

Decision Maker: **Schools Forum**

Date: **12 July 2012**

**TITLE: OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS ON
PROPOSED FUNDING REFORM**

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools Finance Team
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Bob Garnett, Interim Assistant Director (Education)

Ward: Boroughwide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides information on the consultation responses from schools regarding the proposed School Funding Reform for 2013/14 and 2014/15.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 The Schools' Forum is asked to review and discuss the consultation responses.

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 As part of the consultation process on the proposed School Funding Reform, a consultation document was sent out to all schools and Academies. The consultation document focused on a number of main areas:

1. Delegation of Central Expenditure

Under the new funding reform, certain areas of expenditure which have previously been managed centrally will now have to be delegated to schools. This includes central costs such as any contingency funding, free school meal eligibility, behaviour service. Schools are invited to comment on how this funding should be delegated.

2. Changes to the Funding Formula

Certain elements of the current funding formula are no longer permissible under the new funding formula. This includes particular areas of concerns such as transferred grants which includes previous Standards Fund Grants. Schools are asked to comment on how this funding should be delegated in the new formula and also to comment on which indicators should be used for other areas of the new formula such as deprivation and EAL.

3. Optional de-delegation for Maintained Schools

Schools are invited to comment on individual areas for which the funding can no longer continue to be managed centrally rather than delegated to schools. However, schools are asked to note that any decision on this will be made by the Schools Forum representatives and will then apply to all schools in that sector.

3.2 A copy of the circular is attached at Appendix 1. Thirty one responses were received from the following schools:

- 1 Special School
- 1 Primary Academy
- 22 Primary Maintained
- 7 Secondary Academy

3.3 The responses have been analysed on the sheet at Appendix 2. In terms of the responses received, the outcomes appear to be fairly clear cut and will help the working party to decide what data should be used to produce financial modelling as part of the next steps of consultation. The Schools' Forum is invited to review and discuss the consultation responses.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 [Click here and start typing]

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 [Click here and start typing]

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 [Click here and start typing]

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 [Click here and start typing]

Non-Applicable Sections:	[List non-applicable sections here]
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]



Consultation on Proposed Funding Reform



Organisation and Management

- ⇒ Administration and Management
 - ⇒ Financial Management

Audience: Head Teachers of all Bromley Maintained Schools/Academies
 Chairs of Governors of all Bromley Maintained Schools/Academies
 Kingswood Centre/Grovelands Centre
 Head of Specialist Support and Disability Services,
 Phoenix Children's Resource Centre
 Schools' Forum

Action required: Proforma to be returned to Schools' Finance Team

Timing: **Friday, 29 June 2012**

Also sent to: Secretaries of Staff Associations
 Councillor Stephen Wells, Executive Member for the Education Portfolio
 Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, Children's Champion
 Councillor Robert Evans, Executive Member for the Care Services Portfolio
 Councillor Stephen Carr, Leader of the Council
 Doug Patterson, Chief Executive
 Kay Weiss, Assistant Director (Children's Social Care) (ECS)
 Bob Garnett, Interim Assistant Director (Education) (ECS)
 Anne Watts, Assistant Director (Strategic and Business Support Services) (ECS)
 Lorna Blackwood, Assistant Director (Commissioning) (ECS)
 David Bradshaw, Interim Head of Children and Young People Finance (ECS)
 Angela Huggett, Human Resources Manager (CEX)

Type: Consultation

Description: Full consultation with all schools regarding the proposed funding reforms for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Relates to: Circular 047/12

Date Issued: 20 June 2012

Contact: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools' Finance Team
 Tel: 020 8313 4806 Email: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

For reader's use:



Consultation on Proposed Funding Reform

Following on from the recent briefing session which was held at the EDC for all Head Teachers to provide information on the proposed funding reforms, this Circular outlines a number of issues regarding the proposed reforms and asks schools for their views and comments.

