

Outcome of Consultation

Number of responses – 70

- Yes (Primary and Special) = 4
- No (Primary and Special) = 55
- No (Secondary) =11

Comments

- We write on behalf of the Bromley Secondary headteachers, to state that we cannot support the proposal to transfer £1m from the Schools' block to the High Needs block, for the second year running. For all of our schools, this equates to considerable losses to school budgets. In the main, this will result in a direct impact on the number of teachers the schools are able to employ; and thereby directly affects the breadth and quality of provision and resulting standards and outcomes for Bromley children and young people. We cannot underestimate how challenging it will be to find the savings elsewhere in the budget.
If additional funding is required in the High Needs block, this should not be at the expense of mainstream schools. We continue to manage only partly funded pay increases; increasing employer costs, (pensions/national insurance), unfunded changes in courses at all key stages, and the costly challenges around recruitment and retention of teachers, particularly in the shortage subjects.
The decision is also inconsistent with the findings of send4change. It was explained that funding, and therefore provision, within Bromley showed a bias away from mainstream schools. An increasing number of children in our schools with special educational needs, including social, emotional and mental health needs, are not subject to an Education, Health and Care Plan and the resulting funding, yet require additional support and intervention in our schools. If the balance between mainstream and specialist, independent and out of borough provision is to be redressed, we would not expect a cut in school budgets, in favour of the High Needs block, to be the solution taken two years in a row. Additionally, it was noted by send4change that there is a significant spend on external provision, (i.e. non-maintained, independent, or neighbouring local authorities), to the sum of £11.5m (30% of the Specialist Provision budget). This seems very significant. It may be argued that this offers less value for money than in-house/local provision, and would support the decision in previous years for monies to have been taken from the High Needs' block to support the Schools' block. It had been reported to Headteachers at the LA briefing that there has been progress in reducing the number of such placements, and we would therefore argue that this previous solution does not render it the appropriate or required action to be taken now. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this action is 'fair and just'. We are sure that you are aware that the financial times schools are currently working in are very difficult. The Bromley Secondary Headteachers agree that any additional funding in the High Needs block should be addressed by the Local Authority from central funds. We would be interested to hear if the local authority has considered alternative options. We feel that if this continues, not only will standards drop in our local secondary schools, but going forward, the problem is not being addressed.
- The impact of this transfer of funds, on our individual schools' budget, is significant. 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, 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.

- The continued reduction in funding to schools will place an additional burden and further impact on a situation where we are having to make savings to our school budget. We have been required to and are continued to fund teacher pay increases and pay progression notwithstanding the teacher pay grant, which has been received this year. The recruitment and retention of teachers to our school is an ongoing challenge.

We continue to meet a range of additional needs in school for students without SEND and for whom we receive no additional funding. A further reduction in school funding will likely result in us reducing or withdrawing the mentoring and counselling services we provide and fund in school, which constitute early help for our vulnerable students.

Faced with producing an in-year balanced budget and the proposed cut in funding resulting from the movement of funding from the schools block to the high needs block, we will be required to make staffing cuts, which will necessitate a reduction in the curriculum offered to our students.

In light of the focus of the work Sen4change have been doing, it is especially disappointing that this work has not yet resulted in a redistribution of resource and spend from specialist and out of borough provision to schools in order for us to meet the needs of students with SEN, at a time when there are increased needs which do not meet the threshold for an EHCP.

- We do not support this. As schools we are facing severe financial pressures and have had to make difficult decisions to reduce our costs. This proposal also seems to go against much of the literature shared with Schools regarding the future of SEN. We should be investing in our mainstream schools, building on the idea of 'mainstream plus' not cutting funding for schools at this difficult time.
- I cannot support this proposal in light of the severe deficit we are currently forecasting. I understand the reasons for the request but schools cannot afford to lose funding in order to support the High Needs block.

We anticipate additional expenditure in 2019/20 (e.g. salary increase, employers' pension contribution increase, inflation). Removing £1million from the Schools Block can only add to the strain and I would anticipate an even greater negative impact on the quality of education we can provide should this proposal go ahead.

- With external cost rises, schools trying desperately to retain teachers, a reduction in post 16 funding, a real terms reduction in funding across the board and an only part-funded 3.5% -

1.5% pay award very much in mind, it would clearly be wrong to move funding out of the schools block.

In a bid to maintain teaching standards and following the pattern in the last 5-10 years, I expect things that will be reduced first by primary and secondary schools will be the essential services that impact upon student character, their well-being, mental health initiatives and their safety from the ever growing threat from things such as online safety, criminal or sexual exploitation, gang affiliation and knife crime.

- This is a difficult consultation for me as I am the Head Teacher of an Infant school that has an ASD Specialist Provision (Additional Resourced Provision-ARP) but I cannot agree to money being taken from mainstream Primary Schools yet again to support the High Needs Block. Currently the funding received for the ARP does not cover the costs incurred, so at a time of financial difficulty, I already have to find money within the mainstream budget for the ARP. This is impacting on school finances. In effect you are proposing that yet more money is taken from my mainstream school to allow current funding for my ARP to continue.

Finances in Primary Schools are already strained following:

- Two years of cuts
- A history of under-funding for primary schools compared to other LA's
- Teaching staff pay increase (only part funded by government)
- Increasing pension costs
- National Funding Formula

As a Head Teacher that is passionate about inclusion, and hopeful that the new SEND4Change programme would support this, the suggestion of taking money from schools would work against these suggested changes and therefore, in my view, does not support Borough priorities.

