE 10.02.11

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 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 AWP/PU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	Med				
H	Restrict former Early years extra	172	High				



	entitlement grant to 15 hrs only		
I	Charge for early years training	100	<u>High</u>
J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	<u>Low</u>
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

From a personal point of view, our setting has invested over the years in training and staff turnover is low. We had anticipated this proposal and have already begun to budget for future training needs. We will work in partnership with other settings and schools to reduce training costs.  
A further reduction would seriously affect our sustainability and may mean we withdraw from NEF funding.

**Additional Comments**

**I have answered the questions which are relevant to our setting.**

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

NO

Deleted: YES/NO

**NAME** Mrs Jackie Bowen Nursery Manager

**SCHOOL** Trinity TreeTots Nursery

**DATE** 11/02/11

Deleted:

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	L	N			THIS WILL LEAD TO SMALL RURAL SCHOOL CLOSURES
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	M				A COMPROMISE OF FEWER FREE J20



J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	H	N	MEETINGS/TRAINING AND SOME SPECIALISED COURSES TO BE CHARGED FOR THERE WILL BE A HIGH IMPACT IF SMALL RURAL NURSERIES CLOSE DUE TO A REDUCTION IN FUNDING. SUPPORT SETTINGS WHERE THERE HAS BEEN A LEVEL OF INVESTMENT IN RECENT YEARS INSTEAD OF FUNDING NEW PROVISIONS PREFERABLE TO THREATENING THE EXISTING PROVISIONS BY REDUCING REVENUE FROM FUNDING
K	Reduce contingencies	100	L	Y	
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**

Over the past several years there has been an increased investment in Early Years provision. Research shows that support for families and children at a very early stage improves outcomes in the medium to long term for these children into adulthood.  
It is essential that existing provisions are supported in order to maintain a high quality provision in the county rather than funding new settings.

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

Deleted:	
Deleted:	YES/NO

**NAME** JO HOWELLS

**SCHOOL** ST RICHARDS

**DATE** 11/02/2011

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	M	✓			
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188	L	✓			
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156	L	✓			
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99	M	✓			
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144	L	✓			
F	Reduce AWPUP by 0.5%	200	L	✓			
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	H	✓			
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	N
K	Reduce contingencies	100	L	N
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118	M	N

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

M  
N

**Additional Comments**

- Cut backs within De LA, EYES, could mean a lowering of standards for R1 + childminder settings.
- The Early Years Team has already been cut and we will feel its impact from March 2011 via loss of financial support and ~~business~~ support.
- We are unhappy with the reduction in funding as it could jeopardize our future! We are a small setting.
- Many small settings could close!
- headteachers/Managers - lack of confidence as many changes in LA staff - ~~not~~  YES  NO

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

NAME JULIA LAYCOCK  
NOAH'S ARK PRESCHOOL

SCHOOL DATE 11.2.11

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

o This will impact on The setting, The Staff, The Children + The Parents (Careers).



**Anderson, Nicola**

**From:** Green, Malcolm  
**Sent:** 11 February 2011 15:12  
**To:** LMS & Finance  
**Subject:** FW: DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION  
**Importance:** High

*Malcolm Green*

*Schools Finance Manager*

*Herefordshire Council*

*01432 260818*

*Financial Services has launched a new Finance Toolkit on the intranet, the Toolkit has been created to provide information, guidance, forms, contacts, published documents and frequently asked questions. The Finance Toolkit can be found at <http://intranet/financetoolkit>*

**From:** Liz Price [mailto:lizprice@tiscali.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 11 February 2011 15:10  
**To:** Green, Malcolm  
**Subject:** DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2011/12 - BUDGET CONSULTATION  
**Importance:** High



Malcolm

I am emailing on behalf of Ivington Nursery Group, a small community run nursery based near Leominster. I understand that cut backs have to be made, but I am very concerned with the 2% reduction in Nursery Funding to PVI settings. This will put the nursery at risk as we struggle financially to meet costs / staffing wages whilst maintaining required staff ratios. We have already put up our hourly rate to parents and we feel that with the current economic situation that we cannot ask the parents to pay any more. This cut back in funding, combined with falling numbers, could result in the closure of the setting.

The nursery is an important part of the community and Ivington School that we are next door to. Without the nursery, the intake to the school may be affected.

I am not happy that funding may not be available for staff training and this will seriously impact on standards and quality of provision across the county. This is false economy, as it will inevitably cost settings and schools more in the long term to deal with the issues and problems this raises. However, I am sure that compromises and sensible cutbacks can be made on this issue.

