

# Agenda

## SCHOOLS FORUM

**Date:** Tuesday 21 March 2017  
**Time:** 1.30 pm  
**Venue:** Knight Hall, Green Park, Aston Clinton

*Reminder - If you are unable to attend a meeting, please send a substitute from the sector you represent.*

Agenda Item	Time	Page No
<b>9 DE-DELEGATION CONSULTATION</b> Update report to be presented by Mr J Huskinson	<b>3.05pm</b>	<b>3 - 24</b>

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

*For further information please contact: Rachel Bennett on 01296 382290, email: [rbennett@buckscc.gov.uk](mailto:rbennett@buckscc.gov.uk)*

## **MEMBERSHIP:**

### **Headteachers**

Roger Burman, The Aylesbury Vale Academy  
Karen Collett, Haddenham St Mary's Church of England School  
Olwyn Davison-Oakley, Seer Green Church of England School  
Katherine Douglas, Brookmead School  
Karen Duckworth, Padbury CE School  
Janice Freeman, King's Wood School & Nursery  
Andy Gillespie, Burnham Grammar School  
David Hood, Cressex Community School  
Owen Lloyd, Iver Heath Junior School  
Kevin Patrick, Chiltern Hills Academy  
Rebecca Richardson, Haddenham St Marys School  
Alan Rosen, Aylesbury High School  
Debra Rutley, Wycombe Grange PRU  
Sue Skinner, Bowerdean School  
Steven Sneesby, Kite Ridge House PRU  
Kathryn Tamlyn, Cheddington Combined School

### **Governors**

Pete Rowe, Princes Risborough School (Chairman)  
John Bajina, Parent Governor, Secondary Sector  
Gaynor Bull, Haddenham St Mary's Church of England School  
Angela Coneron, The Vale Federation of Special Schools  
Simon Kearey, Great Kingshill Church of England School  
Andrew Nobbs, Ashmead School  
Katy Simmons, Cressex Community School  
Peter Ward, Chilternway Academy

### **Representatives**

Fiona Brooks, St Mary's Pre-School  
Claudia Glasgow, NASUWT  
Lindsey Grexhammer, Bucks NUT  
Michael Moore, Catholic Diocese of Northampton  
Wendy Terry, Manor Farm Pre-School

### **Observer**

**Report to Schools Forum**

---

**Title:** Results of consultation on new de-delegation proposals  
for maintained schools for 2017-18.

**Date:** 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017

**Author:** Janaki Try Senior Accountant CSCL

**Contact officer:** Janaki Try 01296 383063  
[jtry@buckscc.gov.uk](mailto:jtry@buckscc.gov.uk)

**Schools affected:** All maintained schools

**1. Purpose of this report**

1.1. This report sets out the results of the De-delegation consultation.

**2. Background**

2.1. Reductions announced by the Department for Education (DfE) in funding for Education Services Grant (ESG) has resulted in services currently provided by the Council for maintained schools not being funded from April 2017. The DfE allows maintained schools the opportunity to collectively fund some services through retention of maintained schools' funding called "de-delegation".

2.2. Schools Forum only agreed this new de-delegations on the basis of a more detailed consultation and due diligence being carried out for maintained schools to ratify in March 2017. If the amounts ratified are less than the proposals, schools will receive any difference back.

2.3. The rates proposed for maintained primary and secondary schools are by pupil and for special schools and Pupil Referral Units by place (PRUs).

2.4. Details of the consultation responses are given below.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



### 3. Subsequent changes

3.1 The Local Authority will be withdrawing the request for dedelegation for monitoring national curriculum assessments in light of the expected changes in responsibilities not having been undertaken by the DfE.

3.2 The Council is therefore requesting up to £11.75 per pupil not the £18.00 from mainstream schools. This covers additional finance support and assistance via BLT and BCC, educational visits and additional school improvement.

3.3. The Guidance issued by the DfE in February 2017 also clarified that additional school improvement for special schools or PRUs could not be dedelegated and would have to be a traded package. This means that the dedelegation request per place for special schools and PRUs reduces to £19.00 i.e. funding additional finance support and assistance via BLT and BCC and educational visits only.