I would also raise the issue of increased pressure on primary schools while the funding for secondary schools appears more protected. I do not want to pass the costs over to them, but I do feel that primary education is as important as secondary and therefore why are the primary schools asked to carry this burden alone?

Recruitment and retention of staff is an increasing problem, and one that further cuts will not support. Morale within the teaching profession is impacted by schools forced to ask staff to pick up additional tasks/ roles as resources are cut. We have a Borough that is striving for 'Brilliant Bromley' in relation to education and as a Head Teacher I am behind this and at the forefront of delivery, but how am I expected to deliver this with an ever-shrinking budget? I do not support the LA proposal to move £1m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block, but do agree the money must be found. The Borough needs to re-evaluate the use of their own reserves before asking schools to operate on a third consecutive year of reduced funds.

I feel that Primary Schools in Bromley have historically not been well funded. As a school on the edge of Lewisham, and having previously worked in Southwark, I have been amazed by the difference in funding. I understand that there was a short period of two years where

primary schools were favoured in the budget allocations, but this has stopped and has not had a long term impact.

The movement of that £1m from the schools block, would leave us and, I am sure, most schools in dire straits. The increase in teacher salaries, and general costs, matched against a decrease in funding is putting huge pressure on leaders and school communities in general. I know that Bromley is very proud of its academic record, but this will become increasingly difficult to maintain, I fear, when reduced funding eventually leads to less adults supporting children's learning, and potential redundancies.

In addition to this, reduced pupil numbers over time, means further reductions in funding. At █ our budget has seen significant cuts in allocation of funds in recent years, and next year I estimate that we will lose another £40K – this equates to a teacher, and we do not have additional teachers in our school who are not class teachers.

It seems to me that by reducing the schools block, you will be effectively reducing schools' ability to adequately meet the needs of SEND pupils within schools. Much of the high needs block is used to fund SEND provision outside of the borough. Perhaps if there were more funding and support within schools and within the authority, then we wouldn't need to fund so many pupils out of borough – a catch 22 scenario I think.

All of the above has a massive impact on staff morale and workload, which we are all trying to work to improve, because we are committed to happy, motivated staff working with confidence and support within our schools. Removing even more funding will be effectively working against this aim, and our efforts to improve teacher retention and recruitment.

- As discussed at the Headteachers' forums, Bromley primary schools are facing very challenging financial position. Tonight my school will have a Resources meeting and yet again we will be discussing how we will manage our budgets with increased pressures such as teachers' pay awards and pensions. Our reserves will not last longer than two years (in the best case scenario). In addition there are constant pressures due to the loss of funding such as for diabetic children (we lost £12k a year ago) but children have not left. This and other reasons were discussed at the Headteachers' forum.
- Like most primary Schools, we are expecting to have to set a deficit budget in the next year or two. We have tried to save money by not replacing support staff who move on or retire, but we have reached the point where we would not be fulfilling our duty of care for pupils and staff if we continue with this depletion of staff. We pride ourselves on being an inclusive school and – unlike some neighbouring schools – we do not turn new pupils away if they have additional needs. However, these pupils need to be supported, and any additional funding for these pupils is minimal. This means that we are using more of our diminishing funds to support pupils with SEN, and / or use existing staff who are TAs to support pupils 1-2-1. This has a negative impact on the support for SEN pupils (because it is not specialist support) and also – quite significantly – on the support for pupils who could reach age-expected levels if they had additional support.

Bromley's high outcomes will go down if fewer pupils receive additional support to reach age-related expectations, and also if the excellent teachers we have are not supported in class to achieve the high standards that they have been achieving.

Morale is the lowest I have seen for a long time because – quite simply – we are being expected to reach some of the highest standards in the country, with fewer staff to share the teaching load.

- Due to ongoing budget cuts the school has had to significantly reduce the number of support staff employed at the school. A lot of their work is supporting children with additional needs. We are already at a point where it is a daily challenge to meet the needs of the children with high levels of needs in the school. If our budget were to reduce again through this proposal we would be unable to meet the needs of these children as further cuts would need to be made.

Our work supporting children with high levels of needs has been highly praised over the last 3 years and we pride ourselves on the work we have done. It would be completely unfair to cause a situation where by this work is compromised and then potentially lead to children currently at our school no longer being able to be.

We have engaged in conversations with the LA about how we can directly support the need to provide for children with high levels of need within the borough and will continue to do so but need to at least maintain the level of funding we are currently receiving. I strongly disagree with the proposal and feel that it sends a very negative message to schools and their leaders when it is so public that schools are struggling financially. I urge the LA to look at an alternative way of funding the high needs block allowing the primary schools in Bromley to continue doing the fantastic job they do.

- Primary schools have had to face and manage cuts to their budgets for the last two years. Transfer of £1m from the schools block to the high needs block will only make matters worse for primary schools. The recent pay increase for teaching staff, without future resourcing from government, will add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise – and there is unlikely to be any grant that will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures.

If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced. We should be investing not cutting.

Morale for many staff is extremely low and recruitment of good quality teachers is nigh on impossible. There are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

Following the Schools Forum considering the Council's proposal to move £1M between the Schools Block to the HN Block [REDACTED] Primary School and [REDACTED] School disagrees with the proposal as primary schools in the Borough of Bromley are underfunded due to the changes to the National Funding Formula and we cannot absorb further funding cuts with the current pressures on budget due to the rising costs, recent teacher's pay award

and upcoming increase to the Teacher Pension employer contributions as well as more challenging recruitment. The shortfall in the HN block needs to be found elsewhere by the Council.

