

Appendix A Consultation responses

	Question	Response from Consultee and %		Officer Response
1)	Formula - Creation of a TLR allowance in the Secondary	16.67%	Very supportive	
		33.33%	Supportive	
		36.67%	Neither supportive nor unsupportive	
		10.00%	Not supportive	
		3.33%	Not at all supportive	
		0%	Not Answered	
2)	If not supportive of the creation of TLR allowance, can you please explain and elaborate so we consider further	Some responses queried Primary sector not having any similar funding		A further review is proposed of the formula which would start next calendar year which will review the formula in more depth
		A request was made for further detail required around the proposal to better understand the situation		The current Secondary average teacher cost calculation does not include the TLR allowances, there is only time provided in the formula within the 0.83 management time uplift
		Request that the authority carries out analysis of school structures and provides a bench marked exemplary model that allows for single and dual medium schools of mixed sizes. This model should then drive the funding		Further analysis is being carried out on other TLR structures in different schools from different Authorities
		Concerns were raised around the proposal being subject to Cabinet approval		Any bid to Cabinet is subject to final confirmation through a formal process.
3)	Formula – Powys to Powys school pupil movement	30.00%	Very Supportive	
		23.33%	Supportive	
		10.00%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive	
		26.67%	Not Supportive	
		10.00%	Not all supportive	
		0%	Not Answered	
4)	If you don't support Powys to Powys pupil movement, can you please specify and give reasons	Responses received around the proposal ignoring the curriculum led model in place and schools only needing additional monies if it triggers an extra class		The proposal starts to bridge the gap between the current curriculum model and moving towards a lump sum and per pupil allocation. Which was sighted in the consultation responses to the last review which went to Cabinet on the 15 th January 2019.

		<p>Responses received around why the full amount of money cannot transfer with the pupil at any time of the year</p> <p>Authority needs to consider the September intake in the formula</p> <p>Impact on school losing monies and detrimental effect on budgets that are very tight. Perhaps council should build in a contingency to meet the extra in year costs</p> <p>Process around removing the funding and this being actioned on a timely basis</p>	<p>The school the pupil is attending prior to moving requires the money to support the pupil educationally.</p> <p>A further review of the formula will take place, and this feedback will be used.</p> <p>The Authority continues to support all schools with the management of their budget</p> <p>The finance officers will work with the Schools Service to ensure timely action of budget transfers between schools.</p>												
5)	Formula – Out of County pupils moving into Powys Schools	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>23.33%</td> <td>Very Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26.67%</td> <td>Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13.33%</td> <td>Neither Supportive nor unsupportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23.33%</td> <td>Not Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13.33%</td> <td>Not all supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0%</td> <td>Not Answered</td> </tr> </table>	23.33%	Very Supportive	26.67%	Supportive	13.33%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive	23.33%	Not Supportive	13.33%	Not all supportive	0%	Not Answered	
23.33%	Very Supportive														
26.67%	Supportive														
13.33%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive														
23.33%	Not Supportive														
13.33%	Not all supportive														
0%	Not Answered														
6)	If you don't support the change around Proposed "Out of County", please give your reasons	<p>System must not be overly bureaucratic and workload to apply for funding, in general monies should follow the pupil.</p> <p>Concerns around the fact that no direct funding comes with the pupils which differs to Powys to Powys pupil movement.</p> <p>Funding should only be provided if it triggers another class</p> <p>Huge impact on border schools</p> <p>A contingency pot may need to be required to cover this in year</p>	<p>The process will not be overly bureaucratic as it requires a timely response from the Authority to the school to aide planning of budget. The Authority will be reviewing the formula, building on the responses received and next steps discussed when the new formula was introduced in April 19. A set of criteria will be defined to support this process.</p> <p>The Authority has not received the additional funding during the year for out of county pupils within its Revenue Support Grant from Welsh Government. Therefore, the proposal is to review each case, on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Officers will assess the impact and discuss with the school prior to making a decision.</p> <p>The school will be able to apply to the Authority.</p>												

			Schools delegated budget includes a contingency pot which would be utilised for these purposes where applicable												
7)	Formula – Significant growth	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>26.67%</td> <td>Very Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36.67%</td> <td>Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16.67%</td> <td>Neither Supportive nor unsupportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13.33%</td> <td>Not Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.67%</td> <td>Not all supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0%</td> <td>Not Answered</td> </tr> </table>	26.67%	Very Supportive	36.67%	Supportive	16.67%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive	13.33%	Not Supportive	6.67%	Not all supportive	0%	Not Answered	
26.67%	Very Supportive														
36.67%	Supportive														
16.67%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive														
13.33%	Not Supportive														
6.67%	Not all supportive														
0%	Not Answered														
8)	If you don't support the Significant pupil growth proposal, please explain further	<p>Believe the additional funding is required</p> <p>Concerns around where the additional funding is coming from</p> <p>What is the classification around significant growth</p> <p>Authority to consider the September intake in its formula</p> <p>Funding should only be provided if it triggers an additional class</p>	<p>Schools delegated budget includes a contingency pot which would be utilised for these purposes where applicable</p> <p>The classification around what is deemed "significant growth" will depend on the effect it has on the individual school, which will be taken into account by officers when reviewing the case. A set of criteria will be defined to support this process.</p> <p>The Authority will carry out a further review of the formula, in which these responses will be included in order to inform next steps.</p> <p>Officers will assess the impact and discuss with the school prior to making a decision</p>												
9)	Summary of General Comments around the formula received	<p>Specialist centres and how they are account for pupils in the formula</p> <p>Concerns around the impact on funding in relation to the stepped model</p> <p>Review of premises formula</p> <p>Contact ratio of 83% in Secondary</p> <p>Schools transformation and the impact on the formula</p> <p>Current formula does not reflect transience</p> <p>Current formula highly transparent</p>	The Authority will use the responses received from this area of the consultation to feed into any future review of the Formula.												