3.4 The guidance also confirms the arrangements for agreement is the same as existing de-delegation, i.e. voting per sector separately (primary, secondary, special & PRUs)

Area	Reasons for supporting	Recommended de-delegated rate per pupil / per place
Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools	Not traded, part of Finance Team role, alongside funding formulae, administration of grants etc	£1.25 per pupil / £5 per place
Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration	BLT Schools Financial Management Advisory team plus budget held by Education Champion where delegation removed or IEB put in place	£2.50 per pupil / £10 per place
Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)	Not charged to maintained schools.	£1 per pupil / £4 per place
<b>Total ex statutory functions paid for by ESG, if all agreed</b>		<b>£4.75 per pupil / £19 per place</b>
Additional School Improvement	Additional school improvement to provide basic support to all maintained schools	£7 per pupil / £0 per place
<b>All new De-delegation items if agreed</b>		<b>£11.75 per pupil / £19 per place</b>

#### 4. Responses

3.1. There were 28 responses. The responses relate to the following schools - 22 Primary schools out of 164, 5 responses from 4 Secondary Schools out of 7, and 1 response for 2 Special schools out of 8. No response from PRUs:

<b>Primary School</b>	<b>Secondary/Special School</b>
The Mary Towerton School at Studley Green St Mary's C.E Primary Elangeni Great Kingshill CoE Combined School Roundwood Primary School  Burford School Longwick CE Combined School Long Crendon Chalfont St Giles Village School St Paul's C of E Combined School Iver Heath Junior School Winslow CE Combined School Westcott CE School iver village infant school Iver Village Junior School Iver Heath infant School and Nursery William Harding Widmer End CC School Ash Hill Primary Weston Turville CE School Juniper Hill School North Marston C E School	Cressex Community School Cressex Community School The Buckingham School  The Misbourne The Cottesloe School Stocklake Park School/ Booker Park
<b>Total Primary 22</b>	<b>Total Secondary/Special 6</b>

**A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools**

**Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?**

Summary Q1 A .Budgeting and accounting advice to schools,		%
Yes	22	79%
No	6	21%
Unsure	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
21	0	1
1	5	0
0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?**

Summary Q2 A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools,		%
Yes	15	54%
No	11	39%
Unsure	2	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
14	0	1
6	5	0
2	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?**

Summary Q3. A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools		%
Yes	16	57%
No	8	29%
Unsure	4	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
16	0	0
3	5	0
3	0	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?**

Summary Q4. A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools,		%
Yes	18	64%
No	5	18%
Unsure	5	18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
18	0	0
1	4	0
3	1	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration**

**Q1.Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?**

Summary Q1 B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets		%
Yes	22	79%
No	6	21%
Unsure	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

  

Primary	Secondary	Special
21	0	1
1	5	0
0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?**

Summary Q2 B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets		%
Yes	17	61%
No	11	39%
Unsure	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

  

Primary	Secondary	Special
16	0	1
6	5	0
0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?**

Summary Q3.B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets		%
Yes	14	50%
No	7	25%
Unsure	7	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

  

Primary	Secondary	Special
14	0	0
2	5	0
6	0	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?**

Summary Q4. B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets		%
Yes	15	54%
No	5	18%
Unsure	8	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

  

Primary	Secondary	Special
14	1	1
2	3	0
6	1	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### C. Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)

#### Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q1 C. Educational visits advice		%
Yes	27	96%
No	1	4%
Unsure	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
22	4	1
0	1	0
0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

#### 2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q2 C. Educational visits advice		%
Yes	25	89%
No	3	11%
Unsure	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
20	4	1
2	1	0
0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

#### 3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?

Summary Q3. C. Educational visits advice		%
Yes	22	79%
No	0	0%
Unsure	6	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
18	4	0
0	0	0
4	1	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

#### 4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?

Summary Q4. C. Educational visits advice		%
Yes	27	96%
No	0	0%
Unsure	1	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
21	5	1
0	0	0
1	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>



## D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments

### Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q1 D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments		%
Yes	19	68%
No	8	29%
Unsure	1	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
18	0	1
3	5	0
1	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q2 D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments		%
Yes	15	54%
No	11	39%
Unsure	2	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
14	0	1
6	5	0
2	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?

