

## Consultation on 2023/24 Service De-delegations and the MFG Analysis and Comments

### General Comments

There were general comments about current cost pressures and some schools commented that it will be difficult to maintain without further funding.

## Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions in 2023/24

Question 1: What is your preferred de-delegation option for the Staff Costs - Public Duties/Suspensions in 2023/24?						
	Responses	Continue at the 2022/23 levels	Continue but reduce Trade Union Facilities Time contribution	Continue but no Trade Union Facilities Time contribution	Completely discontinue	Not sure
<b>Primary</b>	116	87	5	6	5	13
		<b>75%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	8	6	1	0	1	0
		<b>75%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	13	12	0	1	0	0
		<b>92%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	137	105	6	7	6	13
		<b>77%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>

### Comments

#### The need for continuing facilities time

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

While more can, and should, be sought, there have already been significant financial contributions from academies (non-maintained schools) and some expressions of interest, with at least one request from a free school (previously non-maintained), to contribute to the 'pool', which demonstrates the value that schools place on the pooling of FT: that it is far more cost-effective, it contributes to good industrial relations within workplaces and to a good working relationship with the employer and employee. Reasons for pooling facility time initially included: cost efficiency and reducing disruption in the school by having potentially three workplace-based representatives from each professional association regularly taking time out of the classroom for training (there are typically 3 to 5 days of training every year for every school rep), meetings to resolve workplace issues, health and safety matters, etc. To be clear, any underspend in any year of the notional budget allocated, due e.g., to too few officers being able to claim from it, is always retained by the forum and NOT by the unions. There is no need to reflect a temporary under-use by a permanent reduction in allocation.

It would be extremely irrational to make any reduction to the facilities time and jeopardise

those excellent relationships alluded to by the Head of Schools HR.

Representatives from Lancashire's teachers' professional associations can work with you and your staff colleagues when workplace issues arise and intervene 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 facilities time, there would be a significant likelihood of workplace issues being escalated more quickly and consequential breakdown in working relationships, resulting in an 'unhappy' workplace for everybody.

This is a time when we should all be working together for our pupils and not taking a divisive approach. Many academies are currently part of this agreement and see the significant benefits of contributing to the agreement.

I urge the forum to not vote for a reduction of facilities time funding.

Yours faithfully

**R Waring – Lancashire Governor**

### Heritage Learning Service (Primary Schools Only)

<b>Question 2: Do you support the de-delegation of the Heritage Learning Service (Museums Service) in 2023/24? (Primary schools only)</b>				
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
<b>Primary</b>	116	84	24	8
		<b>72%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	3	2	1	0
		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	119	86	25	8
		<b>72%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7%</b>

**No Comments**

### Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty

<b>Question 3. Do you support the de-delegation of Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty in 2023/24?</b>				
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
<b>Primary</b>	116	90	17	9
		<b>78%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	8	7	0	1
		<b>88%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	13	11	2	0
		<b>85%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	124	97	17	10
		<b>78%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>

*No Comments*

### Inclusion Hubs (Primary Schools Only)

Question 4. Do you support the de-delegation of funding for Primary Inclusion Hubs in 2023/24?				
	Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
<b>Primary</b>	116	71	34	11
		<b>61%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	3	2	1	0
		<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	119	73	35	11
		<b>61%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>9%</b>

### Comments

Inclusion hubs need better evaluation and fairness since each area gets a different offer, so there are winners and losers.
Do not agree with Inclusion Hubs as they are inadequate and need to change.
District 7 has a fantastic Inclusion Hub provision in place. Removal of this funding stream would be detrimental to our district.
Agree with the concept of the Primary Inclusion Hubs but feel that further work needs to be done on the level of provision schools receive to be cost-effective
Not seeing it as value for money. The money would be better spent on other resources with current financial pressures.
We need more information as to how to access places for our children at primary inclusion hubs before I could answer Yes

## School Improvement Functions

Question 5: Do you support the de-delegation of School Improvement Functions 2023/24?				
	Responses	Yes	No	Not sure
<b>Primary</b>	116	54	50	12
		<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	8	3	3	2
		<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	13	4	4	5
		<b>31%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	137	61	57	19
		<b>45%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>14%</b>

### Comments

Not fully understand the impact of not fully supporting School improvement Function if it will not be supported and if all schools will receive equal benefits. If not, will not choose it as an option.
Need a better understanding of what service and its value to make a decision.
Considering all the costs the school is facing and the cost per pupil, the school cannot support this.
School improvement as a buyback SSG is how it should continue as in previous academic years. Schools then have the freedom to buy this support either from Lancashire or a similar service outside of Lancs. Schools would always consider Best Value to them and shouldn't have to fund School improvement twice - once through a de-delegation and then through an SSG. Budgets are far too tight to have this top sliced and school choice removed.
The proposed school improvement de-delegation is not equitable in that schools have chosen to opt out of this, and yet they will be financially penalised for making this choice.
If a school buys into a school improvement service outside of LCC will it still be required to buy into the LCC improvement service? This would not be affordable to do both.
School purchased their School Advisor from outside the Local Authority, therefore, do not wish to pay for it again through de-delegation.
Strongly do not support the de delegation to the School Improvement Function as not using this service and employ an external partner to support school improvement.
We would need more detail about the School Improvement Function. How this would work in practice in our school.

## Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)

<b>Question 6: Do you agree that the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) level should be set at +0.5% in the Lancashire formula in 2023/24?</b>				
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
<b>Primary</b>	116	77	2	37
		<b>66%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	8	6	0	2
		<b>75%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	13	8	0	5
		<b>62%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	137	91	2	44
		<b>66%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>32%</b>

**No Comments**