		<p>ALN funding needs to be reviewed</p> <p>Concerned around KS4 class size</p> <p>Further review of formula requested</p> <p>Funding of PPA at HLTA rate in the Primary Sector</p> <p>Formula not easy to understand</p> <p>Formula makes little provision for all through schools</p> <p>ALN funding in response to ALN changes at All wales level</p> <p>TLR costs should be met in full and average teacher cost</p>															
10)	Formula – Post 16 Principles	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.33%</td> <td>Very Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36.67%</td> <td>Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.00%</td> <td>Neither Supportive nor unsupportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.33%</td> <td>Not Supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0%</td> <td>Not at all supportive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26.67%</td> <td>Not Applicable</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0%</td> <td>Not Answered</td> </tr> </table>	3.33%	Very Supportive	36.67%	Supportive	30.00%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive	3.33%	Not Supportive	0%	Not at all supportive	26.67%	Not Applicable	0%	Not Answered	
3.33%	Very Supportive																
36.67%	Supportive																
30.00%	Neither Supportive nor unsupportive																
3.33%	Not Supportive																
0%	Not at all supportive																
26.67%	Not Applicable																
0%	Not Answered																
11)	Formula – Post 16 transition period old to new formula	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>50.00%</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>33.33%</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16.67%</td> <td>Not Answered</td> </tr> </table>	50.00%	Yes	33.33%	No	16.67%	Not Answered									
50.00%	Yes																
33.33%	No																
16.67%	Not Answered																
12)	Comment re Post 16 proposals	<p>Major towns which cannot provide highest standards of Post 16 education due to funding</p> <p>Request for fully broken down funding for each school (old vs new formula)</p> <p>Funding should follow child</p> <p>Funding should be allocated to each school as if monies were coming direct from Welsh Government allocation</p> <p>Clarification required around the calculation of average teacher cost</p>	<p>The consultation was based on approval of principles in the first instance</p> <p>The new formula is pupil number driven</p> <p>The new formula is based on the principles used by Welsh Government to provide the grant to the Local Authority</p> <p>The average teacher cost is based on the average teacher cost in the Pre 16 formula</p>														

		Clarification required around the formulas in section 2 and how they came about		The uplifts from Welsh Government have been replicated in a similar manner in the new formula
13)	Scheme for Financing of Schools	3.33%	Strongly Agree	
		36.67%	Agree	
		30.00%	Neither agree nor disagree	
		16.67%	Disagree	
		10.00%	Strongly Disagree	
		3.33%	Not Answered	
14)	Scheme for Financing of school's comments	Section 1.1 Page 5) Clarification required over wording at the bottom of page 5		The Scheme has been updated to provide clarity around the right of appeal
		Section 2.2.1 No deadline for local authority to provide detailed guidance to schools on the budget		<p>The authority provides at least 3 year funding estimates for all schools, which includes as many estimates around future years funding as possible.</p> <p>These estimates are updated as further information becomes known, regarding grants, Pay inflation etc</p> <p>Pupil numbers are reviewed after the count date and assessed against current funding estimates, they are also reviewed with schools at twice yearly finance meetings and adhoc as requested by schools.</p>
		Section 2.2.3 Worked example is out of date		The worked example is there to prompt schools that for those schools projecting a deficit in April 20, they need to allow enough time prior to this to go through the necessary timescales to be able to achieve reductions in a timely manner

	<p>Section 2.16 Page 18 - the acronym IEB is used without explanation.</p> <p>I agree with nearly all changes. However, I have ticked 'disagree' for the following reason: On page 18 of the new draft Scheme for Financing Schools, the following addition is made:</p> <p>'The local authority may suspend a governing body's right to a delegated budget in order to secure control of staffing and other spending decisions. This allows the local authority to remove poorly-performing teachers or headteachers if necessary, or to take control of budget deficits. It also allows governors to focus their time and attention on other priorities for improvement.'</p> <p>Has ASCL been consulted on this proposed change?</p>	<p>IEB is an Interim Executive Board</p> <p>Page 18 Section 2.16 has been taken from the Schools Causing concern document statutory guidance.</p>
	<p>Section 2.17 – Concerns around timescales being removed</p>	<p>The section includes the following wording:</p> <p>“The focus will be working through these stages at pace to ensure we minimise the deficit. Where necessary a detailed timeline may be provided within initial correspondence.”</p> <p>The Authority is committed to working with schools through these steps, and not being unrealistic in terms of deadlines.</p>
	<p>4.5 states "a deficit balance will be treated as a deduction the following year". Clarification required if a school has a significant deficit.</p>	<p>A school carries forward a surplus or deficit and the Authority continues to work with schools to manage those balances be it a surplus or a deficit.</p>
	<p>Clawback levels should take into account why a budget might have a surplus</p>	<p>Schools are requested to provide clarification over the reasons for having or projecting to have a surplus in excess of the limits, this is reviewed by Schools service senior management team in the first instance.</p>
	<p>Query raised about the restrictions on school's but further requirements need to be included about the Authority</p>	<p>Proposal is that a working group is formed of members of the Authority and school colleagues to review the Scheme further and the Good Practice Guide</p>
	<p>Section 5.1 Page 29, the following acronym appears without explanation: 'PFI/PPP agreements'</p>	<p>PFI – Private Finance Initiative PPP – Public Private Partnerships</p>