Summary Q3. D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments		%
Yes	13	46%
No	9	32%
Unsure	6	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
13	0	0
4	5	0
5	0	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?

Summary Q4. D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments		%
Yes	16	57%
No	6	21%
Unsure	6	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
15	0	1
1	5	0
6	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

## E. Additional School Improvement

### Q1.Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q1 E Additional School Improvement		%
Yes	17	61%
No	8	29%
Unsure	3	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
16	0	1
3	5	0
3	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

Summary Q2 E. Additional School Improvement		%
Yes	8	29%
No	14	50%
Unsure	6	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
7	0	1
9	5	0
6	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?

Summary Q3. E. Additional School Improvement		%
Yes	6	21%
No	13	46%
Unsure	9	32%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
6	0	0
8	5	0
8	0	1
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### 4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?

Summary Q4. E. Additional School Improvement		%
Yes	7	25%
No	11	39%
Unsure	10	36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

Primary	Secondary	Special
6	0	1
6	5	0
10	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

## **Comments from De-delegation Survey Feb 2017.**

### **Q1.Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?**

<b>A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools</b>
---

<b>Response: Yes 79%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- Why is maintained school money being used to 'support school conversion' to academies LMS handbook is out of date. This should be updated.
- It makes sense for these functions, which all maintained schools need to be part of de-delegation.

**Secondary/ Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary/ Special: None**

**Secondary:**

- I understand the rationale but do not accept it. It is unfortunate that the wording of the question conflates two quite separate issues.
- Yes, I accept that BLT would like to provide advice but we would prefer to seek advice from elsewhere as required.
- We understand rationale but do not accept the rationale as it is yet another restriction on our budget and it has already been taken from our indicative budget prior to this consultation
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Some of the proposed areas should not be paid for out of de-delegated funds (e.g. supporting academy conversion), others could be put into existing finance packages and bought as needed.

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary/ Secondary/Special: None**

### **Q2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?**

<b>A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools</b>
---

<b>Response: Yes 54%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- However visibility and assurance that the schools are receiving good value for money must be transparent.
- This runs across all schools and is therefore appropriate for de-delegation.

**Secondary/ Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- Without a clearer proposal on how much buy back services would be charged it is impossible to ascertain the value of the service provided and evaluate whether an alternative provision could be sourced for a better price/ quality of service.
- Would prefer charging model

**Secondary:**

- These items should be included in the Finance package and separately costed,
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Some of the proposed areas should not be paid for out of de-delegated funds (e.g. supporting academy conversion), others could be put into existing finance packages and bought as needed.

**Special:** None**Response: Unsure****Primary:**

- There is very little information and no real detail on how the sums stated have come to arrive. AWPU makes sense.

**Secondary/ Special:** None**Q3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?**

<b>A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools</b>
---

<b>Response:</b> Yes 57%
--------------------------

**Response: Yes****Primary:**

- For clarity: rates are fair we do not want the de-delegated service
- However as the AWPU from primary to secondary is different, there should be different rates of de-delegation here.

**Secondary/ Special:** None**Response: No****Primary:**

- More info on how amounts were reached would be helpful. The BLT services are already being considered overpriced compared to other external providers. Being a CE school many of these services may be sought through the diocese. As part of FOSS the group may be able to look at negotiating prices as a group of schools with Evolve or other external providers.

**Secondary:**

- It has been stated that it is hard to cost these services so it is hard to comment on the rate. A pay as you use service would be more appropriate. Rates are debatable - particularly the 4x place charge.
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Some of the proposed areas should not be paid for out of de-delegated funds (e.g. supporting academy conversion), others could be put into existing finance packages and bought as needed.

**Special: None****Response: Unsure****Primary:** None**Secondary:** None**Special:**

- Not sure of rates

#### **Q4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?**

<b>A. Budgeting and accounting advice to schools, functions relating to financing of maintained schools, monitoring of compliance with Scheme for financing schools</b>
---

<b>Response: Yes 64%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- My admin team use the service infrequently but find the contact that they have very good.