- Whilst I understand the need for the LA to make sure that the short fall in the High Needs budget is addressed, the unevenness of the way in which this is being met (with the shortfall coming from Primary Budgets) seems unreasonable. I understand that this is in part determined by the primary/secondary ratio in the National Funding Formula, but this is a time of incredible pressure in budgets for all schools (whichever phase) as a result of significant increases in on costs. This proposal would compound an already very difficult financial situation in Bromley Primary Schools and as such I cannot support it
- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Staffing has already been cut. [REDACTED] ran at a substantial in-year loss of approx. £60,000 despite being subsidised by [REDACTED]. This year even with myself being split between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] we forecast another deficit of approx. £40,000. How can a school stay open when they are running at a loss? Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles. [REDACTED] only had 10 out of 15 places filled. This has had a huge impact upon finances. Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period. In a small school staffing pressures are even greater as there are so many jobs to cover with few people. More cuts will mean less staff and even more work load – this will have a real impact upon retention.
- [REDACTED], like other schools, is now dealing with a third year of reduced funding – funding has fallen in that period and this is against a backdrop of ever-increasing costs. Managing the school's budget whilst maintaining standards relative to the significant accountability measures that schools are subject to is the single most challenging aspect of headship. In relative terms, this has always been a more challenging job for primary headteachers in Bromley given the relative under-funding of primaries in the LA compared Bromley secondaries and primaries outside Bromley. This situation was compounded by the way in which primary schools were unfairly penalised in Bromley by the local arrangements imposed in respect of the NFF (following a vote in which primary schools were fundamentally under-represented).

There is a consensus amongst headteacher colleagues across all sectors in Bromley that school budgets cannot tolerate any further cuts without fundamentally compromising the quality of provision for Bromley's children and young people. As teachers (and, for many of us, as parents) we want the very best for our children and a further cut to funding undermines this. Pressures on budgets has already been compounded over the last year by increases to both support staff and teacher pay which have been, at best, partially funded and, in some cases, unfunded and not budgeted for. Alongside this, on-costs continue to rise, particularly pension contributions and even when central funding is forthcoming it does not fully meet the costs to schools.

Furthermore, in respect of SEND and Bromley's SEND4Change programme, one clear weakness identified across the LA was the failure of some mainstream schools to provide effectively for SEND pupils. Cutting school budgets will only compound this issue; if anything, there should be more investment in mainstream schools to enable them to better meet the needs of some our most vulnerable mainstream pupils in order to ease the pressure on other sectors.

In spite of the cuts to funding, Bromley schools, particularly primary schools, continue to perform well but the council must be mindful that this is not a sustainable model for continued high performance. For this reason, and all the others outlined above, this further cut cannot be tolerated and must not go ahead.

- Following a history of underfunding for primary schools the ratios between primary and secondary was finally balanced three years ago. This has now stopped but the ratio between primary and secondary is now broadly in line with other LA's and should remain so. The imposition of the move to the NFF (2017) was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of our best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors. The under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have taken an unfair share of the cuts. We are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools can not afford any more cuts to budgets. Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Teaching staff costs at all levels and pension rises are already placing huge pressure on schools in a climate of a decreasing budget. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts. Is our children's future not worth investing in? Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements. Nearly all primary schools are currently looking at deficits in the coming years and additional cuts cannot be managed. We are currently in a recruitment crisis and morale in schools is low. We are being pressurised to consider workload but are being given less and less resources to support this. Bromley is a high achieving authority and to remain so schools need to be provided with the appropriate resources needed in order that they can continue to flourish. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is

one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

I feel Primary schools have been very supportive of High Needs Funding in the past but the time has come to say NO. We can no longer support this.

- As a Infant and Junior school, we have had to manage two years of cuts in real terms and this will be a third year if the £1 million is agreed from the main schools block to high needs block.

I know that the move to the NFF in 2017 was decided at School Forum, however I am aware that primary schools are underrepresented and has led to primary schools, in the past, having a disproportionate amount of the cuts.

There are many increases for budgets that have been agreed by Government without future resourcing such as pension costs and teacher pay rises. This will be a real become a real cost to schools if funding from the government ceases. The recent increase of support staff pay have presented additional pressures to the school budget.

We should be investing in schools if the aims and objectives of the SEND4Change programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts. In our school, morale for many staff is lowering as they are expected to do more as staff are not being replaced when they leave because of budget limitations.

Primary schools in Bromley are one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools as we work hard to prepare children for secondary schools and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. Bromley schools are highly regarded and this is a benefit for the Borough, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

I feel that the primary schools in Bromley have been very supportive in the past to the high needs Block but we cannot sustain these loses to our funding any more.

- No I do not support this proposal. School budgets are already at crisis point with Headteachers having to make difficult decisions about spending.
- I thought the explanation and discussion of this proposal was thorough at the Heads Forum. Thank you for that. I appreciate that all areas of the education budget are under pressure and that what happens to the high needs budget either way will impact on work in schools. However, **NO** school can take any more cuts and we definitely can't. To enable us at Downe to balance our budget last year we had to use all of our remaining surplus and cut staffing – including a commitment to always cover classes internally by my teaching and the part-time Senco teaching a class and covering absences. The inevitable outcome of this is that our work is impacted, everyone is more stressed and tired and morale is low. However, teaching is our core work and the children have had experienced and qualified teachers in their classes.

