



## **NOTICE OF MEETING**

### **Schools Forum**

**Thursday 9 February 2012, 4.30 pm**

**Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell**

**To: The Schools Forum**

#### **Schools Members:**

Maureen Beadsley, Secondary School Governor  
Trisha Donkin, Primary School Representative  
Andrew Fletcher, Secondary School Representative  
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor  
Ed Glasson, Primary School Governor  
Gill Harbut, Primary School Representative  
Louise Lovegrove, Primary School Representative  
John McNab, Secondary School Governor  
Kelvin Menon, Primary School Governor  
Joanna Quinn, Primary School Representative  
Tony Reading, Primary School Governor  
Paul Salter, Secondary School Representative  
Trudi Sammons, Primary School Representative  
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative  
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)  
Kathy Winrow, Secondary School Representative  
Vacant, Primary School Representative

#### **Non-Schools Members**

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)  
Kate Sillett, PVI Provider Representative  
Vacant, 14-19 Partnership Representative  
Vacant, Diocese Representative (Roman Catholic)  
One Vacancy, Diocese Representative

ALISON SANDERS  
Director of Corporate Services

#### **EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS**

- 1 If you hear the alarm, leave the building immediately.
- 2 Follow the green signs.
- 3 Use the stairs not the lifts.
- 4 Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

If you require further information, please contact: Amanda Roden  
Telephone: 01344 352253  
Email: [amanda.rodan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:amanda.rodan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)  
Published: 1 February 2012

**Schools Forum**  
**Thursday 9 February 2012, 4.30 pm**  
**Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell**

**AGENDA**

	Page No
<b>1. Apologies for Absence/Substitute Members</b>	
To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute members.	
<b>2. Declarations of Interest</b>	
Members are required to declare any personal or prejudicial interests and the nature of that interest, in respect of any matter to be considered at the meeting.	
<b>3. Minutes and Matters Arising</b>	
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of 8 December 2011.	1 - 8
<b>4. The Schools Budget - Proposed Use of 2011-12 Forecast Under Spend</b>	
To receive a report which seeks agreement from the Schools Forum on the proposed use of the 2011-12 forecast under spend on the Schools Budget.	9 - 18
<b>5. Local Authority Budget Proposals for 2012-13</b>	
To receive a report which seeks the views of the Schools Forum as an interested party on the 2012/13 budget proposals.	19 - 48
<b>6. Initial 2012-13 Schools Budget Proposals and other Financial Matters</b>	
To receive a report which updates members of the Schools Forum on preliminary budget information provided to schools on their potential 2012/13 budget and seeks views on the latest proposals from the Council for the 2012/13 Schools Budget.	49 - 70
<b>7. Update to the Scheme for Financing Schools</b>	
To receive a report which seeks agreement from members of the Schools Forum to update the Bracknell Forest Scheme for Financing Schools.	71 - 94
<b>8. Education and Children's Services Financial Benchmarking - 2011-12 Original Budget Data</b>	
To receive an annual information report that provides members of the Forum with financial benchmarking data in respect of the 2011-12 original budget that has been made available by the Department for Education (DfE).	95 - 114

9. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the Schools Forum is scheduled for Thursday 15 March 2012 at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House.

Future meetings are scheduled for:

26 April 2012

14 June 2012

19 July 2012

13 September 2012

18 October 2012

13 December 2012

7 February 2013

14 March 2013

25 April 2013

This page is intentionally left blank



**SCHOOLS FORUM  
8 DECEMBER 2011  
4.30 - 6.00 PM**

**Present:**

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)  
Mike Beadsley, Secondary School Governors  
Trisha Donkin, Primary School Representative  
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor  
Ed Glasson, Primary School Governor  
Louise Lovegrove, Primary School Representative  
John McNab, Secondary School Governor  
Kelvin Menon, Primary School Governor  
Joanna Quinn, Primary School Representative  
Tony Reading, Primary School Governor  
Paul Salter, Secondary School Representative  
Trudi Sammons, Primary School Representative  
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative  
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)  
Kathy Winrow, Secondary School Representative

**Apologies for absence were received from:**

Maureen Beadsley, Secondary School Governor  
Andrew Fletcher, Secondary School Representative  
Gill Harbut, Primary School Representative

**12. Apologies for Absence/Substitute Members**

The Forum noted that Mike Beadsley was substituting for Maureen Beadsley.

