



## West Northants Schools Budget Consultation 2023-24

### 1. Who is this consultation for?

- 1.1. This consultation is for all maintained and academy schools in West Northamptonshire Council (henceforth 'the council'). There is a specific focus on the local funding formula for mainstream schools, so it will be most relevant for primary and secondary mainstream schools.

### 2. Overview

- 2.1. This consultation provides an opportunity for the council to engage with all primary and secondary schools, both maintained and academies about the principles of the local school funding formula for 2023-24.
- 2.2. Based on the provisional NFF allocations for the total Dedicated Schools Grant allocation, West Northamptonshire schools will gain £8.2m overall in 2023-24, as compared to 2022-23 (this includes an estimate of growth, import/export and uses 2022-23 current early years block funding which will be updated in the December settlement)
- 2.3. The Department for Education has indicatively increased the Council's Schools Block funding by £6.48m (2.0%) in 2023-24. Indicative budget modelling using the national funding formula (NFF) rates with the Government provided budgeting tool (Authority Proforma Tool, APT) on 2022-23 school level data shows that schools could expect to see a per pupil budget increase between 0.5% and 2.7% and an overall budget increase between 0.1% and 3.9% in 2023-24 as compared to their 2022-23 budget share (not including new and growing schools). The minimum increase is £243, the maximum is £303k and the average increase is £37.7k.
- 2.4. The Council's schools funding formula will mirror the DfE's national funding formula as closely as possible. It may not be possible to mirror it completely if the funding formula costs more than the final funding allocation provided in December 2022. Indicative modelling of the 2023-24 schools budgets shows that a cap on per pupil increases will have to be applied in the range of 2.2% (option 1) to 2.7% (option 2) in order to bring the schools budgets into balance with the funding available.

### 3. 2023-24 Budget Consultation Themes

- 3.1. The council have a significant number of important themes on which it needs to consult with schools for setting the 2023-24 budget. Each of these are included as a section within this suggested consultation paper.

### 4. Responding to the consultation

- 4.1. Please only make one submission per school DfE number. If Academy Trusts which to submit a response, they are very welcome and it will be counted as one response.
- 4.2. To respond to this consultation, please email:  
[SchoolConsultation@westnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:SchoolConsultation@westnorthants.gov.uk)
- 4.3. Appendix 1 to this consultation document provides an indicative financial summary by individual school for each of the consultation proposals.
- 4.4. Schools should note that all values are illustrative based on the DfE provisional allocation and values are likely to change when the final allocation is confirmed in December 2022.
- 4.5. In addition, the data used in the financial modelling is based on the same data used to create the 2022-23 schools budgets plus an estimate of growth as the schools census data from October 2022 will not be available until December 2022.

### Deadline

- 4.6. The deadline for this consultation is 30 November 2022 at 11:59pm.

### Your Responses

- 4.7. The consultation feedback will be shared with Schools Forum at the December 2022 meeting and used to inform the schools funding formula for 2022-23.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Who is this consultation for? .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. 2023-24 Budget Consultation Themes .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Responding to the consultation .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Deadline.....	2
Your Responses.....	2
<b>5. Specialist Services: LA Commissioned Outreach Services: Proposed funding from 1 April 2023.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Specialist and Impairment Services' Funding and Proposed Changes for 2023-24.....	6
Option appraisal .....	9
Recommendations for Schools.....	10
Next steps .....	11
Financial implications of the options.....	11
Legal implications.....	11
Risks.....	12
<b>6. Indicative Finance Model based on the Proposed Consultation on the two options. ....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7 Split Site Funding Policy .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Purpose.....	15
Background .....	15
Financial Impact.....	15
The Split Policy and Rates .....	15
Legal implications.....	16
Risks.....	16
Recommendations for Schools.....	17
Next Steps.....	17
<b>8. Growth Fund Policy and Weighted Numbers.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Purpose.....	18
Background .....	18
Proposed Pupil Number Adjustments to New Year Groups.....	19
School Growth Beyond 2022-23 .....	19
Proposed Policy .....	19
Growth Fund Budget to be agreed by Schools Forum .....	20
Legal implications.....	21

Recommendations for Schools.....	21
Next Steps.....	21
<b>9 Central Expenditure .....</b>	<b>22</b>
Central Expenditure on Education Functions.....	22
Financial implications.....	24
Legal implications.....	24
Risks.....	24
Recommendations for Schools.....	24
Next Steps.....	24
<b>10 De-delegations .....</b>	<b>26</b>
De-delegations.....	26
Financial implications.....	27
Legal implications.....	27
Risks.....	27
Recommendations for Schools.....	27
Next Steps.....	27
<b>11 De-delegation for Trade Union Facility Time .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Background.....	28
Trade Union Representatives and Facility Time in Schools.....	28
Options for West Northamptonshire Schools.....	29
Draft Budget Information .....	30
Table 15: Trade Union Duties – days / week.....	30
Recommendations for Schools.....	31
Next steps .....	31
Financial implications.....	31
Legal implications.....	32
Risks.....	32
<b>12 De-delegation for School Improvement Grant .....</b>	<b>33</b>
Background .....	33
SIG funding and impact.....	33
Proposed next steps .....	35
Recommendations.....	35
Financial implications.....	35
Legal implications.....	35
Risks.....	35

- 13 De-delegation for redundancy support..... 36**
- Background ..... 36
- Accessing the Fund..... 36
- Financial Position and Budget Requirement for 2023-24..... 36
- Next Steps..... 37
- Recommendations for Schools..... 37
- Legal implications..... 37
- Risks..... 37
- 13. CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE..... 38**

**5. Specialist Services: LA Commissioned Outreach Services: Proposed funding from 1 April 2023**

- 5.1 This report sets out the provision made by West Northants specialist services and the visual and hearing impairment service (currently hosted by North Northants council). Both services focus on assisting schools to meet the needs of pupils with additional needs who attend state-funded schools in West Northants (henceforth 'the council').
- 5.2 The council currently funds these services, mainly from the high needs block of the dedicated schools grant, but also using the council’s general fund. While the council has the legal power to fund these services, the budget and the duty to fund them sits with schools. The legal context is set out in detail in section 7 below.

**Specialist and Impairment Services’ Funding and Proposed Changes for 2023-24**

- 5.3 The cost of the high needs specialist services is considerable (£2.1m in 2022-23) and is set out in the table below. The total cost of all the services provided by a top slice to the schools block, as was agreed through the schools and schools forum consultation process with Schools Forum in 2021 for 2022-23 budgets.

Table 1: Current cost and funding of specialist service (inflation assumptions may be adjusted before final budgets are set).