Full details of the original DfE documentation can be found at the following link <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/adminandfinance/financialmanagement/schoolsrevenuefunding/00205567/school-funding-reform-and-arrangements-for-2013-14>

Also attached at **Appendix 1** is an outline of the information that was provided at the briefing session.



Appendix 1

The consultation document focuses on a number of main areas:

1. Delegation of Central Expenditure

Under the new funding reform, certain areas of expenditure which have previously been managed centrally will now have to be delegated to schools. This includes central costs such as any contingency funding, free school meal eligibility, behaviour service. Schools are invited to comment on how this funding should be delegated.

2. Changes to the Funding Formula

Certain elements of the current funding formula are no longer permissible under the new funding formula. This includes particular areas of concerns such as transferred grants which includes previous Standards Fund Grants. Schools are asked to comment on how this funding should be delegated in the new formula and also to comment on which indicators should be used for other areas of the new formula such as deprivation and EAL.

3. Optional de-delegation for maintained schools

Schools are invited to comment on individual areas for which the funding can no longer continue to be managed centrally rather than delegated to schools. However, schools are asked to note that any decision on this will be made by the Schools Forum representatives and will then apply to all schools in that sector.

Schools are asked to return the attached proforma to the Schools Finance Team **by Friday, 29 June 2012**. We do appreciate that this is quite a short timescale for such a detailed consultation by the LA has to work to a very tight timescale laid down by the DfE. We would also request that where individual respondents do not want to be identified by name that you do indicate whether it is from a Headteacher or Governor and the phase/type of school as this will greatly help with our analysis of the responses.



Proforma

If you have any queries regarding this circular, please contact Mandy Russell, Head of Schools' Finance Team on 020 8313 4806 or by email at amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk.

Reformed Funding System

Mandy Russell
13th June 2012

Reformed Funding System

- To be brought in with effect from 2013/14
- Will run for 13/14 and 14/15 prior to introduction of National Funding Formula in 2015/16
- Minimum Funding Guarantee to continue at minus 1.5%
- Will affect all schools and academies

Dedicated School Grant

- The DSG will be allocated in 3 blocks
 - Early Years
 - Schools Block
 - High Needs Block
- Funding will be based on 2012/13 actual spend and will not be ringfenced

Early Years

- Funding currently based on assumed 90% take up
- Funding will be reduced to 85% take up or actual
- Bromley take up currently around 88% so no significant impact

Schools Block

- Funding Formula will be limited to 10 factors only
- Additional delegation of funding currently held centrally
- Groups of schools can opt for this funding to be de-delegated and managed centrally by the LA

Funding Formula Factors

- Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding
- Deprivation
- Looked After Children
- Low cost/High incidence SEN
- English as an Additional Language
- London Fringe Pay Bands
- Lump Sum
- Split Sites
- Rates
- PFI Funding
- Exceptional Circumstances

AWPU funding

- Will be based on same level for Reception, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2
- Consultation on differing funding levels for Key Stages 3 and 4
- AWPU will increase considerably as other factors disappear

Deprivation

- Can be based on either Free School Meal eligibility or IDACI with the option for banding
- Bromley currently uses FSM

EAL

- Data will be provided by DfE on pupils that have been in the maintained education system for upto 3 years.
- Bromley funding currently based on EAL pupils achieving below a minimum standard
- EAL data audited and provided by EAL team

Low cost/High Incidence SEN

- Will be based on 2 criteria
- Primary – pupils achieving fewer than 78 points on Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP)
- Secondary – pupils achieving level 3 or below in English and Maths at Key Stage 2
- Will include funding currently allocated for Action and Action + and Matrix funding up to £6,000

Lump Sum

- A standard lump sum for each school, with an upper limit between £100k and £150k
- Current funding formula provides different lump sum figures for small schools, 1 and 1.5 fe schools and secondary schools with falling rolls

Additional Delegation

- Funding currently held centrally will need to be delegated to all schools through the formula
- Contingency funding
- Free school meal eligibility
- Staff costs – eg maternity, suspension, jury service and union duties
- Support for ethnic minority pupils or underachieving groups
- Behaviour support service

Optional De- delegation

- Maintained schools can choose for certain budgets to be maintained centrally on their behalf.
- Decision to be made by Schools Forum members in each relevant phase and would then apply to all maintained schools in that phase.

