

## Consultation on 2023/24 School Improvement Function De-delegations Analysis and Comments

### School Improvement Functions

<b>Do you support the de-delegation of School Improvement Functions 2023/24?</b>				
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
<b>Primary</b>	68	28	28	12
		<b>41%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>Secondary</b>	9	4	5	0
		<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Other Nursery/Special/PRUS</b>	8	5	2	1
		<b>63%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Total</b>	85	37	35	13
		<b>44%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>15%</b>

Comments follow on pages 2 and 3.

<p>We feel that the School Improvement offer is extremely valuable to help support our own improvements and supply us with a wealth of expertise and information.</p>
<p>As far as quality goes, the School Advisory Service is no longer what it once was. Schools, therefore, opted to organise their own service instead.</p>
<p>The LA has to meet its obligations to meet statutory duties regarding school improvement functions and with the removal of the Improvement Monitoring Grant, it is understandable that the LA looks to schools to fund this, provision. However, as reported in the national press, school budgets are so stretched that schools are having to cut hours and posts for TAs and teachers, impacting the quality of provision. If schools are being asked to commit additional funds to support the LA school improvement functions, then the LA must also commit additional funds from within its budget, which is reported to the Schools' Forum. It remains unclear what provision will be made for Maintained Nursery Schools; however, it must be separate from arrangements for other de-delegations/buy-backs and the LA needs to meet with MNS headteachers to discuss de-delegation processes and implementation.</p>
<p>The additional de-delegation cost does not provide evidence that the quality of the offer or support we will get will significantly (or even marginally) improve outcomes for children in my school. In fact, given the difficulty schools are under financially, this proposal will only impact negatively on schools during a time of real austerity and therefore does not represent good value for money.</p>
<p>Some concerns about how it fits with RD support. Is there duplication? The support from MIT has been very impactful for our school in the past and is very valuable. Unsure of how the cost has been able to be reduced so significantly in a matter of weeks and if the financial predictions/requests are realistic. The change gives cause for concern that it may not be accurate.</p>
<p>Schools should be free to buy additional improvement services that best meet their needs.</p>
<p>Providing this cost does not exceed amounts de-delegated in the past (taking inflation into account). The increases proposed were far too great and completely unaffordable, however, in my opinion, a limited amount of funding to support the underperforming schools is a good thing.</p>
<p>No value for money for our EY sector and this is difficult still to judge as yet again, no information on the cost of Maintained Nursery Schools.</p>
<p>It would be preferable for a de-delegation to be made for alternative provision/PRU provision to support the LA's drive to reduce permanent exclusions.</p>
<p>It seems to me that this could have a huge impact on an already tight budget.</p>
<p>If this de-delegation will help pay for the costs associated with MIT, would schools have to pay again to have MIT? This seems like double paying.</p>
<p>I welcome the clarity and the reduction in the proposed de-delegation expense.</p>
<p>I understand we need to de-delegate funds for certain services etc. Suggestion, would it be possible for any de-delegation areas to be discussed at cluster head's meetings as a fixed agenda item and then fed back?</p>
<p>I understand that there is going to be an additional cost per pupil under the new arrangements and the explanation provided still does not explain why this is necessary and how this will benefit my school. As it stands we cannot set a budget for 2023/24, so an additional charge such as this cannot be met.</p>

<p>I think the service that is provided by the county is fabulous and appreciate the cost of what is provided for schools; however, I am worried about the rise in cost as many schools are now in a deficit budget due to the wage rises and costs of services and no additional funding from the DFE.</p>
<p>I think schools should be able to choose for their selves whether to buy into this.</p>
<p>I have ticked 'no' because I buy into the SSG/SLA for a Lancashire Adviser (that I am very happy with) and they provide the majority of the functions mentioned in the consultation document. All other functions (the MIT team and Ethnic Minority I thought were also bought into services). I am not sure from the consultation document if there is anything the de-delegated fund would support that is not available already as a traded service. There are a number of schools in my cluster that buy-in advisory services outside of Lancashire that I think would be reluctant to pay for a service they don't need or is this to support the Senior Leaders (I thought they would be part of the SSG cost to schools?)</p>
<p>I do not buy into the LCC School Improvement service, I pay for this support from DBE. Therefore, it is a poor use of my budget to pay for something that I am not receiving, and my Governors agree with this wholeheartedly.</p>
<p>Having discussed this with Governors I have been advised to share that we are in consultation with the Archdiocese of Liverpool over CMATs and if were to need accessing school improvement this may be via the Archdiocese as we already buy into the Archdiocese School Improvement Partner service. As a Lancashire Headteacher, I appreciate the valuable School Improvement Service Lancashire can provide. We as a school buy into LPDS and this is a valuable traded service. If this were part of the de-delegation service then I would be asking Governors to think again.</p>
<p>Dependent on the quality and value for money of the service provided by the LEA by comparison to what can be purchased from other providers</p>
<p>Completed collaboratively with SBM - Kath Scott. We have reviewed the proposals and the implications based on the projected figures. This, at a time when budgets are significantly stretched due to unfunded pay awards and energy prices, is not something that we can support. We also believe that this is a statutory function and therefore are surprised that schools are being asked to fund the deficit created by the withdrawal of the school improvement monitoring grant. If solely focussing on the school improvement function (excluding the SLA for SSG - which we continue to buy into), it would cost the school additional charges. We do not feel that we can support this additional cost.</p>
<p>As budgets are decreasing each year I do not feel that we should be paying for this as we would not be using the LA services. I employ a private school adviser and receive excellent service. I do not feel that my school should have to put funds towards this as this would take money away that would be better spent directly on the children of my school.</p>
<p>As an academy, we are ineligible for this.</p>
<p>As a school that fell under MIT following an RI judgement, we paid a significant amount for all the support we received (and this was not a choice) so to outline this support as being funded by de-delegation is misleading and inaccurate.</p>
<p>As a headteacher, I have benefitted from the support of School Improvement functions.</p>