<b>Service Expenditure</b>	<b>2022-23 £m</b>	<b>2023-24 £m</b>
Specialist support service	1.0	1.05
Sensory impairment service	1.1	1.15
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.20</b>
<b>Funding</b>		
Schools Block Top Slice	2.1	2.20

- 5.4 The schools block top slice in 2022-23 was 0.67% and was therefore above the 0.5% allowable transfer from the schools block to other blocks. This was possible as schools consultation responses, Schools Forum and the Minister for Education were all in favour of WNC making this top slice specifically to fund the high needs related specialist and impairment services from the schools block.
- 5.5 For this arrangement to continue in the 2023-24 budget, a fresh consultation with schools and schools forum and a disapplication request to the minister for Education, is required every year.

- 5.6 This consultation presents two options for schools with regards to the way specialist and impairment services are **funded**. The first being to continue with the arrangements as they are currently for 2022-23 with the schools block being top sliced to fund the services in full. This means that all pupils can access the services they need without the school's own budget position affecting the provision that can be afforded for those pupils.
- 5.7 The second option is that only the Sensory Impairment service continue to be funded by the top slice (which would be within the 0.5% transfer allowable under legislation and would not need ministerial approval) but that the Specialist services are bought individually by each school that requires it, at the point of use.
- 5.8 The high needs budget remains an area of particular concern for WNC and the current forecast deficit for 2022-23 is £0.4m despite having received a 12% increase in the high needs funding for 2022-23 as demand and cost increase together continue to outstrip the increased funding. As discussed in last year's consultation the overspend is structural in nature as this has been balanced to a nil position each year in the last two years, from a combination of DSG reserves (i.e. underspends from other DSG blocks) and a contribution from the following year's high needs budget. Because of this continued pressure on the high needs block, under option 2, we propose to take the maximum allowable 0.5% transfer (estimate £1.63m) from the schools block fund the sensory impairment service and also part fund the forecast high needs overspend with the remainder. We forecast that after the funding of the sensory impairment service, this contribution to the high needs block would be £0.48m.
- 5.9 The council clearly cannot let cumulative, structural deficits continue. A range of actions to address the high needs overspend are being proposed or are in progress. The focus of this report is the council's budget setting process for 2023-24 and separate items regarding the high needs deficit recovery plan are discussed at each Schools Forum meeting.
- 5.10 It is worth noting that the **Provision** of the Specialist Service is from North Northamptonshire Council and that these funding options above do not preclude a change in where the service provision comes from. In the long term, WNC is exploring providing this service from the West and further information on that will be provided to Schools Forum at a later date.

The options for the Specialist services schools block consultation are:

- **OPTION 1:** for schools forum to agree a 'top -slice' £2.2m from mainstream maintained and academy school budgets; or

- **OPTION 2:** Schools Forum agree a top slice to schools block budget up to the allowable 0.5% (estimate £1.63m) to fund the Sensory impairment service and high needs block deficit. And change the Specialist Support Service so that each school paying for the service it receives at the point of delivery.
- 

Table 2: Current number of pupils receiving a support from specialist services

<b>SEN Support Service</b>	<b>Consultation Cases (1-3 appointments)</b>	<b>Allocated cases</b>	<b>Parents booked onto courses and workshops</b>	<b>Total</b>
Academic year 2021/22	439	654	515	1,093

<b>SEN Support Service</b>	<b>Early Years</b>	<b>School Aged</b>	<b>Total</b>
Open allocated Caseload 07/10/2022	281	133	414

<b>Sensory Impairment Service</b>	<b>Consultation Cases (1-3 appointments)</b>	<b>Allocated cases with ongoing work</b>	<b>Parents booked onto courses and workshops</b>	<b>Total</b>
Vision Impairment 2021/22	21	111	10	142
Hearing Impairment 2021/22	63	367	29	445

<b>Sensory Impairment Service</b>	<b>Vision Impairment</b>	<b>Hearing Impairment</b>	<b>Total</b>
Early Years	17	56	73
Primary	61	204	265
Secondary	39	134	173
Post 16	25	51	76
<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>587</b>

5.11 The services provide early intervention to schools, settings and families for children and young people aged 0-19 years. This would include children with or without an EHC plan. The role of specialist SEND services include:

- support and advice to parents/carers in how to support their child's learning and development, through specialist knowledge, strategies and resources



- support pupils, educational setting staff and parents/carers to understand a range of additional needs and sensory impairment and how this may impact on the child or young person's learning and well-being;
- support and advise educational settings in how to close/narrow the gap between pupils with a sensory impairment and additional needs and other pupils, through specialist knowledge, strategies, IT and resources;
- contribute towards improved access to the curriculum and learning environment
- work directly with pupils to develop specific skills which will enable them to independently access learning, improve their self-advocacy skills, improve their mobility and improve their self-confidence, social, emotional and well-being;
- monitor the progress of pupils over time in terms of the support and interventions SIS provide and to hold educational settings to account where necessary; and
- directly teach an Additional Core Curriculum (sign language, auditory processing skills, braille, tactual skills, IT skills, social emotional/well-being, self-advocacy, mobility and independence).

5.12 Schools have reported the value of specialist practitioners (including teachers with specialist qualifications) to support and empower their staff in ensuring positive outcomes for pupils. This is particularly key for pupils with significant and complex additional needs. Schools have reported a positive impact on their inclusive practice.

#### Option appraisal

5.13 In this section there is a broad, brief appraisal of the two options, setting out the advantages and disadvantages of each.

5.14 The first option – top-slicing the resource required for both specialist services from schools' budgets – has the following advantages:

- the services will remain free at the point of delivery, and therefore will not be discriminatory against schools that have high levels of need, but tight budgets that might mean difficult choices regarding the support their pupils need;
- peaks and troughs in need are smoothed out by what is in effect an 'insurance' based system that means each school's costs are fixed;
- the funding to support the purchase of specialist outreach services is delegated to schools, and therefore this proposal is consistent with funding arrangements;
- specialist service managers can remain focused on meeting the greatest need, without regard to 'ability to pay' of any school.; and

- while the gross cost of the top-slice is £2.2m, should schools forum agree this option, the council **will not** ask it to also approve a top-slice of c£1.63m, or 0.5 per cent of the delegated budget, to contribute to the HNB overspend (as is allowed by regulations).

5.15 The disadvantages are:

- schools forum must agree to the top-slice annually – if it does not, alternative, individual school insurance or traded arrangements, with their inherent disadvantages, will have to be implemented;
- schools with low historic use, or that have chosen to purchase their own support, are in effect paying for a service they will not use (although this might encourage the consideration by these schools of use of the services in future); and
- Schools choosing alternative providers will be paying twice for the service – once through loss of budget and a second time through payment for the chosen service.

5.16 The second option – directly paying for the specialist support service – has the advantage of being completely transparent, and respecting the benefits of a competitive market and diversity and choice for schools. However, there are some significant disadvantages:

- services for outreach are difficult to cost, inefficient to administer and difficult to market – the council would have to allocate resources to administration, which would increase the cost of the services;
- schools using the service would start to consider the cost as well as the appropriateness of the service, and consider alternative suppliers, which, for some schools, might be a key consideration – while this might be considered an advantage for some schools, it brings uncertainty to the services and could leave the council considering whether it can maintain the services and
- some schools – even small ones – have peaks and troughs of need, with peaks causing a problem if outreach services have to be paid by them at the point of delivery rather than through a 'top slice' based system.