High Needs Block

- Special schools will not in future have delegated budgets on the same basis as primary and secondary schools
- They will receive £10,000 per place, plus top-up funding for each pupil they have from the commissioning LA to make up the rest of their budget
- This system will also apply to special units and for matrix funding over £6,000

Changes to Schools Forums

- Remove the requirement to have minimum of 15 members
- Restrict LA attendees from participating other than Lead Member, DCS or LA officer providing specific financial or technical advice
- Restrict voting arrangements to allow only schools members and PVI members to vote on the funding formulae

Issues/Concerns

- Removal of differential funding for primary key stages – will shift funding between infant and junior schools
- Funding for additional pupils/ bulge classes – all schools will have to agree for this funding to be de-delegated and held centrally
- Lump sums – could result in small schools being underfunded or 1/1.5 fe schools being overfunded
- Changes to funding for High Needs Pupils – additional admin burden for schools

Timescale

- Mar- Apr: Section 251 budget statements to be completed
- Apr- Jun: LAs to undertake detailed modelling in conjunction with Schools Forum
- May – Sep: LAs to request exceptional factors and MFG exclusions from EFA
- Jun- Oct: Consultation with all schools and Academies
- By July: Schools Forums to be reconstituted where necessary

Timescale cont'd

- By Sept: EFA to confirm DSG baselines with LAs
- End of Oct: LAs to submit budget pro-forma to EFA
- Dec: Census data and schools/high needs blocks confirmed
- Mid Jan: LAs submit any final changes to EFA

To be returned to: Schools Finance Team
Room E24, East Wing
Civic Centre

School Name:	
Respondent: eg Head Teacher/Chair of Governors	
School Type: eg Maintained Primary	

1. Schools are invited to comment on how the following elements of central expenditure should be delegated to schools. For some elements an allocation has been proposed by the LA and schools are invited to agree or disagree.

1.1 Contingencies £1,104,182

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	100%
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Do you agree with the proposed allocation Yes No

Comments

1.2 Behaviour Support Services £876,676

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	10%
Deprivation	45%
Low cost/High incidence SEN	45%
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Do you agree with the proposed allocation Yes No

Comments

1.3 Support to underperforming ethnic minority and bilingual learners: £150,000

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	100%
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Do you agree with the proposed allocation Yes No

Comments

1.4 Free School Meal Eligibility: £74,834

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	
Deprivation	100%
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Do you agree with the proposed allocation Yes No

Comments

1.5 Staff Costs Supply Cover: £501,200

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	100%
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Do you agree with the proposed allocation Yes No

Comments

2. Schools are invited to comment on how the following elements of formula funding should be delegated to schools under the new funding formula.

2.1 Age Weighted Pupil Unit Funding

Under the new regulations the local authority has the option of using one funding rate for both key stage 3 and 4, or separate funding rates. Schools should note that whichever option is used, the amount of funding to be delegated will remain the same, so there will only be an impact on individual schools if there a big variation between pupil umbers in key stages 3 and 4. Secondary schools invited to comment on their preferred option.

One rate for Key Stage 3 and 4 Yes No

Separate rates for Key Stages 3 and 4 Yes No

Comments

2.2 Deprivation

Funding is currently allocated using actual free school meal eligibility as a proxy indicator. Under the new formula local authorities will have the option of using either current year data (as used at present) or ever 6 eligibility (as currently used for the pupil premium). Please state which indicator you would prefer to be used

1 Year Data Yes No

Ever 6 Data Yes No

Comments

2.3 EAL

Funding is currently allocated based on data provided by the LA EAL team and takes into account pupil achievement and refugee status. Under the new regulations this funding can only be allocated using data regarding the length of time that EAL pupils have been in the maintained school system. Funding can be allocated on 1, 2 or 3 years. Schools are asked to indicate their preferred option.

