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1. **Consultation** 
   1. A Consultation exercise was held on the proposed School Funding 2022/23 allocations from 3rd November 2021 to 4th December 2021 and was distributed to all schools for their response and commentary after the School Forum meeting held on 3rd November 2021.
   2. In total, 57 schools and academies was contacted for a response and 24 returns in total were received (42%), slightly higher response than last year.

**2. Response Summary**



* 18 (41%) of Primary Schools
* 6 (67%) of Secondary Schools
* 0 Special Schools

**2.1** A list of the 24 respondents is given at the end of this document

**3. Response Analysis**

**3.1 Section 2.1.7 Schools Funding Formula Options**

**3.2** Respondents were asked to indicate which schools funding formula option they would prefer either NFF model or local model to set for the 2022/32 funding allocation:

* Option A – Replicating the National Funding Formula (NFF)
* Option B – Local Formula with additional funding through AWPU factors

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % |
| Option A | 12 | 6 | 0 | 42% |
| Option B | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10% |

**3.3**  **Comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| * 400K deficit budget - Option A has reduced our deficit from 500 to 400K | |
| * As a new head teacher, I feel that the information provided in the consultation documentation is very detailed but quite difficult to decipher. Looking at Annex A, as a school we clearly benefit more from this option. | |
| * Whilst we would usually support replicating the NFF, we note that our school would receive £17K more funding with Option B than Option A. Our governors would not support us in opting for Option A. | |
| * We feel that on long term, moving on to NFF would be a fair and appropriate solution | |
| * This is a difficult choice for us. While we support the LA preferred Option A for the reasons given, this will result in a disproportionately large cut in funding for our school compared to Option B. | |
| |  | | --- | |  | |  | | |

**4. Section 2.2 MFG percentage**

**4.1** 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 maximum 2% | 12 | 6 | 0 | 52% | | Option B - Set MFG at a different % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |     **4.2 Comments**  None | | |
|  |

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

**4.4** 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**  **Total responses** | **%**  **Yes** | **%**  **No** | **Secondary**  **Total responses** | **%**  **Yes** | **%**  **No** |
| 2.4.5 | Contingencies - Schools in challenging circumstances | 17 | 94% | 6% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.6 | Contingencies - Attain | 17 | 94% | 6% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.7 | Contingencies - Tree maintenance | 17 | 94% | 6% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.8 | Primary school meals management | 17 | 94% | 6% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2.4.9 | Licences and subscriptions | 18 | 100% | 0% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.10 | Supply staff cost for parenting cover and public duties. | 18 | 100% | 0% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.11 | Support to under-performing ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners | 12 | 67% | 33% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.12 | Behaviour support | 18 | 100% | 0% | 5 | 83% | 17% |
| 2.4.14 | School Improvement | 18 | 100% | 0% | 5 | 83% | 17% |

**4.5** De-delegation does not apply to Academies and Free Schools.

**4.6** Respondents were asked to provide any comments they would like to be considered by the Schools Forum on the de-delegation of budgets for 2022/23.

**4.7 Comments**

* 2.4.5 sustainability/transparency around this
* 2.4.11 unclear what service is available - communication is poor
* 2.4.12 is there enough capacity?
* 2.4.14 unclear what inspectors and some "SEND" posts, unclear re data analysis payment
* Contingencies- Schools in challenging circumstances, there needs to be more transparency around this.
* Attain-again more transparency around how the money is used and how equitable this is across schools, also how sustainable is this for schools when budgets are so tight.
* Support for Under-performing ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners-not clear how schools are benefiting and what this impact is this having on our pupils
* Behaviour support-capacity needs increasing to support schools
* 2.4.5 sustainability / transparency around this
* 2.4.11 unclear how schools use / impact
* 2.4.12 - is there enough capacity
* 2.4.14 - unclear what inspectors and ‘some ‘SEND’ posts , unclear re data analysis payment
* 2.4..5 sustainability / transparency around this
* 2.4.11 unclear how schools access, what the support is for schools/ impact
* 2.4.12 - is there enough capacity
* 2.4.14 - unclear what inspectors and ‘some ‘SEND’ posts , unclear re data analysis payment
* 2.4..5 sustainability / transparency around this
* 2.4.7 - very limited trees for Dundonald only - understand for the ‘ greater good’
* 2.4.11 unclear how schools use / impact
* 2.4.12 - is there enough capacity
* 2.4.14 - unclear what inspectors and ‘some ‘SEND’ posts , unclear re data analysis payment

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

**5. Section 2.7 Transfer between blocks**

**5.1** For 2022/23 Merton proposes to maintain the transfer (5%) from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block as in previous years.

This is estimated to be about £698,000 (0.5%) based on DSG grant allocation and will be used to continue to fund the increase in numbers at special schools, the growth and demand of SEN children in mainstream schools and maintaining the prudential borrowing agreed by Schools Forum in 2007. Respondents were asked whether or not they supported this transfer from the schools block to High Needs block.

**5.2** In support of the DSG Recovery Plan Merton proposes to transfer an additional £500,000 (one year) from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in support of the deficit recovery plan, and working in conjunction with the DfE. This would be subject to Secretary of State Approval.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1** – 0.5% | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % |
| Yes | 17 | 1 | 0 | 50% |
| No | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.2** – £500k | Primary | Secondary | Special | Weighted % |
| Yes | 7 | 0 | 0 | 31% |
| No | 11 | 1 | 0 | 20% |

**5.3 Comments**

|  |
| --- |
| * No other options presented except finances taken over by Government * We have agreed due to the possibility of a reduction in banding if not agreed. This seems an unfair choice! * Schools block should not be further reduced to fund structural deficit in High Needs block. An alternative solution is required that does not impact on the over-stretched funding of mainstream schools and their pupils. * "Although the transfer of the additional £500,000 will mean less money for individual schools this year, the Merton DSG Recovery Plan needs to be supported in the interests of long term financial security for the LA." |
|  |

**5.4 Other comments**

**5.5** Respondents were asked to provide any other comments they would like to be considered

by the Schools Forum.

**5.6** There were no additional comments.

**6. Respondents**

 **Primary Schools Secondary Schools**