5.17 In conclusion, while each option has strengths and weaknesses, on balance, funding the service (option 1) has more advantages than paying for some of the specialist support at the point of need (option 2) and no more disadvantages.

[Recommendations for Schools](#)

5.18 Schools are asked to agree the first option for inclusion in the Schools Funding Consultation, as set out in paragraph 3.4 above – to top-slice £2.2m plus

inflation, on the understanding that if it does so, the council will not also ask for the 0.5 per cent top-slice allowed by funding regulations.

#### Next steps

- 5.19 If schools forum agrees the recommendation for option 1, the arrangements for top-slicing budgets for the 2023-24 budget will be put into the proposed local formula for agreement by schools forum in December 2022 and the council's cabinet in February 2023.
- 5.20 If schools forum agrees option 2, then council officers and the lead member will need to determine arrangements for schools purchasing the services directly from the specialist support team.
- 5.21 If schools forum agrees neither option and does not approve a top slice of any size from the schools block, then council officers and the lead member will need to determine arrangements for schools purchasing the services directly from both the specialist support team and the sensory impairments team.

#### Financial implications of the options

- 5.22 Should schools forum agree the £2.2m top-slice, the services will remain available to schools and on the same basis as at present.
- 5.23 The figures quoted in the next section of this paper are pupil averages, the actual effect on individual schools may be more or less depending on formula funding protections and which factor in the funding formula is used to bring the overall cost of the formula into balance with the funding available. These protections and "balancing mechanisms" are discussed in more depth in the next section and school level modelling with indicative budgets is provided in appendix A.
- 5.24 Note that while schools will, if the proposal is agreed, pay more from delegated budgets for insurance-based services, overall balances held by schools and academies indicate this contribution can be comfortably managed by most (balances).

#### Legal implications

- 5.25 Under funding arrangements introduced in 2012 and implemented in April 2013, (see [here](#)), local authorities can still fund specialist SEN support services, such as services to support children with a visual or hearing impairment. This therefore remains a power. However, local authorities can hold back funding from schools for 'expenditure on support services for pupils who have a statement (now an education and healthcare plan or EHCP) of special

educational needs and for pupils with special educational needs who do not have such a statement’.

- 5.26 From 1 April 2013, local authorities have been required to give mainstream schools a notional SEN budget from the schools block. This might be made up of funding from the basic per-pupil entitlement, deprivation and low cost, high incidence SEN factors. It is from this notional budget that mainstream schools will be expected to: a) meet the needs of pupils with low cost, high incidence SEN; and b) contribute, up to a certain level set by the local authority, towards the costs of provision for pupils with high needs (including those with high cost, low incidence SEN) (paragraph 35, the notional SEN budget).
- 5.27 It should be noted that mainstream maintained schools and academies have recourse to top-up funding should the support required for an individual pupil or group of pupils exceed the £6,000 notional funding as set out in paragraphs 108 and 109 of the school funding reform arrangements.

#### Risks

- 5.28 The main risks arising should schools not agree the top slice are:
- the specialist services becoming unviable if insufficient schools and academies either subscribe or buy the service on an ad-hoc basis for the recoupment of the services’ costs; and / or
  - pupils receiving diminished or poorer services through new arrangements.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 5](#)

**6. Indicative Finance Model based on the Proposed Consultation on the two options.**

- 6.1 The [national funding formula \(NFF\)](#) provides information to schools and LAs on the funding Government would provide if there was a single direct national funding formula with no local variation. We are moving closer to a direct national funding formula as per the recent consultation and outcome [response](#). In 2023-24 local authorities will be required to bring their own formulae closer to the schools NFF from 2023 to 2024.
- 6.2 WNC (and its predecessor NCC) has always aimed to follow the NFF as closely as possible. In 2023-24 the NFF minimum funding guarantee (MFG) is 0.5% on per pupil rates. This applies to the per pupil parts of the formula funding (the AWPU, deprivation factors, low prior attainment, English as an additional language but not premises related funding) and means that each school’s average per pupil value is increased by 0.5% as compared to the prior year 2022-23 funding formula. The range that can be used by LAs in setting the MFG for 2023-24 is 0.0%-0.5%.
- 6.3 There is no cap on per pupil increases in the NFF published indicative budgets for 2023-24 but WNC will have to apply a cap. The cap works in a similar way to the MFG in that it is applied to per pupil increases between 2022-23 and 2023-24. This will have to be used for 2023-24 budgets to be able to balance the schools budgets to the schools block funding available (with or without a top slice).
- 6.4 The financial modelling used to arrive at the indicative budgets is based on the provisional DSG announced within the [NFF on gov.uk](#). The NFF does not include the growth fund part of the schools block, so we have used a tool provided by Government to estimate this and that forms part of our total funding estimate. Any additional resources available in the final settlement for the schools block DSG will be used to lift the cap as far as possible.
- 6.5 The other protection in the NFF for schools is the minimum per pupil funding level (MppFL). This is an average rate per pupil of all formula funding including the premises factors and for 2023-24 in the NFF these have increased by 3.3%-3.5%:

Table 3: 2023-24 National Funding Formula minimum per pupil funding level

	<b>Primary minimum per pupil funding level</b>	<b>Secondary (KS3 only) minimum per pupil funding level</b>	<b>Secondary (KS4 only) minimum per pupil funding level</b>
2022-23	£4,265.00	£5,321.00	£5,831.00
2023-24	£4,405.00	£5,503.00	£6,033.00
increase £	£140.00	£182.00	£202.00

increase %	3.3%	3.4%	3.5%
------------	------	------	------

- 6.6 As explained above, the indicative modelling of options 1 and 2 in the specialist services proposals (section 4) which require a £2.2m or £1.63m (respectively) top slice of the school's block, and our modelling based on the provisional DSG settlement and an estimate of the growth funding factor, shows that we will need to use a balancing mechanism within the funding formula. We are proposing to cap the gainers rather than reduce AWPU (age weighted pupil unit) or MPPfL (minimum per pupil funding levels), to ensure that all schools are on the protected minimum.
- 6.7 Option 1 modelling requires a top slice of £2.2 would require 2.3% cap to be applied. This would affect 111 schools with a capped total of £3.2m ranging from £173.00 to £355k for individual schools.
- 6.8 Option 2 modelling requires a top slice of 0.5% (estimate £1.63m) would require 2.7% cap to be applied. This would affect 107 schools with a total capped amount of £2.6m ranging from £376.00 to £319k for individual schools.