1 Year Yes No

2 Years Yes No

3 Years Yes No

Comments

2.4 Lump Sum

The current funding formula allocates different lump sums to small primary schools, one and 1.5 form entry primary schools and secondary schools with falling rolls. Under the new regulations only one lump sum can be allocated to all schools. In order to ensure that sufficient funding is still provided to small schools, the lump sum will need to be set at an appropriate level. The additional costs of paying this to every school will be offset against basic entitlement funding.

Do you support the principle of payment of a lump sum to all schools Yes No

What level of funding would you feel is acceptable? Please tick

Less than £50,000

£50,000 to £100,000

£100,000 to £150,000

Comments

2.5 Transferred Grants

This currently includes all the Standards Funds Grants and the London Pay Grant which ceased on 2010/11. The Grants were previously distributed on a number of different bases for example pupil numbers, deprivation, prior attainment and EAL. It is proposed that eh funding should be allocated on the following basis. Schools are invited to comment on this proposal.

Please note that the proposed percentages are different for Primary and Secondary to reflect the different allocation of historic standards funds.

	Primary	Secondary
Pupil Numbers	40%	60%
Deprivation	18%	18%
Prior Attainment	40%	20%
EAL	2%	2%

Yes

No

Comments

3. Optional De-Delegation for Maintained Schools

There are some central services where maintained schools will be able to decide that some funding be retained centrally rather than delegated ie de-delegated. For each area, it would be for the schools forum members in the relevant phase (eg maintained primary) to decide whether that service should be retained centrally. The decisions would then apply to all maintained schools in that phase. However, if all schools do not agree and the funding is delegated it may be possible for a group of schools to buy back the service as a sold service. The prescribed areas are as follows:

- 3.1 **Contingencies** (including support for schools in financial difficulties and to support basic need growth). This would include funding for bulge classes, expanding schools and funding to comply with infant class size legislation.

Primary schools are invited to state whether they would support funding being retained centrally to fund bulge classes, expanding schools and compliance with class size legislation. IT is anticipated that this would be in the region of £1 million.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated? Yes No

Comments

- 3.2 **Free School Meal Eligibility**
Currently all FSM applications for maintained schools are assessed centrally. It is suggested that it may not be financially viable for each school to manage this process themselves, which is supported by the fact that all academies have opted to buy back into this service.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated? Yes No

Comments

- 3.3 **Staff Costs – Supply Cover**
This would include the funding that is currently held centrally to fund the costs of staff on maternity/paternity leave and to fund supply cover for staff on suspension, jury service and union duties. NB This does not include the long term sickness scheme which operates independently.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated? Yes No

Comments

- 3.4 **Support for minority ethnic pupils or underachieving groups**
This relates to funding held centrally to support EAL and is in addition to the funding for EAL that is already delegated to schools in their budgets.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated? Yes No

Comments

3.5 **Behaviour Support Service**

This relates to the primary and secondary behaviour service areas. Due to the different nature of the provisions and especially due to the number of secondary academies it is likely that different arrangements will be offered to each sector as the option of de-delegation would only be available to the one remaining maintained secondary school.

Maintained primary schools will have the option of de-delegation to allow the service to continue to be run centrally.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated? Yes No

Comments

Number of responses received:

- 1 Special School
- 1 Primary Academy
- 22 Primary Maintained
- 7 Secondary Academy

1.1 Contingencies £1,104,182

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	100%
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 7 Secondary 24 Primary
 No None

Comments: No relevant comments other than to say that schools supported this proposal

Outcome: No change to this proposal

1.2 Behaviour Support Services £876,676

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	10%
Deprivation	45%
Low cost/High incidence SEN	45%
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Yes 1 Special 3 Secondary 18 Primary
 No 1 Primary Academy 4 Primary 4 Secondary

Comments: From the schools that voted no, 4 Secondaries proposed more funding to be allocated through AWPU. Primary Academy proposed 100% to be allocated through AWPU.

