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**Response Summary**

20 Primary Schools

5 Secondary Schools

0 Special Schools

A list of the 25 respondents is given at the end of this document

**Response Analysis**

**Section 2.1.8 Schools Funding Formula Options**

Respondents were asked to indicate which schools funding formula option they would prefer Merton to use for the 2019/20 allocation:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % |
| Option A | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15% |
| Option B | 8 | 3 | 0 | 44% |
| Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Option D | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10% |
| Option E | 7 | 1 | 0 | 31% |

**Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | * Option B - 1% increase is mirrored in local formula. Differences in funding from different formulas is considered likely to be minimal at the margin. | | * We think it is important that we consider the wider picture and the impact on all the schools and children in Merton and we would favour option E which has a staggered approach to the possible detrimental impact of the NFF. | | * Our school loses out on funding bases on deprivation. | | * Option A is the most beneficial to us, although fully appreciated that the overall fairest option for all schools is option E. | | * IDACI gives an accurate reflection of proportion of pupils in the area with low income. Families that come to Liberty have low incomes, quite often they are "working poor" and may not trigger FSM. Our pupils have limited experiences, we often supplement resources such as trip expenditure to allow our pupils to have access. A high proportion of our children are vulnerable, many have ACERS. We need to provide families much additional support in accessing agencies via our PSPA (parent adviser) - all this brings additional cost to the school. | | * Second year we as a school will lose out. So we need favourable input from MSSEP!! | | * If we think of just our own financial position we would choose option B, however we are happy to support other local schools by choosing option E. | | |  | |

**2.2 MFG percentage**

Respondents were asked to select which level of protection they thought should be applied to schools from the options below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % | | Option A - Set MFG at 0.5% | 14 | 2 | 0 | 63% | | Option B - Set MFG at 0.0% | 5 | 2 | 0 | 33% | | Option C - Set MFG at -1.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | | Option D - Set MFG at -1.5% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4% |   **Comments** | | |
| |  | | --- | | * Understand that this is the current level of the MFG and this will support the most schools, although obviously the most expensive option. | | * We found the explanations provided far too unclear to form a proper opinion and request a much clearer explanation next time. | |
|  |

**Options from Section 2.4 relating to de-delegation**

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they would prefer a number of services to be de-delegated back to the Local Authority to be managed centrally rather than by each individual school.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Para.** | **Service** | **Primary**  **De-delegate** | **%** | **Secondary**  **De-delegate** | **%** |
| 2.3.5 | Contingencies - Schools in challenging circumstances | 15 | 75% | 4 | 100% |
| 2.3.6 | Contingencies - Merton Strategic School Effectiveness Partnership | 15 | 75% | 4 | 100% |
| 2.3.7 | Contingencies - Tree maintenance | 18 | 90% | 3 | 75% |
| 2.3.8 | Primary school meals management | 19 | 95% | N/A | N/A |
| 2.3.9 | Licences and subscriptions | 20 | 100% | 4 | 100% |
| 2.3.10 | Supply staff cost for parenting cover and public duties. | 20 | 100% | 3 | 75% |
| 2.3.11 | Support to under-performing ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners | 14 | 70% | 4 | 100% |
| 2.3.12 | Behaviour support | 20 | 100% | 3 | 75% |
| 2.3.14 | School Improvement | 20 | 100% | 4 | 100% |

Respondents were asked to provide any comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum on the de-delegation of budgets for 2019/20.

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * There needs to be some transparency here about how the money is spent/allocated - particularly 2.3.5, 2.3.6 and 2.3.11. |
| * No reason to change provided |
| * We need to be more transparent about how this is used so that we can share and report to our Governing Body. Also we would like to know how the de-delegation is calculated and which criteria it is based on (e.g. size of school site, number of pupils, staff etc). Ideally we would prefer to pay LBM back via invoice rather than having a budget de-delegation. |
| * Last year I requested greater transparency in the way money is spent for 2.3.5 Schools in challenging circumstances and 2.3.6 Merton Strategic School Effectiveness Partnership. I have no idea how the money that our school contributes to both of these funds is actually spent and cannot see how it is benefitting the children in my school. |
| * I would welcome some transparency here. This is something I requested last year. In particular what the MSSEP allocation is actually spent on. |
| * We are not sure what behaviour support includes for a secondary school so no. We appreciate being asked our opinion but would prefer being briefed in far more detail and the guidance material to be updated yearly and better referenced. Several issues are unclear. The impact of PFI, whether certain things only apply to Primary schools, impact of inflation etc. |
| * 2.3.5 last year we asked how this money was being used and for greater transparency but this has not happened. So it’s a no as we don’t know where this money is being used. 2.3.6 Because we do not know how this partnership is benefitting us. Need better communication and information. |

**Section 2.7 Transfer between blocks**

For 2019/20 Merton proposes to maintain the transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block.

This represents 0.49% of the indicative 2019/20 Schools Block allocation which continues to be below the 0.5% limit set by the ESFA and will be used to continue to fund the increase in numbers at special schools as well as the 2% increase in top-up (banding) fees which were agreed for 2018/19.

Respondents were asked whether or not they supported this transfer from the schools to High Needs block.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % |
| Yes | 20 | 5 | 0 | 100% |
| No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |

**Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * Greater transparency needed. What happens in other local authorities? How much is the local authority's statutory duty? |
| * Again I am unsure about what this money is actually spent on. Greater transparency would be helpful. I would like to know actually how much of this should be a statutory duty for those Special Schools? What happens in other LA's? |
| * I would also like consideration to be given to the SEMH provision in the borough. Currently there are very limited spaces for this. In addition there should also be "emergency funding" available for pupils who arrive who have high level behaviours and need additional adult support. Currently schools have to fund from their own budgets. |

**Other comments**

Respondents were asked to provide any other comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum.

**Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | * We would like to be able to comment on the High needs Block Funding section | | * Consider pupils that are arriving into nursery with no EHCP (and then need support). Consider that some schools receive large support/ financial contributions from the parent community (from fundraising) and others do not. | | * We would welcome briefing sessions around these topics and to have explained how the PFI contract is taken into account when considering the finance of schools. We would also welcome more of an ongoing dialogue throughout the financial year so that both the processes followed in monitoring the budget and the formulas used for allocating the budget support and reflect more closely the practises followed in school. | | * Please can you provide some clarity on increase in teachers pension contributions from Sept 19. Are we getting any extra funding? | |

**Respondents**

**PRIMARY SECONDARY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **Bishop Gilpin CE Primary Raynes Park HS** | | **Cranmer Primary Ricards Lodge HS** | | **Gorringe Park Primary Rutlish HS**  **Haslemere Primary Ursuline HS** | | **Hatfeild Primary St Marks Academy**  **Hillcross Primary** | | **Hollymount Primary**  **Holy Trinity CE Primary** | | **Joseph Hood Primary** | | **Liberty Primary**  **Links Primary**  **Malmesbury Primary**  **Merton Abbey Primary** | | **Merton Park Primary** | | **Morden Primary** | | **Pelham Primary**  **Poplar Primary** | | **St Marks Primary**  **St Matthews CE Primary** | | **William Morris Primary** | | |  | | --- | | **Raynes Park**  **Ricards Lodge**  **Rutlish** | | **Ursuline**  **St Marks Academy** | |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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