Table 4: Budget increase between 2022-23 and 2024-24 indicative budgets compared under Option 1 and 2

<b>Budget Increases</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
Less than 0.5%	15	15
between 0.5% and 1%	17	17
between 1% and 1.5%	23	40
between 1.5% and 2%	41	41
between 2% and 2.5%	43	55
between 2.5% and 3%	29	0
between 3% and 3.5%	1	1
between 3.5% and 4%	1	1
<b>Total Schools</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>170</b>

We are often asked why some school's budget percentage increases are less than the 0.5% MFG (minimum funding guarantee increase). This is usually because the school has very small number of pupils. The MFG is a protection applied to the per

pupil rate, so the lump sum, rates and split sites (if applicable) are not included. The larger the proportion of budget made up of those non-pupil related characteristics, the less impact the MFG increase has on the overall budget for the school.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 6](#)

## 7 Split Site Funding Policy

### Purpose

- 7.1 To update West Northamptonshire Schools of the proposed rolling forward of the Split Site Policy from 2022-23 to 2023-24, funded as before from the Schools Block as part of the local funding formula. The LA propose to continue to include the same policy to fund Special Schools with a split site applying the same criteria but funded from the Special Schools Budget of the High Needs Block.

### Background

- 7.2 The DfE has referred to split site funding specifically within the new school funding arrangements. It is recognised that these schools incur higher running costs, for example extra staffing costs due to travel between sites and the care and maintenance of 2 sites.
- 7.3 In 2022-23 WNC provided split site funding in three component elements, leadership costs, building care and maintenance and staff and pupil travel. A school may be entitled to one, two or all three. There is a fourth component level for Secondary Schools only, where the buildings are more than 5 miles apart and this is exclusive of, not in conjunction with, the other three elements. The funding in each of the component elements would be maximums allowing lower amounts to be applied where circumstances warrant this.

### Financial Impact

- 7.4 The premises factor within the National Funding Formula (NFF) is made up of, PFI factor, rates, split sites and exceptional circumstances. There is no NFF rate or criteria set for the split site factor. The premises funding within the 2023-24 NFF allocation to Local Authorities is at the level of funding Local Authorities paid out to schools for split sites in the prior year budgets.
- 7.5 The total funding distributed through the schools funding formula for WNC split sites in 2022-23 was £335k across 5 schools and academies and this is the same level proposed for 2023-24 school budgets.

### The Split Policy and Rates

- 7.6 Schools will be assessed at their request based on these criteria including those schools currently in receipt of split site funding. The criteria to qualify for the funding elements are as follows:

- a) Where a school is more than 1 mile apart an allocation is given to support extra leadership costs including site management. Primary schools of less than 400 pupils in total or secondary schools of less than 1,500 pupils would be entitled to this element of funding. It is assumed larger split site schools should have sufficient scale to manage the efficient use of their site not to require this element of split site funding; and/or
- b) Where a school is separated by a public road that utilises traffic, funding will be given to support the extra pressure incurred by having 2 sites incurring higher fixed costs for the care, maintenance and operation of the buildings; and/or
- c) Where a school is separated by a public road that utilises traffic and there is daily movement of pupils between sites there will be a contribution towards the extra costs of staff and pupils transportation between the 2 sites.
- d) Any Secondary schools with sites greater than 5 miles apart would receive split site funding equivalent to the Secondary lump sum funding amount.

## 7.7 Split Site Rates (same as for 2022-23)

Table 5: Split Site Funding Rates 2023-24

<b>Phase</b>	<b>a. Leadership Costs(*)</b>	<b>b. Building Care &amp; Maintenance</b>	<b>c. Staff and pupil travel</b>	<b>d. Secondary 5+ miles apart</b>
<b>Primary</b>	Up to a maximum of £25,000	Up to a maximum of £20,000	Up to a maximum of £30,000	n/a
<b>Secondary</b>	Up to a maximum of £40,000	Up to a maximum of £25,000	Up to a maximum of £50,000	Total of the Secondary Lump Sum £ in 2023/24)

Note (\*) applies where a Primary school is less than 400 pupils in total or a Secondary school is less than 1,500 pupils in total.

### Legal implications

7.8 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

### Risks

7.9 There is a risk that not funding split sites appropriately leads to a greater financial burden on some schools than others. This creates the risk of financial



instability, or inadequate cover for the safety of pupils travelling between sites or inadequate caretaking of a site and could lead to a school becoming less appealing to parents.

#### [Recommendations for Schools](#)

- 7.10 That Schools Forum consider and support the proposed Split Site Policy for inclusion in the Schools Funding Consultation.

#### [Next Steps](#)

- 7.11 Consultation with schools will be held for a period of six weeks between 20 October-30 November 2022 inclusive
- 7.12 The consultation feedback will be shared with School Forum at the December 2022 meeting.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 7](#)

## 8. Growth Fund Policy and Weighted Numbers

### Purpose

8.1 The report is to update West Northamptonshire Schools Forum of the proposed rolling forward of the Growth Fund Policy from NCC and the pupil number adjustments for new and growing schools to be included in the schools budgets for 2023-24.

### Background

- 8.2 Within the DSG funding allocation for the Schools Block is an allocation for growth. In 2022-23 this is £2.21m. The LA estimate this will be £1.36m for 2023-24 (TBC December 2022). This approach ensures new schools have sufficient funding to open the required new classes needed in year.
- 8.3 It is the Council’s responsibility to propose suitable funding and criteria for the growth fund and it is Schools Forum’s responsibility for setting the Growth Fund budget and policy. See extract below from the [‘Schools Forum Powers and Responsibilities’](#) document

Table 6: Powers relating to growth funding for schools

Function	Local Authority	Schools Forum	DfE Role
<b>Central spend on and the criteria for allocating funding from: • funding for significant pre-16 pupil growth, including new schools set up to meet basic need, whether maintained or academy</b>	Proposes	Decides	Adjudicates where schools forum does not agree LA proposal

- 8.4 The growth fund is applied in two ways;
  - weighted numbers added into the funding formula budget or;
  - from the Growth Fund during the year.
- 8.5 Both methods are applied to Maintained and Academy Primary, Secondary and All-through Schools, in the same way. LAs do require Schools Forum agreement to add these increases in pupil numbers into the schools formula budget and we will be asking for Forum members to vote on this in December’s Forum.
- 8.6 West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) has applied weighted numbers in the funding formula to new schools, only where year groups are not already

occupied for 2022-23 and propose to keep this policy the same going forward for 2023-24.

### Proposed Pupil Number Adjustments to New Year Groups

- Monksmoor, Daventry +30 - year 5
- Marie Weller, Towcester +30 - year 2
- Buckton Fields Primary +60 – year 2
- Moulton area Secondary – +240 - year 7

### School Growth Beyond 2022-23

#### 8.7 New Free Schools:

- Northampton area Secondary – 6FE/900 places total – Sept 24\*

\* subject to the Secretary of State entering into a funding agreement with the Academy Trust.

#### 8.8 There are currently no non-free schools planned for WNC.

### Proposed Policy

8.9 We propose to continue the current policy and criteria for the growth fund for West Northamptonshire Council with a 5% inflationary increase to funding rates. Funding rates were last updated for 2021-22 budgets. The policy is as follows:

8.10 Where schools are requested to increase their pupil admission number (PAN) by the local authority by 15 or more pupils, or where a new school is being established by the authority, the full pupil/class increase will be taken into account in determining the funding.