Kind Regards

Liz Price  
Nursery Manager  
Ivington Nursery Group

11/02/2011





emailed to  
Malcolm 11/2/11.

## 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.
<b>SAVINGS OPTIONS</b>							
A	Reduce small schools protection by 25% or £250k	121					<u>THEY ARE STRUGGLING NOW</u>
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188		<u>YES</u>			
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156		<u>YES</u>			
D	Reduce SEN funding by an average 5% Either a) 5% from bands 3 & 4 Or b) 10% from band 3 only	99		<u>NO</u>			<u>EARLY INTERVENTION MEANS MORE SUPPORT NEEDED SO CUTS WOULD HARM FACILITIES</u>
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144		<u>NO</u>			<u>CHILDREN WILL SUFFER</u>
F	Reduce AWP/PU by 0.5%	200					
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant - reduces cost of MFG	137		<u>NO</u>			<u>MORE WORKLOAD FOR SCHOOLS. SOME ARE ALREADY SHARING</u>
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>YES</u>			<u>AGREE</u>







WOULD REDUCE STANDARDS AS GROUPS COULDN'T AFFORD IT

AS LONG AS IT'S NOT MORE THE FOLLOWING YEAR

I	Charge for early years training	100	HIGH	NO
J	Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2%	72	MEDIUM	YES
K	Reduce contingencies	100		NO
L	Reduce central DSG by -3%	118		NO

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

M See below

N

#### Additional Comments

Haven't Early years cuts in staffing levels already made a big saving. Would like to know how much. Service is now seriously depleted which will cause a reduction in standards.

Support for SEN children is essential and we are concerned about the lack of Speech & language practitioners from March this year.

Training could be at a cheaper venues with no food supplied, and we bring our own lunch. Also Could some be on Saturdays when supply cover would not be necessary and school premises could be used. This would enable childminders to take up training more easily too.

Could we also have more representatives on Schools Forum, as we do not have an equal voice at present. And Early Years is of paramount importance to the children.

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

NAME Liv Moss

SCHOOL Mordiford Dragons Playgroup and EY forum rep for Voluntary groups

DATE 9 February 2011-02-09



## Leaders/managers feedback re DSG Budget proposals

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

- 1, To have a quality setting, the setting needs a framework of support from a Team, sadly the 'Team' is now going to be very stretched and I expect Stressed.
- 2, Having to find funds to pay for Training will mean only the bare minimum is attended i.e. First Aid and the setting will also have to take the day off without pay.
- 3, Fewer Supporting Professionals will leave practitioners out there, trying to cope with development needs for children in what potentially could be a high hazard way.
- 4, With all the cuts in Funding, they have not taken into consideration all the support staff that have recently been made. How are settings expected to deliver high quality childcare with very little support, only doing the legal required Training and a loss of Funding for NEF Sessions.

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

- 1, A lower grading when inspected
- 2, Closures of settings

Impact for Families

- 1, less choice of childcare

Ideas for cuts

- 1, Reduce admin for NEF Sessions
- 2, Management Structure is top heavy, A Review of Senior Management CPD and cuts to LA Salaries could be made.
- 3, School Buildings or large Halls could be used for training such as J20
- 4, J20 could be delivered once a Term or every other month.

Ideas for Savings

- 1, Blachfriars could be a pay and display car park
- 2, If Management having Parking Permits, cut them encourage car share or walking to work.





# 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	Or 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	M	Y			
B	Reduce social deprivation by 19.4% or £250k	188	M	Y			
C	Reduce Personalised Learning by 16% or £250k	156	L	Y			
D	Reduce SEN Banded funding by 5%	99	L	N			
E	Reduce school grants by 1.5%	144	L	N			
F	Reduce AW/PU by 0.5%	200	M	Y			
G	Delegate £330k SEN support services and £45k of former Ethnic Minority grant – reduces cost of MFG	137	M	Y			
H	Restrict former Early years extra entitlement grant to 15 hrs only	172	M	Y			
I	Charge for early years training	100	M	Y			



J Reduce PVI nursery formula funding by -2% 72 M Y

K Reduce contingencies 100 H Y

L Reduce central DSG by -3% 118 M Y

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

M

N

Additional Comments

Whilst accepting that reductions in funding are a necessary evil - may I make a plea for Special Schools whose numbers on roll are consistently increasing not falling as in the Mainstream school sector. Managing a split site as we will be doing from September 2011 is going to be quite a challenge and an unknown one at that!

P:32

NAME	SCHOOL
BARKS COURT SPECIAL SCHOOL	
KAREN ROOKE	
DATE	11.2.11