We have implemented the DFE percentage pay award to teachers (all of our teachers are top of their respective grades). We have recently discovered that the promised funding of this will not meet the costs fully and therefore this year's budget outcome is likely to be below prediction which will of course impact further on next year's budget.

On top of this we made a commitment to the governors to engage in fund raising, to try to ameliorate the situation with future budgets which we (clearly wrongly) believed would at least be fairly stable if low after the large cut we sustained last year and the LA decision to move towards NFF immediately. We have fund-raised which takes further time and effort. Sadly not enough has been raised to in any way match the surplus we used up last year, but some money has been gained.

We are doing everything that we possibly can to make this work and to provide a good standard of education for our children, in respect of that we cannot approve any decision to cut our budget even more. Every department will have to work to meet their own shortfall as much as is possible in these very challenging times. We all understand how difficult that is.

- I do not agree because already the schools block is less, due to sharing it with two new secondary schools. It is not fair to lose that money and an additional £1m. The council need to dip into their reserves for the additional £1m.
- Primary Budgets have historically taken the brunt of Council cuts in education. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. This year our budget saw a 30,000 decrease from the previous year.

Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream, as schools do not have the resources. In our one form entry Primary School we already have over 50 children with SEND and 6 children with an EHCP; with 2 more EHCPs in the pipeline. To further reduce any funding would mean that we would find it even more difficult to support our children with the varying complex needs that we have in our school. Families who have children with special needs choose our school in particular as we are small and have an excellent SEND department – but this service will even harder than it already is to provide and maintain. Due to the cuts this year, we have already got 7 less members of staff in our school, which obviously impacts hugely on the provision we offer our pupils.

At a time where moral is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff is particularly difficult any more cuts would make our job even more difficult and will mean that morale continues to deteriorate as less and less support will be able to be afforded to support staff and the children in their care.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with primary schools. Since 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LAs and secondary schools. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

The imposition of the move to the NFF (2017) was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors. We are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools cannot afford any more cuts to budgets .

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.

Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales present additional pressures. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4Change programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls. Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

Morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- Following the Schools Forum considering the Council's proposal to move £1M between the Schools Block to the HN Block, █ Primary School disagrees with the proposal as primary schools in the Borough of Bromley are underfunded due to the changes to the National Funding Formula and we cannot absorb further funding cuts with the current pressures on budget due to the rising costs, recent teacher's pay award and upcoming increase to the Teacher Pension employer contributions as well as more challenging recruitment. The shortfall in the HN block needs to be found elsewhere by the Council.

█ Primary School has had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. We are looking at cutting some of our front line services to pupils.

Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government has added further pressure to our school. Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls.

All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

Morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource. This has led to increased instability at [REDACTED] Primary School.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- The school's budget has continually been reduced due to cuts in education. The funding formula for 2017/18, adopted by Bromley, placed the school under increasing financial pressure causing provision to be impacted negatively. Despite there being a more favourable formula in the two previous years, there was still an imbalance.

[REDACTED] School is one of the highest attaining schools in the Borough. It has however, seen a change in the needs of children joining at Reception. Many of the additional needs presented are complex and specific. As such, the school has been placed under additional pressure by having to seek external specialist staff. By reducing funds to schools in favour of High Needs funding, the already pressured provision for SEND pupils will be further affected.

In addition, the forecast for staffing costs shows that there will be additional financial pressure on the school due to increased costs. Already, the school is having to consider whether vacant posts can be filled by staff of a similar calibre, or indeed whether they can be filled at all.

The school finds itself in a period of low staff morale with staff questioning work life balance.

The proposed movement of funds will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the education of children at the school and on its attainment and progress as well as putting additional pressure on already overworked staff. The school can therefore not support this proposal.

- We cannot support further cuts to our budgets
- Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Staffing has already been cut at [REDACTED] and we still have an in-year deficit. Any more cuts will compound issues and increase the future years in-year deficit.

Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

[REDACTED] has had a few places available for the last few years. This is a cut to our budget.

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the 250 schools in the country. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

- In 2017/18 [REDACTED] was required to undertake a restructure of the senior leadership team due to underfunding. This has impacted upon the workload of the remaining staff members who are already feeling the strain of restricted finances. The staff are committed to the community which they serve and passionate in achieving excellent academic outcomes for children. However, further cuts to budgets will undoubtedly increase staff sickness and mental health difficulties, moreover, creating additional costs and problems for schools. Ultimately, this will lead to staff shortages at a time when recruitment is already in crisis.

[REDACTED] has 37% SEND children and is already stretched to its limit in providing the pastoral and academic care necessary to address the vast array of needs our children require. Currently, staff, bear the brunt of this. However, there is only so long that we can sustain and maintain our success. Further cuts will be sure to cause critical damage which in turn will be far more costly to repair in an already deprived school. For example, school currently employ a speech and language therapist to deliver essential intervention to children so that they can acquire the speech sounds, vocabulary and the receptive language necessary to become able readers, writers and develop social relationships. All vital life skills. Further restriction to our finance will result in services such as this being cut. As well as this a further priority is to provide mental health services in school. Another essential area in peril of being cut. Without these basic needs being met, our children will be unable to access the curriculum and teachers will be further pressured to support these needs rather than their priority of academia.

Increases in salaries, pension contributions and a drop in pupil numbers are additional factors which our budgets need to sustain. With these additional costs and impacts as well as further cuts, the education of our children will suffer.

Therefore, I do not agree with funds being moved from the school block as it will have a severely detrimental impact on the education of children and the high quality provision we currently deliver, in an already underfunded service.

