

Number of responses received = 17

Number of yes responses = 3

Number of no responses = 9

Number of neither yes or no = 5

Comments;

- There is insufficient information in the proposal to have an opinion – Oaklands would need to know what that therefore means for the High Needs block, what are the strategies for managing that/ or any issues.  
Are the impacts the same for Primary/Secondary /Special schools?  
Can't answer as I don't know what I'm saying yes to.  
Don't know what the financial movement is for Oaklands – can it be quantified yet?
- Schools are already facing huge financial challenges. The LA needs to put in place a clear plan for the High Needs Block which deals with the root of the issue and not just plug the gap by taking from the schools block. In order to resolve the current issue new funding needs to be invested.
- It is important that the provision for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged students is maintained at, or close to, current levels. It is for this reason that I support the request to move £1m from the Schools block to the High Needs Block for 2018/19.
- There is not enough money to go round. We have struggled to meet our costs this year 2017/18 with the decreased budget and would be severely compromised to ensure we can meet the needs of all our children if we get even greater cuts in 2018/19. This is probably the same for all schools and also those who have high needs.  
The authority can only meet the needs of all the children in Bromley by either going in to deficit or lobbying for more money from central government.  
The additional £1m needs to be found from other council revenue or from the government but not from the education budget, therefore I neither agree or disagree
- I neither support nor do not support this request. We are already supporting the High Needs Block by having to use money allocated for the mainstream to finance our provision.  
Is there no other money available from the council that we could use instead?
- It is not possible to support this proposal and I must strongly object to it.  
Schools are already facing huge financial challenges. The LA needs to put in place a clear plan for the High Needs Block which deals with the root of the issue and not just plug the gap by taking from the schools block. In order to resolve the current issue new funding needs to be invested.

- Increased funding is desperately needed to safeguard our pupil's education. Many schools use Pupil Premium stream funding to plug the gaps caused by cuts in the value of other funding. However, St Joseph's does not have much additional funding as PP and EAL numbers are low. As St Joseph's is a one form entry any cuts to funding will particularly have a negative impact. The reduction in funding for SEND, either from the notional budget or top up funds will reduce the support we are able to provide to SEND pupils. We are currently funding directly from our notional budget the speech therapist, the social and communication advisor, EP visits as well as in class support.
- We are concerned about the poor funding of Kemnal Technology College in comparison to the NFF and the impact that a reduction in the schools block will have on that funding going forward.
- It is difficult to see how we can support this. I have not seen any modelling of the impact on schools and can only assume it will impact negatively. This year our budget was reduced by over £300,000. We have not yet agreed how the NFF will be applied in 2018/19. We do not yet know what impact the removal of the 1% pay cap on public sector workers will have on school budgets next year and there is the likelihood of further employer pension contribution increases. It is being requested whilst there is a review of SEND spending which may provide some other ways to reduce the deficit in High Needs Block.
- The impact of this transfer of funds, on our individual schools' budget, is unclear. This proposal precedes further decisions about the DSG distribution to schools and there is no modelling of likely impact on an individual school.

We have also not yet been provided with any indication of the LA Schools' Forum intended modelling of the "soft" national funding formula for our school in 2018-19 and 2019-20 prior to the full introduction of the NFF.

We have recently responded to the SEND review currently taking place to address the perceived imbalance between funding for SEN within schools compared to funding in specialist provision. The review is necessary to instigate a sustainable plan for SEND funding in the local authority. 'Topping up' the high needs block in this way does not address the ongoing imbalance in funding allocation and subsequent impact.

The proposed transfer takes yet more funding away from Schools with lower levels of high needs students. Schools are already under significant financial pressure as we tackle unplanned pay increases set out in the STPCD (which have not been funded), increases in pension and national insurance contributions, pressures to recruit and retain quality staff, meeting the SEND needs of students without EHCPs and the increased pressure on resources to support all students with emotional health issues.
- It is not clear what the impact of this will be on our individual schools' budget because this decision precedes further decisions about the DSG distribution to schools and there is no modelling of likely impact on an individual school.

We have also not yet been provided with any indication of the LA Schools' Forum intended modelling of the "soft" national funding formula for our school in 2018-19 and 2019-20 prior to the full introduction of the NFF.

Whilst I understand the pressure on high needs and the existing liabilities/commitments which need to be met by the LA, the SEND review currently taking place is underway to address the perceived imbalance between funding for SEN within schools compared to funding in specialist provision etc.

We are increasingly expected to and required to meet a range of SEN needs in school for students without EHCPs from the notional £6k within our school budget, which is already stretched and under significant pressure. This is further exacerbated by pressures to recruit and retain quality staff and pay increases set out in the STPCD which have not been funded.

- Schools are struggling to make ends meet as it is and get little back from the LA in terms of SEN funding. We are already having to support provision that would historically have come from health and a further squeeze is unreasonable.  
The fact that changes in personnel within the LA and the awaited report by SEND4Change have prevented savings being achieved is regrettable, but should not result in further pressure on school budgets.
- It is not possible to support this without any modelling to show the impact; in particular the impact on AWPU.  
The proposal removes money from the Schools Block – which has already been reduced by the “Growth Fund”. The proposed disapplication of a further £1million means an overall 1.5% reduction in the Schools Block. This is unacceptable for all the oft publicised reasons – not least of which is the anticipated removal of the 1% pay cap without any additional funding.  
The SEND review currently taking place aims to make more efficient and effective use of limited resources – ideally leaving more money available at the proactive end of the intervention spectrum (in schools) rather than the reactive (and far more expensive per pupil/young person) end. The proposed adjustment simply takes even more money out of schools, reducing their capacity to intervene early and proactively – thereby continuing the vicious circle which exists and so ill serves the most vulnerable of our young people; and for whom early and proactive intervention (in mainstream school) would be most transformative.
- **I neither** support nor do not support this request. There is chronic underfunding of schools in Bromley and nationally, so that that an effective education system is no longer possible. There is a cut of £100million pounds in the SEND funding nationally and a cut of £2 billion in the schools budget up to 2020 and £6 billion up to 2022. These cuts will rise further as inflation rises and funding stays static. These cuts are unsustainable for all schools nationally and are unsustainable for schools in Bromley.  
Schools cannot lose £1 million from their budgets in Bromley and provide an effective education for the children in their care .The high needs budget cannot sustain a cut of £1.7 million to ensure that the most vulnerable children have access to effective provision. Neither option is sustainable for the children in Bromley.  
The only sustainable option is to lobby and to campaign for the £100 million cuts to be put back into the High Needs budget nationally and the £2 billion to be put back into the Schools Block so that schools are able to deliver high quality learning for all the children in their care, nationally and in Bromley.  
There are specific issues about the funding of education, both the High Needs Block and the Schools Block in Bromley but overwhelmingly there is not enough money for Bromley children and all children nationally. This is what needs to be addressed and exposed. It would be invidious to support either option so therefore I cannot, in all fairness, support either.  
Two further options should be considered; funding the shortfall through accessing the council’s surplus to fund the High Needs Block or by setting a surplus budget on the High Needs Block to show the government that their funding is insufficient and unsustainable.