Other proposals were: 50:50 Deprivation / SEN
 30:35:30 AWPU/Deprivation/SEN
 20:30:45 AWPU/Deprivation/SEN

Outcome: No change to primary allocation.
 Secondary Allocation to change to 50:25:25

1.3 Support to underperforming ethnic minority £150,000 and bilingual learners

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	100%
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 6 Secondary 22 Primary

No 1 Primary 1 Secondary

Comments: No Relevant comments

Outcome: No change to original proposal

1.4 Free School Meal Eligibility £74,834

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	
Deprivation	100%
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 6 Secondary 20 Primary

No 1 Secondary 2 Primary

Comments: From the schools that voted no, the secondary school suggested that all funding should be allocated through AWPU.

Outcome: No change to original proposal

1.5 Staff Costs Supply Cover £501,200

Formula Factor	Suggested %
Basic Entitlement/AWPU	100%
Deprivation	
Low cost/High incidence SEN	
EAL	
Lump Sum (all schools)	

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 7 Secondary 22 Primary

No 1 Primary

Comments: The primary school voting no made the comment that as there is a correlation between higher levels of SEN and higher numbers of staff required to work with children with needs, it may be beneficial to allocate a percentage against Low cost/ High Incidence SEN.

Outcome: No change to proposal

2. Schools are invited to comment on how the following elements of formula funding should be delegated to schools under the new funding formula.

2.1 Age Weighted Pupil Unit Funding

Under the new regulations the local authority has the option of using one funding rate for both key stage 3 and 4, or separate funding rates. Schools should note that whichever option is used, the amount of funding to be delegated will remain the same, so there will only be an impact on individual schools if there a big variation between pupil umbers in key stages 3 and 4. Secondary schools invited to comment on their preferred option.

One rate for Key stage 3 and 4	1 Primary	6 Secondary	
Separate rates for Key stages 3 and 4	1 Special	1 Primary Academy	1 Secondary
Comments:	No relevant comments		
Outcome:	No change to proposal		

2.2 Deprivation

Funding is currently allocated using actual free school meal eligibility as a proxy indicator. Under the new formula local authorities will have the option of using either current year data (as used at present) or ever 6 eligibility (as currently used for the pupil premium). Please state which indicator you would prefer to be used

1 Year Data	3 Primary	1 Secondary		
Ever 6 Data	1 Special	1 Primary Academy	6 Secondary	19 Primary
Comments:	No relevant comments			
Outcome:	Funding to be allocated using Ever 6 data			

2.3 EAL

Funding is currently allocated based on data provided by the LA EAL team and takes into account pupil achievement and refugee status. Under the new regulations this funding can only be allocated using data regarding the length of time that EAL pupils have been in the maintained school system. Funding can be allocated on 1, 2 or 3 years. Schools are asked to indicate their preferred option.

1 year	1 Primary Academy	3 Secondary	7 Primary
2 years	1 Primary		
3 years	1 Special	4 Secondary	13 Primary Academy
Comments:	No relevant comments		
Outcome:	Funding to be allocated on 3 years		

2.4 Lump Sum

The current funding formula allocates different lump sums to small primary schools, one and 1.5 form entry primary schools and secondary schools with falling rolls. Under the new regulations only one lump sum can be allocated to all schools. In order to ensure that sufficient funding is still provided to small schools, the lump sum will need to be set at an appropriate level. The additional costs of paying this to every school will be offset against basic entitlement funding.

Do you support the principle of payment of a lump sum to all schools?