- Primary Budgets have historically taken the brunt of Council cuts in education. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. The decision to weight the formula more favourably previously (two years prior) toward primaries was to enable them to gain back funding from the years of historic underfunding. The short term gain did not balance the years of inadequate funding.

The movement of a million pounds exacerbated the funding issues in 2017/18. 2018 / 20 budgets have to withstand funding for teacher's salaries, a movement of the scales for support staff to align with National, pension rises, increased costs to services whilst providing a broad curriculum and extended services. The funds do not stretch.

Pupil numbers are volatile and effect a variety of our schools. Schools are seeing vacancies across year groups or over-number places not being used, this ultimately impacts on budgets. Predicted budgets for 2019/20 show a drop in pupil number across the trust. With one school losing £70k. Even three or four vacancies across a school has a significant impact on the delivery of essential services.

Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream as schools do not have the resources. Our schools are having to only recruit to essential posts to ensure that they do not have to restructure.

At a time where moral is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff, especially those to middle and senior leadership posts, is difficult the Council are proposing to add more financial misery to an already underfunded sector.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with primary schools.

- all schools can not afford any more cuts to budgets .

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. It is becoming detrimental to the provision and we are making staff redundant and moral is low – we are unable to secure budgets lasting 3 years with no deficit – this will ruin us! Those of us who struggle to fill pupil spaces this will be in many ways catastrophic – we can even afford to restructure staff out as even the redundancy costs are too high. I oppose this decision and feel that you may well find across Bromley that headship becomes an untenable position for us

- I cannot oppose this proposal strongly enough.

From 2015-16 to the current year 2018-19, our income has fallen by £139,000. In the same period, staff salaries have increased by £79,600. Next year, we are projected to lose another £88,000.

The consultation for the local authority to reduce school funding further by moving £1million from the School Block to the High Needs Block would make the school funding situation impossible.

We have already made our French teacher redundant, lost another teacher and our Finance Officer. We have reduced the time teachers have for PPA, have reduced the intervention support children receive and stopped the rolling programme of building maintenance. Our curriculum budgets for this year have been stripped bare. There is no more blood in the stone. Children and teachers are now going to end up suffering.

We heard from Cllr [REDACTED] recently at the Heads Forum that we are lucky to have such passionate teachers and leaders in Bromley who make such a difference to our children. Local funding cuts on top of national funding cuts, mean this passion we heard about will be extinguished. We cannot continue to provide a quality education with further cuts.

Increasing the burden upon schools by removing further funding from the Schools Block will have a severely detrimental effect upon children in Bromley mainstream schools. It is not a tenable situation.

If the education and welfare of children in Bromley is valued, the money that has been identified as being needed to support SEN must be found from elsewhere.

- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, a third would be crippling for all schools. Historically in Bromley, prior to 2013, primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary schools. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of underfunding, however this stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of underfunding which is now impacting on primary budgets.

In addition to this schools are paying for the increase in the teaching staff award without future resourcing by government and for the harmonization of support staff pay scales, both which add further pressure to budgets. Alongside this pension costs have risen and will continue to rise and it is unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases. The grant may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the coming years.

Furthermore, If the aims and objectives of the SEND4Change programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as

it has and will be given further cuts. We should be investing not cutting. As result of significantly reduced budgets morale for many staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload, we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource. Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country; this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

We understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some or all of the proposed cuts?

- We have always been underfunded compared to other LAs, secondary schools and only for the last three years did this change. However this has stopped.
As a group of primary schools we were underrepresented at the Schools Forum and this has meant the secondary schools having the louder voice consequently receiving greater cuts than our secondary 'friends'.
As Primary schools we have had to manage two years of cuts whilst being expected to achieve the increased standards bestowed on us by the government.
We already subsidise our Provision as we do not receive enough funding to cover the cost of salaries, let alone the additional needs of the children. We struggle to keep staff because we can't pay them as much as they receive at special schools so recruitment and retention is a challenge, at times. We are also having to pay more as the academies agenda means there is no longer the sharing of resources, leading to reduced prices e.g. speech and language therapist. We used to pay £9,000, now we are having to pay £27,000!
At [REDACTED] we work incredibly hard to make sure our pupils achieve of their best. Money is definitely needed to provide first quality teachers who are prepared to work in a more challenging area and for good quality teaching assistants to provide interventions for those with additional needs. Please help us to continue to be Brilliant Bromley!
- The Council cuts in education have historically negatively affected primary school budgets. The Council opted for a formula that hit primaries schools unfairly in 2017/18. The decision to weight the formula more favourably previously (two years prior) toward primaries was to enable them to gain back funding from the years of historic underfunding. The short term gain did not balance the years of inadequate funding.
As a school we have had to manage two years of cuts already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. To counter act the cuts in the previous years, I have had to cut back spending in all areas – as a school we cannot cut back any further without seriously affecting the quality of education that we are offering our pupils. Furthermore funding for the rise in teacher's salaries, a movement of the scales for support staff to align with National and increased costs to services has further impacted the budget. Our funds simply do not stretch. .
Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise – it is unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years. Pupil numbers are volatile and vacancies across a school has a significant impact on the delivery of essential services.
Through cutting the schools block the Council will affect the provision for SEND pupils within the mainstream as schools do not have the resources. We are having to only recruit to essential posts to ensure that they do not have to restructure.
At a time where moral is at its lowest and recruitment and retention of staff, especially those to middle and senior leadership posts, is difficult the Council are proposing to add more financial gloom to an already underfunded sector.

