

## RESPONSES TO DECOUPLING CONSULTATION PAPER DECEMBER 2005 – JANUARY 2006

RESP	DO YOU SUPPORT DECOUPLING IN PRINCIPLE?	WHAT SHOULD BE THE LEVEL OF THRESHOLD/CUT-OFF	SHOULD THERE BE PROTECTION FOR LOSING SCHOOLS?	ANY OTHER COMMENTS
1P	No re watering down spirit of statements, but yes in terms of ease of admin and redirecting fund to earlier intervention	£5,000 with three year phase in and option to go to £7,500 later	Yes, as per Forum recommendation	No
2C	Yes, I support it	It should initially be set at £5,000	Yes, there should be a three year phasing in for losing schools	This will cut the Gordian Knot posed by special funding for pupils on the SEN register
3P	No, I do not think that decoupling should be part of the 2006/07 formula change			Concerned about impact on school of statements below £5,000. Impact re children who already have a statement below £5,000. Statements below £5,000 could be agreed for financial reasons. Schools need training as to whether or not to go for a statement
4P	There is insufficient information to respond. More information is needed about the impact on statements	Need better information about whether statements will be issued whether or not value is below £5,000. Decision on decoupling cannot be taken without a review of the wording of statements. If statement dictates the level of provision but does not allocate funding, other children will be disadvantaged.	Need answers to other point before this can be answered. Any immediate change to school funding which has the potential of immediate effect on school budgets must be phased in (particularly when related to staffing). What is legal position if a school has no funding to support a statement?	See comments in previous columns. Main concern is potential for a statement to be agreed with no related funding. Want to see revised level descriptors. Concerns about the funding for future statements,
5P	Chair of Governors of school 4: Agree with Head Teacher (4P)		Need greater safeguard for potentially losing schools. Set threshold in a different way?	Need for further clarification. There is a real conflict: Does the school avoid responding to the needs of one child in order to avoid going through the statementing process if likely to be below the threshold? Get more information from LAs that have already tried decoupling.

RESP	DO YOU SUPPORT DECOUPLING IN PRINCIPLE?	WHAT SHOULD BE THE LEVEL OF THRESHOLD/CUT-OFF	SHOULD THERE BE PROTECTION FOR LOSING SCHOOLS?	ANY OTHER COMMENTS
6P	Finance Committee of school 4: Support Head Teacher's response	If statements below threshold will not be awarded, suggest £4,500 to continue funding for children requiring specialist teaching.	Apply a protection factor to smooth any transition. Also apply a scheme of moderation to ensure all school apply the same criteria for identifying school action and action plus pupils.	Support reduction in bureaucracy but not at the expense of individual pupils. Support more flexibility, but if statements awards below the threshold but not funded, governors would need to switch funding to meet statutory duty.
7P*	No – decision should be deferred			Implications of other formula changes to improve primary funding should be considered first Needs to be more clarity on the implications for decoupling
8S	No – decision should be deferred to allow for fuller debate and introduction from 2008/09	If proposals are introduced, threshold should be set at £4,900.	Yes, but this would not be required if school were given more notice and introduction was from 2008/09	A number of issues need to be clarified Statements that are not funded are not deliverable The formula distribution methodology for non-statemented SEN does not allocate resources based on need. (This should be reviewed for 2008/11 irrespective of the debate on decoupling. The 25% cap should be removed).
9S	No – preference is to retain existing basis of consultation	If proposals are introduced, agree with Schools Forum and support £5,000 threshold	Yes, there should be a three year phasing in as it is not possible to have full flexibility in staffing levels	Concerns about understating school action and action plus data

CODE: Letter after respondent number refers to category (P = Primary; S = Secondary; Sp = Special; C = Clerk; N = Nursery School; TP = Teachers' Panel)

\* Primary Head Teachers Group response