8.11 The allocations, which apply to all maintained schools and academies, will be based on the following criteria; The Head of Place Planning and Pupil Admissions will:

- confirm with the school if the lower (15 pupil increase) or higher (30 pupil increase) reimbursements rate will be utilised and
- confirm if classroom support of a learning support assistant (LSA) will be funded
- confirm if an allocation for consumables is required,

- Funding will be issued for the period from the intake of pupils to the subsequent issue of the budget where the pupils are then included in the base budget.
- This funding is calculated using Pupil Census data or schools admissions data. Where school admission data is used to calculate the increase in pupil numbers this will subsequently be verified by the following Pupil Census data and adjusted up or down as applicable.

8.12 The level of funding provided to schools for growth is detailed in the tables below:

Table 7: Growth funding in primary school (LSA or Classroom support, if required).

Primary Growth Fund Element	Annual Rates	5/12ths Apr to Aug	7/12ths Sept to Mar
Teacher	43,731	18,221	25,510
LSA (per 1 class of 30)	12,721	5,300	7,421
Classroom Support (per 1 class of 30)	14,905	6,210	8,694
Consumables	1,000	417	583

Table 8: Growth funding rates in secondary schools

Secondary Growth Fund Element	Annual Rates	5/12ths Apr to Aug	7/12ths Sept to Mar
Teacher	55,216	23,007	32,210
LSA	28,090	11,704	16,386
Resource	3,150	1,313	1,838

#### Growth Fund Budget to be agreed by Schools Forum

8.13 WNC propose to include the following within the schools budget consultation, with the proposed new schools and increases in classes to cope with increasing pupil numbers:

- The forecast expenditure required for 2023-24 is £1.610m
- Expected refund of recoupment for amount paid to academies for period April 2023 to August 2023 is £0.406m
- Budget requirement for commitments for 2023-24 is therefore £1.204m. See table 2 below for the schools due to receive additional classes of pupils in-year for 2023-24.
- Any surplus within the schools block, after the national funding formula has been applied to schools is proposed to be held in the growth fund to fund in year uncommitted growth and if unused, to cover high needs overspends.

Table 9: Committed use of the growth fund in 2023-24

<b>Phase and WNC Schools list</b>	<b>Growth Fund Funded (£)</b>
Secondary Schools Abbeyfield School Caroline Chisholm DSLV Duston School Kingsthorpe College Malcolm Arnold Moulton Secondary Northampton Academy Northampton International Academy Northampton Boys School NSG Wootton Park Requirement for temp bulge capacity from Sept 2022	1,351k
Primary Schools Marie Weller Primary Monksmoor Overstone Primary Pineham Barnes Radstone Fields Primary Roade Primary The Grange	260k

#### [Legal implications](#)

8.14 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

#### [Recommendations for Schools](#)

8.15 Schools to consider and support the proposed growth fund and respond to the Schools Funding Consultation to give schools forum members your views.

#### [Next Steps](#)

8.16 Consultation with schools will be held during November 2022

8.17 The consultation feedback will be shared with School Forum at the 13<sup>th</sup> December 2022 meeting where a vote will be required.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 8](#)

## 9 Central Expenditure

- 9.1 There is a £0.4m decrease in the requested amount for central expenditure largely due to the 20% reduction in the historical element of the Central Schools Services Block (CSSB).
- 9.2 Table 21 shows the relevant responsibilities in relation to formula change which is taken from the Education and Skills Funding Agency’s Schools Forum Powers and Responsibilities, published in September 2018.

Table 10 responsibilities in relation to formula change

Local Authority	Schools Forum	ESFA
Proposes	Maintained School members decide	Adjudicates where Schools Forum does not agree Local Authority proposal

### Central Expenditure on Education Functions

- 9.3 The CSSB came into existence in April 2018 following the termination of the Education Services Grant (ESG). This funding is insufficient to fund the full cost of the Local Authority’s duties to all schools and results in West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) revenue general fund (and Northamptonshire County Council before this) picking up the remaining expenditure on central services for all schools i.e. results in these services being provided at no cost to schools.
- 9.4 The CSSB is made up of two elements:
- Ongoing responsibilities funding which is formula drive (nationally distributed 90% via a per pupil rate current multiplied by October 2021 pupil census data but will be revised to October 2022 numbers in the December 2022 announcement).
  - Historical commitments funding allocated at levels carried forward from previous years. The DfE have been reducing the historic commitments funding from 2021-22 by 20% per annum. This reduction has been applied to the provisional 2023-24 CSSB funding.
- 9.5 The provisional total allocation is £3.9m compared to £4.3m in 2022-23 – a reduction of £0.4m.
- 9.6 Table 22 shows WNC’s proposals for the use of the CSSB funding in 2023-24, together with explanations of its use and changes from 2022-23. 5% inflationary uplift has been assumed on expenditure under ongoing responsibilities and the PFI and pre-2013 teacher’s pension costs.
- 9.7

Table 11 – WNC Provisional CSSB Expenditure £m

	2022-23	Inflation	Move to General Fund	2023-24	Change
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Historical Commitments</b>					
Combined Services - School Standards & Effectiveness	0.43	0.00	-0.36	0.06	-0.36
Combined Services -SACRE School Standards & Effectiveness	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
Combined Services - Moderation	0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.02
Combined Service - Northamptonshire Safeguarding Children Board	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00
Combined Services - MASH - Staffing	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00
Combined Service - Educational Entitlement Team	0.14	0.00	-0.14	0.00	-0.14
PFI – Greenfields Special School	0.28	0.03	0.00	0.31	0.03
Historical Teachers Pension pre-2013	1.22	0.06	0.00	1.28	0.06
<b>Total Historical Commitments</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>-0.53</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>-0.44</b>

	2022-23	Inflation	Other Change	2023-24	Change
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Ongoing Responsibilities</b>					
Schools Forum	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
Admissions	0.49	0.02	0.00	0.51	0.02
National Copyright Licenses	0.31	0.02	0.06	0.38	0.08
Ex ESG retained LA duties for all schools	0.88	0.04	0.00	0.92	0.04
Teacher’s Pay and Pension Grant	0.18	0.01	0.00	0.19	0.01
Historical Teachers Pension pre-2013	0.05	0.00	-0.05	0.00	-0.05
Educational Entitlement Team (incl 145k combined serv)	0.08	0.00	-0.08	0.00	-0.08
Contribution to DSG / High Needs deficit	0.11	0.00	0.04	0.15	0.04
<b>Total Ongoing Responsibilities</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>0.07</b>
<b>Total CSSB</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>-0.55</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>-0.37</b>

-ve reduction in expenditure    +ve increase in expenditure

9.8 The reduction of 20% on the historical block leaves a funding gap of £0.4m against the expenditure requirement which will be met through the WNC general fund £0.4m (proposal in budget).