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

#### **Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?**

<b>B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 79%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- BLT currently provides the support. Have other quotations been obtained to ensure we are receiving best value for money. As a new Head I had no finance training or support through this service and would like to know if this will be available to all Heads

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary/ Special: None**

**Secondary:**

- I understand the rationale but do not accept it. It is unfortunate that the wording of the question conflates two quite separate issues.
- We understand rationale but do not accept the rationale as it is yet another restriction on our budget and it has already been taken from our indicative budget prior to this consultation and we would use this service as and when needed
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Better to have "pay as you go" service. There also appears to be some double funding. Financial training for governors is already accessible through the BLT governor packages.

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary/ Secondary/Special: None**

## Q2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

<b>B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration</b>
--

<b>Response:</b> Yes 61%
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- However visibility and assurance that the schools are receiving good value for money must be transparent.
- This service has to happen and it would be unrealistic to ask schools who are already in this situation to pay additionally for it.

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- We have delegated budget so why would we support those who do not
- Would prefer hourly rates where applicable

**Secondary:**

- Should be part of Finance package, not top sliced from everyone. Related finance training is already in Training package purchased by schools
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Better to have "pay as you go" service. There also appears to be some double funding. Financial training for governors is already accessible through the BLT governor packages.

**Special:** None

## Q3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?

<b>B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration</b>
--

<b>Response:</b> Yes 50% / No 25% / Unsure 25%
--

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- For clarity: rates are fair we do not want the de-delegated service

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Response: No**

**Primary/Special:** None

**Secondary:**

- It has been stated that 20% of schools use some of these services and in this case we feel it should be a pay as you go service.
- Understand - yes; accept - no. Better to have "pay as you go" service. There also appears to be some double funding. Financial training for governors is already accessible through the BLT governor packages.

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- The cost here seems high for the small number of schools that this should affect compared to the amount for advice to all schools.

**Secondary:** None

**Special:**

- Not sure of rates

#### Q4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?

<b>B. Authorisation and monitoring of expenditure in respect of schools which do not have delegated budgets and related financial administration</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 54%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- Colleagues who have been supported in the past have not always felt that there was the right balance between support and challenge and there has been a perceived lack of empathy with the head teachers who have been in that situation.

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- having required this service we received 1 'checking' visit in 2 years and have cleared our deficit without ever being licenced or receiving support

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary/Special: None**

**Secondary:**

- As this would only be utilised if needed it is hard to comment as the school has not used this service in my time here

#### Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?

<b>C. Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 96%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- Will a more detailed breakdown of the £44K be provided
- This service is extremely useful to us
- Yes, it would be impractical for there to be continuity and consistency in this area if the process of monitoring visits was not paid for and ran centrally.

**Secondary:**

- I understand the question and accept the rationale
- Understand - yes; accept - yes. A valuable service.

**Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary/Special: None**

**Secondary:**

- We understand rationale but do not accept the rationale as it is yet another restriction on our budget and it has already been taken from our indicative budget prior to this consultation

**Response: Unsure**  
**Primary/ Secondary/Special: None**

## Q2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

<b>C. Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 89%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- This has been a useful and effective service
- This is a valuable service and we would like to continue to subscribe to it.
- Yes, it would be impractical for there to be continuity and consistency in this area if the process of monitoring visits was not paid for and ran centrally.

**Secondary:**

- Good value.
- Understand - yes; accept - yes. A valuable service.

**Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

## Q3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?

<b>C. Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 79%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- Happy with this service
- This is vital to all schools, however as the AWP from primary to secondary is different, and secondary schools run more and more complex visits (e.g. skiing) than primary schools there should be different rates of de-delegation here.

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- As part of FOSS this is something that they may be able to negotiate price for smaller schools.

**Secondary:**

- Clearer rationale is in place which is useful and therefore we can see the merits of the charging model.



**Special:**

- Not sure of rates

**Q4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?**

<b>C. Educational visits advice (compliance under health and safety)</b>
--

<b>Response:</b> Yes 96%
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- very good service
- Excellent
- We do not use this service a lot but we are able to access the evolve site for info and advice.
- Very good
- The service is excellent and very responsive when there are issues. The team are tremendously knowledgeable and I value them a great deal.

