

Transfer to HNB Consultation - 2022-23

Issued 07-10-21	Deadline 22-10-21		
	Response date	Q1	Comment
Victoria Rd	10/10/2021	Yes	-
St Clements	07/10/2021	Yes	-
Woodside	08/10/2021	-	
Windmill Hill	08/10/2021	Yes	-
St Gerards	09/10/2021	Yes	-
OLPS	20/10/2021	Yes	-
Bridgewater Park	22/10/2021	No	
Palacefields	22/10/2021	No	
Daresbury	22/10/2021	No	
Widnes	21/10/2021	No	
The Grange	20/10/2021	No	-
The Heath	22/10/2021	No	
Wade Deacon	21/10/2021	No	
Brookfields	12/10/2021	Yes	-

Narratives

School	Comment
Woodside	Neither. I wish to protest that schools and the LA should not be forced into this parsimonious penny pinching where children's futures are at stake.
Bridgewater Park Palacefields Daresbury The Heath	<p>Saying 'NO' does not means we are against the principle of the need for further investment in SEN, but we need to balance the needs of SEN with the funding requirements for all of our pupils, and this proposal could lead to an 80k reduction in our funding in 22/23.</p> <p>The impact of 'no' could also be detrimental and push back costs/lack of provision on schools which may also have a considerable cost both to the schools and pupils so it becomes an impossible choice, especially as incorporates an improvement to services.</p> <p>The information provided does not appear to show forward projections beyond 22/23 – when will the DSG management plan be available and would we be better placed to agree to the 1% if we could see its impact within this plan? This would give more assurance that this contribution would make a positive difference – even if it did not fully eliminate the issue, and would negate the inference that it is just a short term 'fix'.</p>
Widnes Academy Wade Deacon	<p>As you state schools have previously supported requests from the LA in order to seek to bring budget under control by interim cash support which has resulted in schools including my own not being able to provide the full range of provision and resources we would normally have undertaken. Whilst I appreciate that the simple methodology of a1 % cross clawback is common it does not appreciate the impact this will have on a small schools already restricted budget whilst seeking to support the high level of catch up and covid legacy costs. This will mean staff support reductions for us. To minimum or cap on any contribution is not a reasonable approach.</p> <p>Future Years – there appears to be no rationale for supporting this proposal as you state that there is no guarantee that this will not be required for further years. By not applying a consultation that considers the contribution towards additional investment in capacity items 1,2 and 3 only which schools can see would provide capacity into a system this is an omission as the question of deficit should have been treated separately as these are two different matters. To be clear we do not support the consultation in its current format and oppose the transfer of 1%. In order to provide a view on the potential other options much more detail is required and as indicated the existing information provided in the email there are errors in templates that need to be corrected.</p>