No movement of funds from the schools block could be supported without a detrimental impact to the provision with both [REDACTED] and all primary schools in Bromley.

- Primary school funding is disadvantaged enough as it is, compared with the secondary bias.

- I am against the LA proposal for a number of reasons.

Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly under funded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of under funding. But stopped last year. The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

Primary School Heads in Bromley are in agreement with secondary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools **can not** afford any more cuts to budgets .

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years.

Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls. All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. **This is unfair and unsustainable.**

We understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some or all of the proposed cuts?

- Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts and a third year is not tenable. We cannot continue to deliver the breadth of service on the present funding arrangements.

- As the COO of the [REDACTED] Trust, I can share with the School's Finance Team that the Trust has experienced a *reduction* in School Budget Share income totalling £277,539 over the two academic years 2016-17 to 2018-19.

This decrease presents significant difficulties and is negatively impacting teaching and learning across each of the Trust's schools. A staffing hire freeze is now in place and staffing cost reductions have been budgeted and are now in plan. Premises improvement and ICT

improvement expenditure has ceased in their entirety asides from Devolved Formula Capital spend.

School budgets for each of the six schools for 2019-20 onwards forecast sizeable outturn deficits.

I'm sure that others will reflect on the morality, fairness and politics of the suggested proposal. I wish only to comment that any further reduction in income will have a profound and negative impact on the outcomes from Bromley primary school children within our Trust

- Following hot on the heels of the Council's deeply flawed decision regarding Primary/Secondary funding ratios last January we are now being asked to accept further reductions in income which take us below even the NFF indicator. For our Trust this reduction would equate to approximately £82,500 – more than the cost of two young teachers. Given that all of our schools are down to the bare bones regarding teacher numbers this would be detrimental to the education of our children. Councillors may well have followed the local press stories last summer regarding staff re-structuring at [REDACTED]. Further staff re-structures would have a hugely detrimental impact on parental confidence and commitment, both in schools and also the London Borough of Bromley! As a Trust we are rapidly eating into our reserves and anticipate being close to an overall deficit by August 2021. We have exhausted means of reducing costs but continue to have in-year deficits, especially as central government continues to announce pay and pension increases without funding them adequately. I find the mere suggestion by Councillors that this could be an option deeply insulting, and it appears to be yet more evidence of a disconnect between Bromley Council and its schools. Councillors should not be looking to resolve their problems by shifting the challenges to others - I am furious. Please do not challenge your already very strained relationship with Primary Schools any further
- Once again Primary schools lose money.
- The national funding for schools has been cut by 8% over the last 8 years and there is a £4 billion short fall nationally in funding that needs to be addressed immediately.

Schools across the country and Bromley are reporting the high likelihood of setting deficit budgets in the future. Many schools have or are considering a reduced timetable to cope with these cuts.

Despite Mr Hammond's little extras and the promise that all schools will receive 0.5% per pupil more this year no school in Bromley is receiving this. Secondary schools will receive no increase in pupil funding and Primary schools will receive a cut of 1.25% per pupil.

This is because of the disastrous government policy of imposing free schools on the borough and their unreasonably high funding. Money is being moved from primary schools to secondary schools where there might not even be children.

This along with the high levels of inflation and increased pension contributions means schools are losing funding in all areas.

And this has become unsustainable.

It is also true that there is a national and local crisis in funding for the most vulnerable children in our schools. The settlement locally and nationally for the high needs block is totally inadequate for the level of need.

Rather than set up a false dichotomy and moving one block of money where it is needed to another place where it is also needed the Council should lead protests about this grossly inadequate settlement for the children in Bromley, for all children in Bromley and they should demand a better and adequate settlement for children across the country and for children in Bromley.

If they are unwilling or unable to do this they should realise that the only way to address this crisis is to access the council's reserves to invest in children in Bromley.

- I do not support the LA proposal to move £1million from the Schools block to the High Needs Block as I have real concerns about the impact another funding cut would mean for our school as there are significant budgets issues already. The decision to adopt the NFF was decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented. This has led to a situation where primary schools have borne a disproportionate burden of cuts. Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts. Awarding teaching staff pay increases without future resourcing by government adds further to the pressure we are under and pension costs have risen and will continue to rise. If the aims of the SEND4CHANGE programme and an inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced. The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term and these have also impacted on school rolls. Primary schools cannot deliver the breadth of services on the present funding arrangements. Morale for staff is low, there are concerns about job security and workload - we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resources. The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools as we prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these unfair cuts continue. Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure. I understand the challenges faced by the LA in other areas of their funding and appreciate that council tax has already been used to fund education but are there reserves which could be used to offset some of the proposed cuts?
- Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government will cripple our budget. We are a one form entry school already at breaking point. Support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. It is unlikely that any grant from government will fully fund the pension costs (which has risen and will continue to rise). Whilst in the short term the impact will not be as detrimental as it will be in the medium to long term.
I am relatively new to the borough and within a very short period of time it has become apparent that the views of the Primary school representatives on the Schools' Forum has been overshadowed. It appears as if the secondary schools representatives have consistently taken a view to represent only the needs of their sector. This and the under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have borne the majority of the cuts.
Furthermore, the impact of the free schools is clearly starting to within Bromley. School rolls are falling which is also having a major impact on funding.

- From 2015-16 to the current year 18-19, our income has fallen by a cumulative £142,686. This amount, for an average-sized primary school is simply untenable. Next year, we are due to lose another £40,000 from our budget, meaning a loss in income of nearly £200,000 in just four years.