**Secondary:**

- The service provided in this area is needed and currently is strong

**Special:** None

**Response: No**

**Primary:** None

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:** None

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?**

<b>D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments</b>
--

<b>Response:</b> Yes 68%
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- As with point B BLT is again the proposed provider however have alternative providers been sought and level of service and cost compared. Who oversees BLT? There appears to be some confusion regarding charges for mandatory courses. We have paid for BLT moderation courses for Foundation and KS1. An outline of what is statutory and what is not should be made clearer.
- As this is a county wide statutory obligation it is practical to manage this within a de-delegation structure.

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Response: No**

**Primary/Special:** None

**Secondary:**

- I understand the rationale but do not accept it. It is unfortunate that the wording of the question conflates two quite separate issues.
- We absolutely do not agree with this charge as we are subsidising KS1/2 and Early Years and no data work is completed for secondary level. It is of no value to us what so ever.
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. This matter relates to primary schools only. Why is there not a separate proposal for primary schools?

## Q2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

### D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments

**Response:** Yes 54%

**Response:** Yes

**Primary:** None

**Secondary/Special:** None

**Response:** No

**Primary:**

- LAs are required by statute to carry out moderation and cannot pass the charge on to schools. Please see below response from The Key re: Charging for moderation of KS1 and KS2 SATS A school leader asked us if LAs can pass on the cost of moderation to their schools, or if it must be covered by the Education Services Grant. The guide to the grant says that as LAs are "bound by statute" to moderate and monitor National Curriculum assessments: LAs cannot charge maintained schools for national curriculum assessments, although academies may be charged. The Education Services Grant, GOV.UK – DfE and Education Funding Agency, see page 18 (Adobe pdf file) "Local authorities have a statutory duty to monitor the administration of national curriculum assessments in maintained schools and to moderate teacher assessments at key stage 1. The department has provided clear guidance on local authorities' responsibilities for monitoring and moderation. In addition, local authorities can contact the Standards and Testing Agency helpline on 0300 303 3013 for further advice. A small number of respondents suggested that savings could be made on this function through greater use of school-based staff or through cross-school moderation. There were mixed views reported on whether it was appropriate for local authorities to charge schools for something they are bound by statute to provide. We are able to provide some clarification on this question. Local authorities cannot charge maintained schools for national curriculum assessments, although academies may be charged. We do not anticipate that monitoring or moderation of the new national curriculum end of key stage tests will result in significant cost pressures for local authorities, but will keep this under review."

**Secondary:**

- Not relevant to secondary sector. Not acceptable for secondary schools to be subsidising primary.
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. This matter relates to primary schools only. Why is there not a separate proposal for primary schools?

**Special:** None

**Response:** Unsure

**Primary:**

- Whilst we appreciate this is a statutory requirement it appears we are being charged for courses related to this at present. Clarification is needed as to what is included and what we are expected to pay for. There needs to be a consistency across the country as we deliver a National Curriculum.

- The quality of this service is questionable. Bucks are aware of the issues associated with writing this year and much of this was due to the ability of the moderation team to interpret the process- we did not look good against comparable authorities. An independent third party provider could provide better impartial service

**Secondary/Special: None**

### **Q3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?**

<b>D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments</b>
--

<b>Response: Yes 46%</b>
--------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary:**

- As long as we receive everything we are entitle to.

