

**Consultation on 2022/23 Service De-delegations and the MFG
Analysis and Comments**

General Comments

Need to be aware of Diocesan 'moves to academisation'; and the potential impact on the financing of services
--

Broadly happy to leave the underlying principles unchanged
--

I would like to see that the situation remains as it is at the moment.
--

Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions in 2022/23

Question 1: What is your preferred de-delegation option for the Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions in 2022/23?						
	Total Responses	Continue at the 2021/22 levels	Continue but reduce Trade Union Facilities Time contribution	Continue but no Trade Union Facilities Time contribution	Completely discontinue	Not sure
Primary	82	61	8	3	3	7
		74%	10%	4%	4%	9%
Secondary	15	9	4	1	0	1
		60%	27%	7%	0%	7%
Total Pri & Sec	97	70	12	4	3	8
		72%	12%	4%	3%	8%

Comments

The existence of the Public Duties / Facilities Time funding is essential to support employees undergoing issues that could be very costly for a single school to pay for in the event of a complaint or issue.

Without the support the Facilities Time contribution the well-being of staff will suffer since it will result in loss of vital support (we have experienced a huge need for it this year with one of our staff members)

The Need for Continuing Trade Union Facilities Time
It is important that LA officers present the facts to the Schools' Forum and for the Forum only to decide. LA officers must refrain from offering their opinions or referencing the decisions made by LCC leaders for other reasons.

The aim of the Trade Union Act 2016 was, and should still be, to improve the UK industrial relations framework to better support an effective and collaborative approach to industrial relations, balancing the interests of Trade Unions with interests of the wider public sector. The facility time (FT) regulations currently adopted in Lancashire help to fulfil these. Any worsening of these of the terms would reduce the level of fulfilment, with inevitable negative consequences.

While more funding can, and should, be sought, there have already been financial contributions from 15 academies (non-maintained schools) and expressions of interest from other previously maintained and non-maintained schools, to contribute to the 'pool'. This demonstrates the positive value that schools place on the pooling of FT, understanding that it is far more cost effective, it contributes to good industrial relations within workplaces and to a good working relationship between the employer and employee. Reasons for pooling facility time initially included cost efficiency and to reduce disruption in the school by having potentially three workplace-based representatives from each professional association regularly taking time out of the classroom for training (typically three to five days' training every year for every school rep). The demand for this

reps' training, with its legal entitlement for paid release from school to attend, as well as internal meetings to resolve workplace issues, health and safety matters, etc., would significantly increase if central officer capacity was reduced. All this at a time when Lancashire Schools' HR has increased its capacity due to an increase in workload.

The matter of under-spend has been raised. All under-spend in any year of the notional budget allocated, e.g., due to too few officers being able to claim from it, is always retained by Schools Forum and not by the unions. There is no need to reflect a temporary under-use by a permanent reduction in allocation.

Representatives from Lancashire's teachers' professional associations work with you and your colleagues when workplace issues arise, intervening at an early stage before the matter escalates. This includes support for Head Teachers in meetings when there is an issue between them and Governing Boards. With a reduction of FT there is a significant likelihood that workplace issues could be escalated more quickly, with the consequential breakdown in working relationships, resulting in an 'unhappy' workplace for everybody.

In summary, at this time when we should all be working together for our pupils and not taking a divisive approach, it would be extremely counter-productive to make any reduction to the facilities time and jeopardise those excellent relationships alluded to by the Head of Schools' HR, especially at a time when HR is increasing its capacity due to an increase in workload.

I urge the forum to vote 1 a) Continue the 'Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions' de-delegation using the same policy as 2021/22.

Yours faithfully

Branch Secretary, Lancashire National Education Union

The Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions de-delegation is vital schools in helping headteachers through union support to deal with HR issues. If this wasn't in place it would have a detrimental impact on headteachers' wellbeing. Lancashire's support for schools in financial difficulty is invaluable and I strongly support the continuation of this de-delegation.

Heritage Learning Service (Primary Schools Only)

Question 2: Do you support the de-delegation of the Heritage Learning Service (Museums Service) in 2022/23? (Primary schools only)				
	Total Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
Primary	81	65	10	6
		80%	13%	7%

Comments

No specific comments received about this service.

Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty

Question 3. Do you support the de-delegation of Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty in 2022/23?				
	Total Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
Primary	82	68	9	5
		83%	11%	6%
Secondary	15	9	4	2
		60%	27%	13%

Comments

I answered no to the de-delegation of the monies associated with the schools in financial difficulty because of the suggested payment being based on numbers on roll. Does this also recognise the challenges of larger schools, larger buildings, staffing etc. I fully appreciate that for smaller schools that this is a significant challenge but don't know the amount we are discussing. I hope the response doesn't sound negative and it is not designed to be. I recognise the important work and value being consulted. I do wonder whether other headteachers may be in a similar position if they do not regularly attend schools forum. (Also happy to learn that it might just be me who isn't fully aware of the process).

Re; SIFD Proposal The Schools Forum have previously raised concerns that a greater proportion of small primary schools are identified in the higher risk categories using the County Council's Schools in Financial Difficulty (SIFD) categorisation. It may be argued that lump sum charges disadvantage smaller schools, as the lump sum element is the same regardless of the size of school or its budget. Per pupil only charges are more reflective of different sizes of school and also to any year-on-year changes in pupil numbers, which impact on the revenue funding each school receives. The above statement infers that small primary schools are more likely to go into the SIFD category yet as a result of the change it appears the financial burden is being shifted to larger schools effectively subsidising the smaller schools that are more likely to utilise the SIFD support. It's also worth noting that the financial impact on larger secondaries seems way less in some cases over 50% of the additional burden of larger primaries but noted that many have now academised. I hope I never need to draw upon SIFD support but feel it necessary to give an opposing viewpoint given this could add potentially £1,000 to my costs along with increases from the other proposed changes based on numbers on roll.

Inclusion Hubs (Primary Schools Only)

Question 4. Do you support the de-delegation of funding for Primary Inclusion Hubs in 2022/23?				
	Total Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
Primary	81	56	22	3
		69%	27%	4%

Comments

The information about inclusion hubs is interesting but apart from a couple of areas has little or no impact information. Some areas eg xxxx have provided inadequate detail. Hubs should have an expectation of an at least good amount of impact information in order to access their allocation so the LA can be confident the funds are being properly used. The report should include comparative exclusion data.

The Inclusion Hub in xxxx should not be de-delegated. It does not support the needs of the children at our school. No referrals can be made for KS2. It does not provide good value for money. CISS provides little reporting of money spent and referrals made. This service should be traded.

No money should automatically go to the behaviour hubs. So far thousands of pounds of this school's money has gone to the xxxx Hub yet I have not been able to seek any support for children with significant behaviour difficulties because they are on EHC Plan pathway. We are quick to get children onto the pathway for EHC so we can never access support from the Hub. It is not good value for money. They have not been able to appoint enough Pych assistants so have cut service, yet we pay the same amount. I find it infuriating!

The Primary Inclusion Hub in xxxx is not fit for purpose. The service provides an outreach service (I have no problem with this) to support children at risk of exclusion. However, if that support is insufficient for the child's needs, there is no 'next step'. I then have to pay xxxx for their outreach service (effectively paying twice) in order to access their short stay service, for which I pay in full. There is no short stay service available for xxxx. I am obliged by Admissions to accept all children as long as I have a space but the cost of providing for their needs is huge. The whole county-wide inclusion hub system needs an overhaul, as there are geographical inequalities. Children in xxxx are getting an inferior service and I am obliged to pay for services the school cannot afford. It's not fair.

I would support de-delegation of Inclusion Hubs if the uptake from Primary schools supported this. In my locality, these meetings are not attended well and I can only assume this is replicated across the county.

Without the Primary Inclusion Hub money at a time of stress in families then exclusion rates will increase even more and schools will be left with less resources to fall back on for help

Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)

Question 5: Do you agree that the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) level should be set at +2.0% in the Lancashire formula in 2022/23?				
	Total Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
Primary	82	65	1	16
		79%	1%	20%
Secondary	14	11	1	2
		79%	7%	14%

Comments

Being a new headteacher, it is hard to make an informed decision without fully understanding the impact on our financial situation. My understanding is that the government have set a minimum per pupil amount and that LA's will allocate this.

I would need to see the implications of the MFG being more or less and the impact of such changes to be able to make a judgement