In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10% and services by more than that. We have had to cut our support staff budget by 25%. The budget for staff training has been halved.

For a short while, we were able to survive from our reserves. However, these have now gone. The impact in the classroom is already being felt and this will be the first year when the quality of education has been directly negatively impacted by the financial situation of our school.

The allocation of money to free schools must be found from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. These new schools have impacted my school directly from the funding allocation, but also from the fall in role because of the opening of a new school 0.4 miles away from ours. Brilliant Bromley will be merely a distant memory unless action is taken this year.

- Historically, our schools have been underfunded and this was acknowledged in the increased funding levels three years ago. The proposed £1m transfer from primary school funding coupled with the planned 1.5% budget cut would see Bromley primary schools struggle once again against a background of increasing staff and other costs.

This year's pay award and the imminent increase to pension costs have put enormous pressure on our schools. The SEN funding reforms have compounded this and have had an impact in real terms on my school. Children with high-level need who would previously have begun school with transition funding are now arriving unfunded and we are having to make cuts to other provision to put support in place for them; my SENCO spends her time filling in paperwork and meeting with Bromley's SEN gatekeepers rather than being able to have a direct impact on learning. Unfunded inclusion is not the solution to these children's difficulties.

The introduction of free schools within the vicinity of my school plus the expansion of neighbouring schools has impacted on our admissions. We currently have 10 spaces on roll across Reception and Year 1 and this has affected our budget; we are not unique in this situation.

We have worked hard to build a successful school and have been proactive in recruiting staff of a high calibre. Staff workload has increased as a result of our underfunding and whilst my team are currently willing to go 'the extra mile' for our children, there will come a point when they will not be prepared to do more with fewer resources.

There has been much talk of 'Brilliant Bromley' and our schools being the jewel in the borough's crown. I have been a Bromley headteacher for almost 14 years and times have never been as challenging for our schools as they are now. Further cuts will destabilise our schools and the borough needs to make up for the shortfall from its

reserves, rather than jeopardising the educational opportunities of our children

- We are a one form entry, who have been hit hard over the last two years. Our teaching costs are rising every year and our budget is in deficit with dwindling reserves. We are a high performing school, who secures excellent outcomes for all our children and if we have any more cuts it will have a detrimental effect on our children's education and staff morale. At this rate Bromley will end up with schools closing down as they will no longer be financially viable.
- We at The Highway are quite small as a one form entry primary school but we believe that primary schools of every size cannot deliver the breadth of services expected on the present funding arrangements. Morale for many staff is low, there are already concerns about job security and workload and as always we are being expected to do more and more with less and less resource

Primary schools have had to manage two years of cuts, for many in both real and cash terms and for all in real terms, already and a third is planned in the transfer of £1m is agreed from the main schools block to high needs. Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government add further pressure.

Pension costs have risen and will continue to rise - unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it won't for the teachers' pay award. This may also be short term and will become a real cost to schools over the next year years. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures.

All the free schools being funded disproportionately are Secondary schools and this represents another unfair move from funding primary school children into secondary schools. The cuts in primary schools will fund places in these free schools and not actual children. This is unfair and unsustainable.

The impact of the free schools is clearly starting to be felt with no additional funding in the short-term, they have also impacted on school rolls.

Many schools have vacancies across age range the proposed fund to support drop in numbers will not cover this. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles.

Historically - prior to 2013 primary schools were significantly underfunded compared to other LA and secondary school. This was re balanced three years ago to address some of the years of underfunding, but stopped last year.

The ratio between primary and secondary funding is now comparative to other LAs but was not sufficient to address the years of under funding

The imposition of the move to the National Funding Formula last year was originally decided by a vote at the schools forum where primary schools were clearly underrepresented, in spite of our best efforts to secure full representation with two academy governors.

Despite attempts by the Primary school representatives on the Schools' Forum to be bipartite and to take a cross sector approach the secondary schools representatives have consistently taken a view to represent only the needs of their sector. This and the under representation of Primary Schools on the forum, despite having the largest number of children attending primary schools in Bromley, has led to a situation where primary schools have borne a disproportionate burden of cuts.

Thankfully secondary colleagues are now in agreement with us as primary colleagues on the current consultation that all schools cannot afford any more cuts to budgets.

If the aims and objectives of the SEND4CHange programme and a really inclusive Bromley are going to be achieved, mainstream provision should not be reduced as it has and will be given further cuts - some mainstream schools have had to fund their own provisions. We should be investing not cutting.

Delivery of services, retaining staff and providing the present standards is already under pressure with most schools predicting the loss of any reserves over a three year period.

As we concluded at our recent Primary heads forum:-

Primary Schools in Bromley are the third best in the country and there are 3 primary schools in Bromley in the top 250 schools in the country.

The excellent outcomes in Primary schools in Bromley is one of the key reasons for the good outcomes for secondary schools. We prepare children for secondary school exceptionally well and this is one of the key reasons why they do well in their GCSEs and A levels. We continue to be one of the best things about living in Bromley, this will not continue if these disproportionate and unfair cuts continue.