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- For our school this equates to £945 we do not consider fair value for money as we would be able to take 2 days consultancy from the private sector each year for this- currently this is only 'guaranteed' on a 4 year rolling programme equating to nearly £4000 for moderation over that period. Attendance at moderation meetings are expected if not in the formal system and these are further chargeable
- Absolutely not - see comments above - LAs are required by statute to carry out moderation and cannot pass the charge on to schools. Please see below response from The Key re: Charging for moderation of KS1 and KS2 SATS A school leader asked us if LAs can pass on the cost of moderation to their schools, or if it must be covered by the Education Services Grant. The guide to the grant says that as LAs are "bound by statute" to moderate and monitor National Curriculum assessments: LAs cannot charge maintained schools for national curriculum assessments, although academies may be charged. The Education Services Grant, GOV.UK – DfE and Education Funding Agency, see page 18 (Adobe pdf file) "Local authorities have a statutory duty to monitor the administration of national curriculum assessments in maintained schools and to moderate teacher assessments at key stage 1. The department has provided clear guidance on local authorities' responsibilities for monitoring and moderation. In addition, local authorities can contact the Standards and Testing Agency helpline on 0300 303 3013 for further advice. A small number of respondents suggested that savings could be made on this function through greater use of school-based staff or through cross-school moderation. There were mixed views reported on whether it was appropriate for local authorities to charge schools for something they are bound by statute to provide. We are able to provide some clarification on this question. Local authorities cannot charge maintained schools for national curriculum assessments, although academies may be charged. We do not anticipate that monitoring or moderation of the new national curriculum end of key stage tests will result in significant cost pressures for local authorities, but will keep this under review."

**Secondary:**

- No value for us as a school so we do not see that we should pay. Transferring of records between schools is a legal requirement.
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. This matter relates to primary schools only. Why is there not a separate proposal for primary schools?

**Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- Many schools are already working in small network groups doing this already. May see external influences from places like the diocese
- It seems high here. Could any of the work be carried out on a school to school basis? I understand that the BLT are planning to train school staff once their own training is complete so this should be a saving.

**Secondary: None****Special:**

- Not sure of rates

**Q4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?****D. Monitoring national curriculum assessments****Response: Yes 57%****Response: Yes****Primary: None****Secondary/Special: None****Response: No****Primary:**

- For our school this equates to £945 we do not consider fair value for money as we would be able to take 2 days consultancy from the private sector each year for this- currently this is only 'guaranteed' on a 4 year rolling programme equating to nearly £4000 for moderation over that period. Attendance at moderation meetings are expected if not in the formal system and these are further chargeable

**Secondary:**

- As explained in previous comments. We do not see value to this service. Transferring of information between schools is a legal requirement. No data is provided in this service for secondary schools from the explanation provided.

**Special: None****Response: Unsure****Primary:**

- Do we feel that the BLT are carrying out a good enough job when we consider the difficulty that we had as a county when comparing our data to national last year for KS2. There was certainly a feeling that although we moderated consistently, our interpretation of the standards was stricter than other authorities with a result that our standards appeared to fall.

**Secondary/Special: None****Q1. Do you understand and accept the rationale for requesting de-delegation for each of the following?****E. Additional School Improvement****Response: Yes 61%****Response: Yes****Primary:**

- Are some of the provisions stated new as we have not received a 'desk top review of data' or 'half termly newsletters'. Again the question of sourcing and costing other providers comes up. How are we assured that

the BLT is 'best value for money' and how is the company's performance overseen? We receive at least 5 fliers per week in the internal mail which are in full colour advertising courses. We also receive all of this via e mail. Costing for these paper copies makes one question where the funds are directed.

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- I would prefer additional school improvement to be traded so that I can chose the support that I want rather than be forced to commit to the service provided by the BLT regardless of quality.

**Secondary:**

- I understand the rationale but do not accept it. It is unfortunate that the wording of the question conflates two quite separate issues.
- We absolutely disagree. We look for best practice where our support for school improvement would come from and cost is accordingly.
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. It seems to us that what is described here is the service as provided to primary schools. The BLT certainly do not provide the core service to us that is described above, nor would we wish to have it. We do have regular contact with BLT staff and BLT commissioned staff. Some of this we fund ourselves and some comes via the secondary school project that we understand has been underwritten by £100 000 made available to the BLT by BCC. This project is open equally to non-selective academies and non-selective maintained schools. There is therefore no differential benefit to us as a maintained school in return for any payment we would make through de-delegation. On the contrary, if BCC were to use de-delegated funds in this way we maintained schools would effectively be subsidising the BLT's work with academies.

**Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- What additional services would this include and how would this work in the future MAT Landscape?
- What is the additional offer as opposed to the standard offer?

