


## LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

### Appendix B : Consultation Responses on De-delegation of funding from maintained schools in the schools block 2014-15

**15. Do you agree that maintained schools de-delegate a total sum of £300,000 for a schools central contingency?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>Primary Sector</b>		
Yes	43.8%	7
No	56.3%	9
<b>Secondary Sector</b>		
Yes	100.0%	8
No	0.0%	0
<b>All Through Sector</b>		
Yes	100.0%	1
No	0.0%	0
<b>Unknown</b>		
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0



**Comments:**


As long as this spend is restricted to the maintained schools contributing  
 There needs to be sufficient assurances and checks that the contingency can only be used in maintained schools. If this is not possible, all other schols (Academies, Free Schools) should be asked to contribute to the contingency.  
 It should be less than this say £200k  
 I would have preferred a sliding scale. A real choice.

# LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

## Appendix B : Consultation Responses on De-delegation of funding from maintained schools in the schools block 2014-15

16. Do you agree that maintained schools de-delegate a sum of £96,500 for a centrally retained funding for Occupational Health Services?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>Primary Sector</b>		
Yes	77.8%	14
No	22.2%	4
<b>Secondary Sector</b>		
Yes	71.4%	5
No	28.6%	2
<b>All Through Sector</b>		
Yes	100.0%	1
No	0.0%	0
<b>Unknown</b>		
Yes	100.0%	1
No	0.0%	0



### Comments:

Poor service

Provided again the resource is only free to schools who contribute through the top slice

Good effective service


Provided the quality is high and the service is closely monitored and evaluated.

## LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST

### Appendix B : Consultation Responses on De-delegation of funding from maintained schools in the schools block 2014-15

#### 17. Do you agree that maintained schools de-delegate a total £133,000 for trade union facility time?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>Primary Sector</b>		
Yes	14.3%	2
No	85.7%	12
<b>Secondary Sector</b>		
Yes	33.3%	2
No	66.7%	4
<b>All Through Sector</b>		
Yes	100.0%	1
No	0.0%	0
<b>Unknown</b>		
Yes	100.0%	2
No	0.0%	0



#### **Comments:**

Can not agree or disagree until we know more of the outcomes of discussions.

Again provided the service provision is ring fenced to schools funding the time

Further issues to be considered on this:- []

> we feel it unfair and unreasonable that only maintained schools contribute, and this must change - or the support for staff provided by the unions focus only maintained schools.[]

> does this total amount represent a reduction in previous years?[]

> monitoring the quality of the support is essential and needs to be supported by the LA.

I understood that there was to be a protocol regarding how facilities time was to be managed. I have not seen anything relating to this so at present am not able to either agree or disagree.

There has not been any change in attitude by the unions.

We are in agreement in principle but are unhappy about the way it has been included in the consultation. Headteachers were in discussion the LA Finance Team about costs and we would want more information before we could respond fully.

Whilst recognising the correct use of facilities time. I would require that facilities time is fairly allocated across all associations and with a minimum guarantee for the smallest association. The behaviour of such representatives must reflect good professional conduct at all times.

Trade union representatives can be adequately provided for in each school. This is a large amount of money which can be used for the benefit of the students and providing a small amount of training for the schools in-house rep.