9.9 Table 23 shows the CSSB funding in 2022-23 together with future estimates of grant and expenditure. This shows that in 2024-25 the Government's 20% reduction to the historical part of the CSSB will not be possible. In this year a "floor" will be hit whereby the pre-2013 teachers' pension costs and the special school PFI costs will limit any further reductions.

Table 12 – CSSB Funding £m

	2022-23	2023-24	Difference £m	2024-25 Estimate		
	Grant £m	Grant £m		Budget £m	Requirement £m	Difference £m
Historical Commitments	2.18	1.75	-0.43	1.40	1.67	-0.27
Ongoing Responsibilities	2.09	2.16	0.07	2.27	2.27	0.00
Total CSSB	4.27	3.91	-0.36	3.67	3.94	-0.27

-ve increase in income    +ve reduction in income

#### Financial implications

9.10 These are set out in the report and in the appendices to the report.

#### Legal implications

9.11 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

#### Risks

9.12 The main risks arising should Schools Forum not agree the recommendations are set out in the respective appendices for de-delegations.

#### Recommendations for Schools

9.13 That Schools respond to this consultation to provide Schools Forum members with your opinions on the Central Expenditure on Education Functions proposals for 2022-23 funded from the CSSB as per Table 2 are included in the Schools Funding Consultation.

#### Next Steps

9.14 Consultation with schools will be held for a period of six weeks between 20 October-30 November 2021 inclusive.

9.15 The consultation feedback will be shared with School Forum at the December 2021 meeting.



9.16 Schools Forum and Maintained Schools Forum members will be asked to agree to the final proposals for central expenditure and de-delegations respectively in December 2021.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 9](#)

## 10 De-delegations

10.1 There are three de-delegations taken from maintained schools budgets at WNC for specific purposes:

- Redundancy costs for Maintained Schools (£5.00 to £4.00)
- School Improvement Grant (SIG) (reduction £7.50 to £5.50)
- Trade Union Duties (increase in rate from £2.10 to £3.57)

### De-delegations

10.2 Maintained members of Schools Forum can decide on behalf of all maintained schools to de-delegate funding for the Authority to provide services to all maintained schools.

10.3 Funding cannot be de-delegated from academies however they can choose to procure these services from the Authority or an alternative provider.

10.4 Table 25 shows the Authority's proposals for de-delegation for maintained primary schools for 2022-23 and shows a comparison with the prior year.

Table 13 – Proposed De-delegations £

	2022-23 per pupil £	2022-23 Budget £000	2023-24 per pupil £	2023-24 Provisional Budget £000	Movement per pupil rate £	Movement budget £000
Redundancy costs for Maintained Schools	5.00	173	4.00	144	-1.00	-29
School Improvement Grant (SIG)	7.50	253	5.90	250	-1.60	-3
Trade Union Duties	2.10	99	3.57	95	1.47	-4
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.60</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>13.47</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>-1.13</b>	<b>-36</b>

10.5 Further details on the individual proposals

10.6 above can be found in the appendices to this report.

### Financial implications

10.7 These are set out in the report and in the appendices to the report.

### Legal implications

10.8 There are no legal implications arising from the proposals.

### Risks

10.9 The main risks arising should Schools Forum not agree the recommendations are set out in the respective appendices for de-delegations.

### Recommendations for Schools

That Maintained Schools members agree to the proposals for de-delegation as per Table 5 and the associated appendices to this report.

### Next Steps

10.10 Consultation with schools will be held during November 2022.

10.11 The consultation feedback will be shared with School Forum at the December 2022 meeting.

10.12 Schools Forum and Maintained Schools Forum members will be asked to agree to the final proposals for de-delegations respectively in December 2021<sup>2</sup>

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for the de-delegations](#)

## 11 De-delegation for Trade Union Facility Time

### Background

- 11.1 The structure of trade union facility time in West Northamptonshire Council's (WNC) maintained schools (and academies who are part of the shared arrangements) is as follows:
- Each school may provide some facility time to employee trade union representative(s) from within their workforce for matters specific to that school.
  - Through de-delegation of budget for facility time, schools collectively fund senior employee representatives who operate across all schools within the shared arrangement. These representatives may also participate in centralised Education and Schools engagement and consultation (JCNF, DCF, H&S Forums etc.).
- 11.2 It is Schools forum that decides whether shared facility time arrangements operate across schools and they set funding levels annually. Maintained primary and secondary schools forum representatives vote on behalf of their phase to transfer funding from delegated budgets to a central budget (held by the local authority) for trade union facility time. This is known as de-delegation.
- 11.3 Funding of facility time is paid for by the school at the same 'per pupil' rate. This has remained at £2.10 per pupil for a number of years. The budgets for 2021-22 and 2022-23 included a large carry forward of £47k and £48k respectively. However for 2023-24 there is a forecast carry forward of £8k, a significant reduction in academies buying into the scheme and also a reduction in primary school numbers of ~700 pupils following the recent academy conversions in September 2022. As a result, the per pupil rate will need to be set at a higher level for the 2023-24 budgets to arrive at the same overall funding envelope. We propose raising the per pupil rate from £2.1 to £3.57.
- 11.4 The arrangements for 2023-24 needs to be agreed at schools forum on 13 December 2022 and this report sets out further information to assist schools in feeding back their views to schools forum to help them make that decision.

### Trade Union Representatives and Facility Time in Schools

- 11.5 The ACAS Code of Practice 3 uses the term 'union representative' to mean an employee who has been elected or appointed in accordance with the rules of the independent union, to be a representative of all or some of the union's members in the school(s) where the union is recognised for collective bargaining purposes. This is intended to equate with the legal term 'trade union official'.
- 11.6 The recognised trade unions for the school workforce are as follows:
- Teachers: ASCL, NAHT, NASUWT, NEU, Voice
  - Local Government Employees: GMB, Unison

11.7 The legislation relating to time off for trade union duties and activities applies to all employers, including those responsible for maintained schools, academies and free schools. There is significant flexibility for all schools to determine their own approaches to facility time to ensure positive workplace relations. Further information can be found in the non-statutory advice produced by the DfE [‘Advice on trade union facility time in schools’](#)

#### Options for West Northamptonshire Schools

11.8 Option 1: Continuation of the delegation as in previous years. Access centrally organised facility time arrangements by contributing a proportion of the school’s delegated budget back to a central budget (in the case of Academy schools, purchasing a Trade Union Facility Time SLA). This money is then used to reimburse schools who employ the recognised trade union representatives who undertake trade union duties across all contributing schools.

11.9 The continuation of the de-delegation:

- Ensures Schools and the Council meet their legal obligations
- Enables WNC to undertake the management and operation of the statutory consultation framework on behalf of maintained schools via the Education & Schools Employee Consultative / Health, Safety & Wellbeing Forum
- Enables consultation on school transfer to Academy status
- Ensures representation on employee relation issues (e.g. disciplinary, grievance)

11.10 Option 2: Make provision for the arrangement for facility time to operate just within the school (refer to risks of this option under section 9.1).