**Secondary/Special: None**

## Q2. Do you support de-delegation for each of the following?

<b>E. Additional School Improvement</b>
<b>Response: No 50% /Yes 29% /Unsure 21%</b>

**Response: Yes**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- This service does not meet the brief outlined in the consultation support materials. Much of the support is additionally charged at a very high rate for CPD etc.
- Would prefer charging model.

- I want to be able to make my own choices in this area.

**Secondary:**

- No. BCC has already commissioned BLT in relation to school improvement. This is a further subsidy and would bring no benefit to our school.
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. It seems to us that what is described here is the service as provided to primary schools. The BLT certainly do not provide the core service to us that is described above, nor would we wish to have it. We do have regular contact with BLT staff and BLT commissioned staff. Some of this we fund ourselves and some comes via the secondary school project that we understand has been underwritten by £100 000 made available to the BLT by BCC. This project is open equally to non-selective academies and non-selective maintained schools. There is therefore no differential benefit to us as a maintained school in return for any payment we would make through de-delegation. On the contrary, if BCC were to use de-delegated funds in this way we maintained schools would effectively be subsidising the BLT's work with academies.

**Special: None**

**Q3. Do you think the rates suggested are fair for each of the following?**

<b>E. Additional School Improvement</b>
---

<b>Response: No 46%</b>
-------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- As a school which only receive 2 business meetings a year this does not seem value for money
- We do not feel we get £3000 worth of value from the provision outlined in the consultation document
- Outstanding/ good schools will not get value for money from the funds as they will not receive the same service.
- This seems very high in comparison to all of the other charges identified here. There is no way that I would be comfortable paying half of the total de-delegation costs for a service that does not necessarily meet my needs.

**Secondary:**

- The charge is too high and this service currently is more targeted at Primary and Infant schools and so we adamantly do not support this charge
- Understand - yes; accept - absolutely not. It seems to us that what is described here is the service as provided to primary schools. The BLT certainly do not provide the core service to us that is described above, nor would we wish to have it. We do have regular contact with BLT staff and BLT commissioned staff. Some of this we fund ourselves and some comes via the secondary school project that we understand has been underwritten by £100 000 made available to the BLT by BCC. This project is open equally to non-selective academies and non-selective maintained schools. There is therefore no differential benefit to us as a maintained school in return for any payment we would make through de-delegation. On the contrary, if BCC were to use de-delegated funds in this way we maintained schools would effectively be subsidising the BLT's work with academies.

**Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- We have nothing to compare it to.
- As the diocese increase its service this may be the route that more smaller CE schools take.
- This is by far the most expensive part and will it be the most useful? If the cost includes Early Years part time pupils this will be equivalent to approx. £1600. How much support will we receive and will this include the specialist teachers? For this price it may be cheaper to buy in support from elsewhere?
- Seems a high amount in comparison to other areas. What support is given to schools already Good and Outstanding for this cost?

**Secondary: None**

**Special:**

- Not sure of rates

**Q4 Do you think the service provided is good enough for each of the following?**

<b>E. Additional School Improvement</b>
---

<b>Response: No 39%</b>
-------------------------

**Response: Yes**

**Primary: None**

**Secondary/Special: None**

**Response: No**

**Primary:**

- As a school which only receive 2 business meetings a year this does not seem value for money
- We do not feel we get £3000 worth of value from the provision outlined in the consultation document
- No, I think that in the main package there is little support for good and better schools and that is a real issue when they make up the vast majority of the school community within the Bucks family of schools. I would rather save my money and pay for services that I felt supported the school or elements of the BLT offer without being committed to all of it.

**Secondary:**

- As explained in previous comments this service is more targeted at Primary/Infant schools and so is not a service that is of any value to us - BLT have said they look to expand their secondary provision but this has not been evident

**Special: None**

**Response: Unsure**

**Primary:**

- The quality of provision is dictated by the knowledge and understanding of the provider. Sometimes the provider is great and sometimes not.
- Please see previous comments. We would need to know what the support being provided would consist of and how much choice we have as school leaders to decide what support we require.
- We have bought extra support as requests for support in the past have not been approved as we are not a school in RI or special measures. This doesn't mean we don't wish to improve and require support to do so.

**Secondary/Special: None**

