



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All

Schools Forum

School Funding De-delegation Arrangements 2021-22 Consultation Analysis

Report of the Head of Finance, Education & Children's Service

1. Summary of the Report

- 1.1 This report analyses the responses to the consultation exercise carried out by Leicester City Council on the de-delegated aspect of School Funding Arrangements 2021/22. The consultation ran from Tuesday 13th October until Monday 2nd November.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. That Schools Forum determines the de-delegated items for 2021/22.

3. Report

Summary

- 3.1. The overall response rate to the consultation was 28%, with a 31% response rate from maintained primary schools (15 out of 49 schools) and 11% from maintained secondary schools (1 out of 9 schools).
- 3.2. The results of the de-delegation consultation can be seen in the data below.

Table 1: Primary Summary – De-delegation continuation responses

	Yes Continue	No	Total
Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH Team) for Leicester City Primary Schools	14	1	15
Primary School Improvement	15	0	15
Assessment and Moderation	15	0	15
Closing the Gap	14	1	15
Whatever It Takes	13	2	15
Staff Costs for TU facility time	13	2	15

Table 2: Secondary Summary – De-delegation continuation response(s)

	Yes Continue	No	Total
Staff Costs for TU facility time	0	1	1

3.3. Specific comments relating to the responses can be seen listed in Appendix 1.

3.4. As a reminder, the table services listed below were the de-delegated service options in the consultation for 2021/22. The figures shown are based on the 2020/21 pupil numbers. The final total de-delegated sums will change according to the October 2020 pupil census which will be used for the 2021/22 budgets.

Table 3: 2021/22 De-delegated Service options

De-Delegation Service	Primary 2021/22		Secondary 2021/22		Total 2021/22
	Amount £000	Per Pupil £	Amount £000	Per Pupil £	Amount £000
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> SEMH service	672	<i>31.98</i> 32.94			672
School Improvement:					
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> <i>Primary School Improvement</i>	189	<i>9.00</i> 9.27			189
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> <i>Assessment and Moderation</i>	105	<i>5.00</i> 5.15			105
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> <i>Closing the Gap</i>	189	<i>9.00</i> 9.27			189
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> <i>Whatever it Takes</i>	147	<i>7.00</i> 7.21			147
<i>2020/21 Rate</i> Staff costs for TU facility time	87	<i>4.16</i> 4.28	61	<i>6.30</i> 6.49	148

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1. Financial Implications

Whilst the majority of respondents in the primary sector agreed with the de-delegating funds for TU facility time, the only response for secondary schools was not to continue. The response from the secondary school indicated that academies were 'not contributing to the pot'. We need to be clear that whilst academies cannot de-delegate they do pay directly for the services they consume as was outlined in the additional information circulated as part of the consultation.

The increase in the rate per pupil requested for TU facility time was to reflect the teachers' pay award and is in line with the increase in the rates for the national school funding formula for 2021/22. If the secondary schools do not vote for TU time then all maintained secondary schools would need to purchase their TU facility time directly from a provider. The implications for the current TU facilitator staff would need to be looked at and will be affected by the take up by maintained schools of the in-house service.

5. Report Author

5.1. Simon Walton, Accountant, Education & Children's Services

☎ 0116 454 4053

List of response comments to the de-delegation consultation

Primary responses	Secondary responses
-------------------	---------------------

- **Social, Emotional and Mental Health Team (SEMH Team) for Leicester City Primary Schools**

Concerns raised by heads last year about the parity of service between LA maintained schools and academies have been answered the “The SEMH Team have attempted to address concerns around parity of funding across LA and Academy Schools; to that end, this year we have introduced Academy packages”. There are currently no plans to trade fully from this service and in light of the current need for a settled service to support children this and next year, we recommend a continuation of de-delegation. If schools chose not to de-delegate then the service would either trade or cease, however there is no guarantee of either. If schools vote no to de-delegation, they would be able to find and fund their own behaviour support services.

(Response x4)

This team have been advised for 2 years now that they need to develop a traded offer. This was by LPP.

Therefore I do not think we should continue to de-delegate to this team.

- **Primary School Improvement**

School Improvement Leicester or SIL has run in its current format for less than a year due to covid restrictions. The format was previously agreed by headteachers as a strong balance between partnership and external support for school improvement. The service is shaped by headteacher representatives and coordinated by an external project lead. This model promotes a consistent approach to school improvement across all 55 schools, regardless of their classification or Ofsted categorisation. The systems in place enable the identification and quality assurance of good practice to maximise the impact of school-to-school support. The current infrastructure is strong, and the project lead and school improvement partners are also strongly placed to support this model for a further year with full transfer of funds via SDSA in order to commission the SIL programme. We recommend de-delegating funds. If schools chose not to de-delegate, they would have to find their bespoke arrangements for school improvement, however the current model involving head teachers and linking with the local authority in this way would cease.

(Response x4)

Yes, to support schools that need additional high level support.

I do see that LPP & SIL will take over as something the LA might ‘buy’ in the future to support school in trouble.

De-delegation should be minimal.

- **Assessment and Moderation**

The current team support assessment and moderation across the LA. There will be no requirement for EYFS moderation from the LA under the new EYFS framework from 2021. However, if the current de-delegation is agreed then the LA can provide schools with this service, particularly under the new EYFS framework, this will be beneficial to all schools when cluster moderating. All other moderation activity should remain the same. The de-delegation also covers release time for teachers to come to moderation training and benefit from the moderation programme. The statutory monitoring and moderation will continue to be provided and paid for by the LA for each key stage. A recommendation therefore to de-delegate.

(Response x4)

With EYFS, I don't believe the LA has any in house specialists, so any new curriculum and assessment support is likely to be contracted externally anyway, but we'll all need it. We, as individual schools, already pay for any 'extras' regarding work beyond LA statutory duty work.

- **Closing the Gap**

CTG continues to support city wide initiatives, training, and support. The funding has ensured strong project leadership, administration, and quality delivery of projects to meet the needs of schools. All LA maintained primary schools benefit from this. We agree on the understanding that funds pass to the SDSA who will commission LPP to run this programme. We recommend de-delegation. If schools chose not to de-delegate, then funds would go into school without a planned and dedicated 'Leicester' solution for training and support.

(Response x4)

Isn't this part of our SIL/LPP subscription? Going to be a part of this? Shouldn't we be reducing this so SIL stands alone.

- **Whatever It Takes**

The long running initiative continues to successfully support Leicester Primary schools with their reading provision and engagement. The funding ensures a strategic approach, good value for money and quality delivery of projects to meet the needs of schools. All LA maintained primary schools benefit from this. We agree on the understanding that funds pass to the SDSA in order to commission this programme. If schools, choose not to de-delegate then this service would fragment from its current position and could cease.

(Response x4)

I know different schools take up different opportunities. Maybe we could buy what we use?

- **Staff Costs for TU Facility Time**

No objection, as this is a valued service for all members of staff within schools in need of union support. If schools, choose not to de-delegate this would risk local trade union leaders' positions and expertise more generally. This may cause difficulties if schools want union advice for areas such as restructures etc. Much more information regarding funding within this area has been shared with head teachers to ensure this is fully transparent. Any costs for TU time additional to the allocated de-delegated fund will be paid for through the Local authority and not increased de-delegated funds.

(Response x4)

Yes, as it helps us all to keep things balanced for the good of all.

Unions should fund this – members pay their subscriptions, schools should not – schools pay for HR & legal.

Whilst the LA and Academies have not been contributing to this pot, it cannot be argued that it is reasonable for all maintained schools to.