11.11 The impact of no de-delegation on schools would mean that each individual school would be required to:

- Consult with all recognised TUs on all employment and health and safety matters
- Develop own agreement with TUs and any collective approach
- Make own arrangements for access to TU representatives to represent employees and to manage facility time within the school
- Have a potentially longer timeframe for resolution of employment relation issues

11.12 The trade unions see the benefits of de-delegation funding as follows:

- Understanding of local context
- Ability to deal with casework (which continues to increase across Northamptonshire)
- Fast, efficient and informal resolution
- Reduced staff turnover & recruitment costs
- Cost effective TU representation

- Local knowledge to support local members
- Enables consistency of practice
- Least disruptive to education and cost effective means of organising facilities time; ensures no single school faces a disproportionate cost

### Draft Budget Information

11.13 The forecast outturn for trade union activities in the current year is a surplus of £10k. This creates a much smaller surplus than has been available in previous years. The forecast financial requirement for 2023-24 is £95k and if the rate is kept at £2.10 per pupil as for 2022-23, then this would result in an overspend. To create a balanced budget, with the current forecast number of maintained primary pupils and academies buying into the service, the per pupil rate required is £3.57. Any surplus at year end will be ring fenced to TU facility time in 2024-25.

Table 14: Trade Union Funding and expenditure 2021-22 to 2023-24

	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
Expenditure	83,530	90,000	94,500
DSG (primary de-delegations)	-29,419	-28,798	-46,067
		1,000	
Academies	-55,201	-23,274	-39,566
Carry forward from prior year	-46,707	-47,797	-8,870
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-47,797</b>	<b>-9,870</b>	<b>-3</b>

Rate per pupil	2.1	2.1	3.57
Maintained Primary Pupils	14,009	13,713	12,904
Academy Primary Pupils		11,083	11,083

11.14 This currently operates at a price per pupil rate of £2.10 per pupil. Benchmarking of East Midlands local authorities (2019) found per-pupil de-delegation rates between £1.51 - £6.00 (mean £3.56).

Table 15: Trade Union Duties – days / week

Union	Schools Trade Union duties days/week	
	2022-23 Current	Proposed 2023-24
NEU	4	4

NASUWT	5.5	5.5
GMB	2	2
UNISON	2	2

Schools forum de-delegated budget for TU facility time in schools 10.5 days per week

UNISON - 1.5 day/week

GMB - 1.5 day/week

NEU - 3 day/week

NASUWT – 4.5 day/week

WNC funded facility time (senior education/schools TU representatives) 3 days per week

UNISON - 0.5 day/week

GMB - 0.5 day/week

NEU - 1 day/week

NASUWT - 1 day/week

### Recommendations for Schools

11.15 To support this report and the officer suggested de-delegation rate for trade union facility time in the Schools Funding Consultation and to be aware that a vote will be required by Maintained School Members in December's forum meeting.

### Next steps

11.16 Information on the redundancy de-delegation will be included in the schools consultation document for the 2023-24 budget setting process.

11.17 School Forum members will be asked to vote in December 2022 on whether the trade union duties de-delegation should be continued with the suggested scheme and rate of £3.57 per pupil, as outline above.

### Financial implications

11.18 Without the Trade Union de-delegation schools and academies will have to employ and fully fund their own facility union rep for the time they need. It is likely to be more expensive purchasing directly than through the de-delegation.

### Legal implications

- 11.19 The legislation on time off for trade union duties and activities applies to all employers, including those responsible for maintained schools, academies and free schools (Section 2.3). The continuation of de-delegation enables schools to meet these requirements.

### Risks

- 11.20 If facility time is not organised centrally, each trade union can press for the release of a union representative at each individual school. The training requirement for these representatives could be significant, given the new role they would be expected to fulfil (e.g. employee, Health and Safety and Learning representative duties; attend training or learning activities; consultation and negotiation on employment related matters and the schools own HR policies).
- 11.21 There would be a risk of increased disruption in the school, for example, releasing a teacher from the classroom to accompany a member in a formal disciplinary/ grievance/performance/individual consultation meeting.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 11](#)



## 12 De-delegation for School Improvement Grant

### Background

- 12.1 The school standards and effectiveness (SSE) team is funded from the central block of the dedicated schools grant. However, this is supplemented by funding from maintained primary schools (there are no maintained secondary schools) in order to support and challenge primary schools 'of concern' as defined by the DfE's 'schools causing concern' guidance – see [here](#) for the latest iteration, dated September 2022).
- 12.2 The SIG is an essential source of funding that enables the school effectiveness team to broker support for maintained schools requiring support. It funds:
- a team of well-qualified and experienced head teachers (partnership heads) who work with senior school improvement Managers (SSIMS) on school reviews, carry out bespoke support and monitor progress that schools make against agreed objectives.
  - executive head teacher arrangements on a 50:50 basis with the host school if needed for a 6 month (maximum) period (this fund is held back as a contingency if it is not used).
  - costs of an interim executive board chair.
  - cost of governing body review where a school is causing concern and the school is unable to afford it.
  - school-to-school support plans approved by the head of learning and effectiveness.
  - school-to-school support for targeted schools where outcomes or progress are low in target areas of phonics, reading, maths, SEND and pupil premium outcomes.
- 12.3 This report describes the:
- purpose of the review;
  - de-delegation agreed for the current year;
  - use of SIG grant;
  - impact of the work undertaken with the grant; and
  - priorities.
- 12.4 Finally, recommendations for 2023-24 are made.

### SIG funding and impact

- 12.5 The purpose of this review is to:
- identify what has been delivered through the SIG de-delegated funds;
  - review if the de-delegation should continue in 2023-2024 and if so the amount per pupil that should be 'charged'.

12.6 For 2022-23 the primary SIG de-delegation was approved by West schools forum in December 2021. The effect was a de-delegation of £7.50 and a budget of £253k (including a carry forward of £186k). The forecast carry forward into 2023-24 is £173k and therefore to achieve a similar budget of £250k we can use the carry forward to reduce the rate to £5.90.

12.7 The SIG is being used to target primary maintained schools which were judged by Ofsted to require improvement or special measures, or:

- have a data dip or downward trend in outcomes that would put them at risk of an adverse Ofsted inspection unless bespoke interventions were put in place;
- require improvement in pupil premium outcomes;
- require improvement in reading outcomes.

12.8 The SIG is used to:

- resource school-to-school support plans for those schools requiring intervention;
- support the placement of a partnership head teacher to support improvements in the school placed into special measures;
- fund several reviews of governance and pupil premium;
- pay partnership head teachers for their role in whole school reviews especially in those schools requiring improvement;
- Fund school-to-school support from partnership heads, SLEs and NLEs;
- Provide initial funding for the Northamptonshire collaborative reading project launch.