**13. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**14. Minutes and Matters Arising**

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the addition of Tony Reading to the list of those present, the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2011 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Arising on the minutes, the Forum noted:

- That the names of the people appointed to fill the vacancies for primary and secondary heads representatives would be reported to the next meeting; and,
- The date of the meeting originally scheduled for 8 March 2012 had been changed to 15 March 2012 but this would be checked to ensure there was no clash with primary and secondary heads' conferences.

15. **Membership of the Schools Forum**

The Forum received a report advising it that, in accordance with its constitution, Kelvin Menon had been re-appointed to the Forum as a primary school governor representative until 31 August 2012, as insufficient nominations had been received to fill the three vacancies which had needed to be filled.

The appointment had been made by the Executive Member for Education in consultation with the Director of Children, Young People & Learning and Chairman of the Forum.

16. **Role of Executive Member for Education on Schools Forum**

The Forum discussed a report seeking an amendment to its constitution formalising the role of the Executive Member for Education. As an executive member of the Council could not be appointed as a member of the Forum, it was proposed that the Executive Member should be formally nominated as an "observer" at panel meetings. This would enable them to speak and respond to queries which might arise on any issues being considered by the Forum. Whilst the regulations did not permit the executive member to be a member of the Forum, the Department for Education had advised that it was good practice for them to be able to attend and speak at the meetings.

**RESOLVED** that the constitution of the Bracknell Forest Schools Forum be amended to add the Council's Executive Member for Education as an "observer" at 2.6.

17. **School Meals Specification**

The Forum considered a report seeking its views on the proposed specification for the school meals contract which was to be re-tendered as the existing contract was due to end on 31 July 2012.

In response to questions, the Forum was advised that:

- The use of RPI rather than CPI was considered to better reflect the true cost of the service.
- The introduction of an online payment system would be in addition to existing methods thereby enabling those who still wished to pay by cash to do so.

**RESOLVED** that the proposed specification for the school meals contract from August 2012 be endorsed.

18. **School Building Cleaning**

The Forum received a report advising it that the Council had awarded its new corporate cleaning contract to the existing provider KGB Cleaning following a tendering exercise. The contract also covered school sites which wished to buy into it. Six schools had chosen to join the ten which had previously obtained their cleaning service through the existing contract. Other schools could join at any time if they wished.

In response to questions, the Forum was assured that KGB had a good track record and that any staff being transferred would do so under TUPE regulations.

**NOTED**

## 19. **Priority School Building Programme**

The Forum considered a report which was seeking its views about future participation by Bracknell Forest in the new DfE Priority School Building Programme. The new Programme followed in the wake of the cancelled Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programmes, and was intended to address those schools in the worst condition. Ministers might also take into account pressing cases of basic need for the creation of new school places. To be eligible to participate, the Council would be required to demonstrate that:

- Identified need for condition works would be in excess of 30% of the notional cost of rebuilding the whole school.
- The School had not received major investment to more than 50% of the existing buildings in the last 15 years.
- There was sufficient long term pupil demand.
- There was certainty that the LA or school held title to all the land.
- The proposed development was either wholly new build or the refurbishment element was less than 30% of the gross internal floor area.
- There was a commitment to continued testing for 'Value for Money' throughout the approval process. It was stated that schools would be removed from the programme if this was not proven to be the case.