No	1 Primary Academy	3 Primary	3 Secondary
----	-------------------	-----------	-------------

If yes, what level of funding would you feel is acceptable?

Less than £50,000	4 Primary		
£50,000 to £100,000	6 Primary	1 Secondary	
£100,000 to £150,000	1 Special	11 Primary	1 Secondary

Comments:

Outcome: The lump sum will continue to be modelled around small and 1 FE schools, and also to take account of other factors being removed through this process eg threshold funding, premises funding.

2.5 Transferred Grants

This currently includes all the Standards Funds Grants and the London Pay Grant which ceased on 2010/11. The Grants were previously distributed on a number of different bases for example pupil numbers, deprivation, prior attainment and EAL. It is proposed that the funding should be allocated on the following basis. Schools are invited to comment on this proposal.

Please note that the proposed percentages are different for Primary and Secondary to reflect the different allocation of historic standards funds.

	Primary	Secondary
Pupil Numbers	40%	60%
Deprivation	18%	18%
Prior Attainment	40%	20%
EAL	2%	2%

Primary

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 20 Primary

No 2 Primary

Secondary

Yes 3 Secondary

No 2 Secondary

Comments: Secondary schools commented that all/more to be allocated through AWPU. One comment was raised as to whether all pupils numbers ie including 6th form would be used for distribution as was the case with Standards funds , and also if some allowance would be made for specialist funding.

Funding can only be allocated on the elements allowed by DfES and AWPU funding will only be directed at pre 16 pupils.

Outcome: No change for Primary or Secondary

3. Optional de-delegation for Maintained Schools

There are some central services where maintained schools will be able to decide that some funding be retained centrally rather than delegated ie de-delegated. For each area, it would be for the schools forum members in the relevant phase (eg maintained primary) to decide whether that service should be retained centrally. The decisions would then apply to all maintained schools in that phase. However, if all schools do not agree and the funding is delegated it may be possible for a group of schools to buy back the service as a sold service. The prescribed areas are as follows:

3.1 Contingencies (including support for schools in financial difficulties and to support basic need growth). This would include funding for bulge classes, expanding schools and funding to comply with infant class size legislation.

Primary schools are invited to state whether they would support funding being retained centrally to fund bulge classes, expanding schools and compliance with class size legislation. It is anticipated that this would be in the region of £1 million.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated?

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 3 Secondary 21 Primary

No 1 Primary

Comments: Although this option is only available to maintained primary schools, responses from other schools have been included for information only.

3.2 Free School Meal Eligibility

Currently all FSM applications for maintained schools are assessed centrally. It is suggested that it may not be financially viable for each school to manage this process themselves, which is supported by the fact that all academies have opted to buy back into this service.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated?

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 3 Secondary 22 Primary

No 1 Secondary

Comments:

3.3 Staff Costs – Supply Cover

This would include the funding that is currently held centrally to fund the costs of staff on maternity/paternity leave and to fund supply cover for staff on suspension, jury service and union duties. NB This does not include the long term sickness scheme which operates independently.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated?

Yes 1 Special 3 Secondary 21 Primary

No 1 Primary Academy

Comments:

3.4 Support for minority ethnic pupils or underachieving groups

Would you support this funding being de-delegated?

Yes 1 Special 1 Primary Academy 3 Secondary 18 Primary

No 4 Primary 1 Secondary

Comments:

3.5 Behaviour Support Service

This relates to the primary and secondary behaviour service areas. Due to the different nature of the provisions and especially due to the number of secondary academies it is likely that different arrangements will be offered to each sector as the option of de-delegation would only be available to the one remaining maintained secondary school.

Maintained primary schools will have the option of de-delegation to allow the service to continue to be run centrally.

Would you support this funding being de-delegated?

Yes 1 Special 2 Secondary 20 Primary

No 1 Primary Academy 2 Secondary 2 Primary

Comments:

Outcome: The responses appear to show a strong support for de delegation in all areas.