12.9 The impact has been:

- schools of concern have become more focused on improving outcomes compared to national benchmarks and comparing their pupils' outcomes with those of similar pupils in similar schools, thereby raising aspiration of what can be achieved;
- outcomes in maintained schools have improved over 2018-19 in all ks2 measures except progress in maths;
- the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard and above in reading has risen to above national in maintained schools;
- the improvement in reading at both expected standard and greater depth is 3% nationally and 5% across all Northamptonshire's schools;
- Ofsted inspections have all been favourable in the schools supported by the DSG; and
- although many improvements are evident this year, standards remain below national and below that of statistical neighbours for many schools.

(Note: data on pupil premium outcomes are not available presently).

12.10 Future priorities are:

- continue to raise aspiration using FFT benchmark data;
- improve progress and attainment in reading and phonics;
- accelerate the rate of improvement in primary outcomes at key stages 1 and 2;
- reduce the achievement gap for disadvantaged pupils and those with send; and
- work with teaching schools and MATS to improve outcomes in primary maths for all pupils.

12.11 It is currently estimated the SIG resources will be fully utilised in 2023-2024. In the unlikely event that the SIG is not fully utilised at the end of March 2024, the underspend would be rolled forward to be used in future years for SIG.

#### Proposed next steps

12.12 The consultation responses will be returned to schools forum for the final vote on this proposed de-delegation in December.

#### Recommendations

12.13 Schools are asked to agree the consultation proposals and questions, or propose alternatives and feed that back to Schools Forum members through the response to this consultation.

#### Financial implications

12.14 Should the consultation take place, and schools forum agree at its December meeting the de-delegation of £5.90 (or a close amended amount resulting from changes in the latest school census information), primary maintained schools will have £5.90 deducted from the schools individual budget as set through the funding formula.

#### Legal implications

12.15 Under schools forum regulations, the responsible local authority has the power to de-delegate funding from maintained schools, following agreement of its schools forum, or any direction by the secretary of state for education.

#### Risks

12.16 The risk, if schools forum does not agree the de-delegation, is that the authority will not have the resources required to support and challenge schools of concern. This is likely to result, at best, in standards failing to improve or, at worst, poorer pupil progress and achievement.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 12](#)

## 13 De-delegation for redundancy support

### Background

- 13.1 The redundancy costs for maintained schools de-delegation enables maintained schools to collectively manage redundancy situations that are unaffordable for individual schools. It provides a means for maintained primary schools to access financial support when restructuring for the purpose of bringing their budget into balance.
- 13.2 This gives some protection to schools that need to adjust their staffing structures in order to manage their financial circumstances, potentially preventing them from incurring deficits and compounding their financial circumstances.

### Accessing the Fund

- 13.3 Maintained Schools can submit a redundancy business case and a three-year budget plan for before and after planned redundancies (in an agreed format available on asking) to West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) HR and WNC Finance. If specific conditions are met, financial support is authorised by both the Director of Children's Services and the Section 151 Officer (or their deputies).
- 13.4 The standard level of support provided is 25% of the cost of redundancy or greater if the resulting cost leaves the school in a deficit budget in the year purely as a result of the redundancy costs.
- 13.5 Detailed Criteria for Accessing the fund:
- Must be a maintained primary school
  - Restructure needed to bring school budget into balance within next year or across the three-year business plan
  - Reserves not held that could cover cost of redundancies
  - The revised structure must balance the budget (or significant work must be in progress towards that end e.g. amalgamation)
  - Three-year business plan before and after restructure must be provided in business case (in full excel format)
  - Estimate of cost must be provided in business case, including pension strain.

### Financial Position and Budget Requirement for 2023-24

- 13.6 In 2022-23 budget setting the rate set was £5 per pupil and this combined with the carry forward gave a budget of £173k. There has not been a call on this resource yet in 2023-24 but there are two expected draws on the fund before the end of 2022-23. Therefore there is a need to increase the per pupil rate in 2022-23. we believe it reasonable to reduce the per pupil level to £4 p for 2023-24 to provide a budget of £144k.

Table 16: 2022-23 Forecast Outturn Position on Redundancy De-delegation Budget

	2022-23	2023-24 estimate
Budget	-68.6	-51.6
Carry forward	-104.3	-92.8
Spend estimate	80.0	100.0
TOTAL	-92.8	-44.5

- 13.7 The contributions and therefore the budgets can reduce during the year if maintained schools convert to academy in year.
- 13.8 As this funding is de-delegated from individual maintained school budgets any underspend at the end of 2023-24 would be ring-fenced and carried forward to use in future years as necessary.

#### Next Steps

- 13.9 Information on the redundancy de-delegation will be included in the schools consultation document for the 2023-24 budget setting process.
- 13.10 School Forum members will be asked to vote in December 2022 on whether the redundancy de-delegation should be continued with the suggested scheme and rate of £4 per pupil, as outline above.

#### Recommendations for Schools

- 13.11 To support this report and the officer suggested de-delegation rate for redundancy funding for inclusion and to feed this back to the Schools Forum members through the response to this consultation. Maintained School Forum Members will then take a vote on this in December's forum meeting.

#### Legal implications

- 13.12 The legislation governing the Schools Forum Powers and Responsibilities is available through the link below. This outlines that de-delegations require a vote by maintained schools forum members.

[Stat guidance template \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

- 13.13 For further information on the legislature for de-delegations please see [The School and Early Years Finance \(England\) Regulations 2020 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk) under regulations 11(5) and 11(6).

#### Risks

- 13.14 The main risk is that the budget is not sufficient to support all schools that are restructuring due to financial difficulties. This could be mitigated by agreeing to carry forward any overspends to the following year to fund from the budget set for 2024-25.

[Click here to jump to the consultation questionnaire for section 13](#)

## 13. CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

### Section 6: Specialist Services

Q6) With regards to the Specialist Services paper which option do you support:

- a) Option 1
- b) Option 2
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

### Section 7: Split site policy

Q7i) Split Site Policy: Do you agree with rolling forward the split site policy from NCC

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

Q7ii) Split Site Rates: Do you agree with using the same rates as the 2022-23 split site rates

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

### Section 8: Growth fund policy and weighted numbers

Q8i) Growth Fund Policy: Do you agree with rolling forward the growth fund policy from last year

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

Q8ii) Growth Funding Rates: Do you agree with the update to the growth fund rates?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

### Section 9: Central expenditure from the central schools services block

Q9) Central: Are you in favour of the continuation of the central services that are partly funded by the dedicated services grant?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

#### [Section 11: Trade Union Facility Time de-delegation](#)

Q11) De-delegation for Trade Union Facility Time: Do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate proposed?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

#### [Section 12: School Improvement Grant de-delegation](#)

Q12) De-delegation for School Improvement Grant: Do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate of £7.50 proposed?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.

#### [Section 13: Redundancy de-delegation](#)

Q12) De-delegation for redundancy support: Do you support the proposed continuation of this de-delegation and the rate proposed?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Other – please provide details
- d) Comments - please use this space for any comments you would like to make.