- Whilst I can see that there are financial difficulties across all phases in education and within the council, I have strong concerns about the impact another funding cut would mean for the primary phase as there are significant budget issues already.
- In the past Bromley schools have been justifiably proud of the achievements of all their pupils and have been one of the highest performing local authorities. However, with the current budget cuts this **is not** sustainable. Since 2015-16 to the current year, our income has fallen by almost £140,000. This amount, for a school of our size is simply not manageable. On top of this, next year, we are due to lose more than £45,000 from our budget, which means we have lost £185,000 in only four years.
In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10%, services by more than that, the budget for staff training has been cut by 50% and the budget for support staff by 25%. The impact of this is already being felt both in the classrooms and by staff and indeed parents and children. Interventions, resources and teaching assistant help has been cut for our most needy children. Whilst reserves have been available in the past to bridge any gap, these are now virtually gone. More vulnerable children are being placed in mainstream schools, particularly Unicorn as we have a good track record with SEN children, and without more funding, let alone a cut in funding, children and staff are at risk.
The allocation of money to free schools must be made available from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. With the opening of so many free schools, there is now too many school places available. This has meant that not all schools are able to fill their places which leads to more funding issues and Bromley will fall down the ranking and as schools we will not be able to support our pupils effectively.
- As a school, we have already made significant cuts to our annual budget over the past five years. These include:
 - Not replacing the school Librarian (this staff member also played a key role in support speech and language throughout the school)
 - Reducing the school's HLTA's from three to two
 - Not replacing the school's Family Worker and Play Therapist who left the school in July 2018
 - Significantly reducing the budget allocation to support school development priorities from

£30,000 to £15,000

At present, staff at [REDACTED] are working to their limits as everyone has had to take on more work to absorb the workload of those staff members who have not been replaced. There is nowhere else left to cut without further reductions having a significant negative impact on current provision, standards or pupil and staff wellbeing.

The level of need of pupils coming in at Reception or joining mid-year has increased. Our own school resources are stretched and, cuts to school funding centrally is simply not going to work.

Recently, the Interim Director of Education presented on ‘Brilliant Bromley’ which showed a positive picture of achievement in the Borough compared to the National. However, she pointed out that Bromley were not doing as well as other London Boroughs. It would be most welcome to receive a contextual report of the funding and level of resources Bromley receives compared to the top three performing London Boroughs.

- The proposal to move £1m from the School Block to the High Needs Block will result in cuts for all primaries and for the overwhelming majority will represent a third year of a real term’s reduction in budgets. At Warren Road this will represent a real cut of almost £150k.

The impact of the implementation of the NFF has not been a positive one and was implemented after a process which at best was questionable given the underrepresentation of primary schools on the Schools’ Forum.

Against a background of rising costs including staffing costs, a gap has opened up in the resources available with staff redundancies and reductions in hours already evident across the local authority and more inevitable if the proposed cuts are allowed to take effect.

Colleagues in secondary schools are facing similar challenges and some have even had to reduce the range of subjects taught.

Staff are being asked to do more and more whilst the government are asking us to review teacher workload. Teachers are leaving the profession in their droves and recruitment is difficult.

Over the past 18 months, we have worked hard to develop a clear vision for children with special needs and disabilities. This is based on the premise of a more inclusive approach in mainstream schools to which we are firmly committed. This will however require adequate resources in mainstream schools which I don’t believe will be the case with further cuts.

We understand that Bromley wants to manage its high needs funding more effectively and in time costs will be reduced. In the short and medium term however additional funding is required. An alternative option to the proposed transfer of funds is essential. Whether this is using council reserves, working with a short-term deficit model, increase funding through council tax or other revenue streams, an alternative option is essential if we are to invest for the future of all Bromley children and make Brilliant Bromley a reality now and for years to come.

- From 2015 to the current year and going forward, our income has fallen by almost £140,000. This amount, for an average-sized primary school is simply not sustainable! Next year, we are due to lose another £20,000+ from our budget, meaning a loss in income not much short of £200,000 in just four years.

In that time, teaching costs have risen by over 10%, and services by more than that. We have had to cut our support staff budget by 25%. The budget for staff training has been more than halved.

For a short while, we have been able to call upon our reserves. However, these have now virtually gone. The impact in the classrooms is already being felt and this will be the first year when the quality of education has been directly negatively impacted by the financial situation of our school. Teaching assistants, resources and interventions for our most vulnerable pupils have been drastically cut.

More children being placed in main stream schools and more funding for such children being re-allocated elsewhere, this is not maintainable, children and staff are at risk

Additionally, the allocation of money to free schools must be found from elsewhere, at least in the short-term. These new schools have impacted on my school directly from the funding allocation, but also from the fall in roll, my current years 1 & 2 have approx. 25% less pupils than our roll permits. The opening of a new 2 form entry primary school only a mile away from ours has impacted on all the 4 schools in our small multi academy trust in the West Wickham area.

Brilliant Bromley is a wonderful notion that must be paid for from Bromley Local Authority reserves and not from the very service it states is at its heart.

- Working in an already underfunded sector my school cannot sustain yet more cuts. Pupil numbers are volatile across the borough but even more so in my school. In the past year I have seen my pupil numbers change dramatically as over 70 children have moved in and out of my school. Being under subscribed and competing with 3 newly opened and highly funded free schools I have little choice about the children entering onto my roll. The majority of new entrants are coming with additional needs such as EAL, behaviour or emotional needs associated with being evicted and relocated to a new area-stretching my dwindling budget even further. Delivery of education in primary is based on full school roles. My school roll is already under by 60 places! Awarding teaching staff % increase without future resourcing by government adds further pressure. Not to mention pension costs that have risen and will continue to rise – it is highly unlikely any grant will fully meet these increases as it hasn't for the teachers' pay award. Recent harmonization of support staff pay scales have and will present additional pressures. I have a high number of support staff as I am dependent on my TAs to help meet the demanding needs of the children entering my school.