All schools selected were required to provide a signed statement from the Headteacher, governing body and local authority (for maintained schools) that they accepted the terms & conditions

The Council had responsibility for collating and submitting applications for all the schools in the borough. The whole school estate had been evaluated against the eligibility criteria. Whilst there were no schools that matched all of the criteria, the Council had identified the following schools which constituted the closest match and had submitted bids on a no obligation basis to meet the October deadline:

- Kennel Lane Special School, which was subject of a masterplan under Building Schools for the Future for a phased rebuild on the existing site.
- The Brakenhale secondary school, which was also subject of a masterplan under Building Schools for the Future for a phased rebuild on the existing site.
- Holly Spring Infant & Junior Schools which were subject of expansion by one form of entry under the Primary Capital Programme.
- Meadow Vale Primary School which was subject of expansion by one form of entry under the Primary Capital Programme.

The Council had also identified a future requirement for a new secondary school to be built in North Bracknell, subject to the approval of future housing development.

There was considerable concern amongst members of the Forum about the possible use of PFI as it had been shown to be an expensive method of delivery in the longer term both in schools and the NHS, where the long term repayments had caused significant financial difficulties.

The Forum was advised that the officers were conscious of the concerns and stressed that the bid had been submitted on a no obligation basis as there was a need to get more information about how the programme would work as full details were not yet available. Moreover, officers believed that not only would the emphasis be on new build rather than rebuilding existing schools, but the existing four Bracknell Forest schools did not meet the criteria. It was therefore likely that the bid in respect of a new secondary school at North Bracknell was the only one with a chance of success. As the Council needed to look at all funding options, it was prudent to submit the bid, albeit that the concerns raised by members would be taken into account in due course when considering the risks of a PFI scheme.

Further concerns were raised about the funding of any PFI scheme as the revenue costs were likely to have to be met from the existing schools' and Council budgets and therefore impact on all the borough's schools.

**RESOLVED** that the Council be asked to note the concerns being raised by the Forum about the use of the PFI approach to the delivery of either a new school or existing building improvements based on the record of longer term financial difficulties created by applying the PFI approach both within schools and the health service.

## 20. **The Schools Budget: 2011-12 Budget Monitoring and other Financial Matters**

The Forum considered a report updating it on the latest budget position and seeking its views on:

- The 2011-12 forecast budget monitoring position for the Schools Budget as at the end of October;
- The current budget monitoring forecast that indicated £0.9m of funding was available to invest in the current financial year, on a one-off basis;
- The revised criteria proposed to be used to fund schools experiencing significant in-year growth in pupil numbers;
- Changes made by the Department for Education to the initial per pupil funding rates for the Pupil Premium.

In response to questions posed, the Forum was advised that:

- The likely underspend was ring-fenced for education related expenditure and would not be clawed back.
- The officers would look into the implications of the Equalities Act for SEN provision.
- The expectation that proposals would be brought to the February meeting of the Forum for investment in SEN resource units was in response to work of the SEN sub-group, which had head teacher representation, and was reviewing out of borough school placements and local special educational needs provision.
- The underspend could be made available to address maintenance requirements.



- The had been an increase in the number of secondary pupils registering for free school meals but a decrease in the number of registered primary school pupils.
- Whilst some schools chose to use the pupil premium to contribute to the cost of free school meals, it could be spent on whatever an individual school chose.

The Forum noted the budget variances being forecast on the 2011-12 Schools Budget that in total aggregated to a net under spending of £1.3m . With a forecast year end underspend, there was approximately £0.9m of funding available for one-off investments in the current financial year. Proposals for its use were to be brought to the February meeting of the Forum. The Forum also noted that schools in Bracknell Forest would receive an additional £0.071m of Pupil Premium Grant as a result of the DfE increasing the basic per pupil funding amount from £430 to £488.

**RESOLVED** that the criteria at Annex A of the Director of Children, Young People & Learning's report to fund schools experiencing significant in-year growth in pupil numbers be adopted.

## 21. **Preparations for the 2012-13 Schools Budget**

The Forum considered a report on progress towards setting the 2012-13 Schools Budget, and in particular:

- Seeking agreement to a budget strategy to enable effective budget planning;
- Reviewing the questions posed and responses received to the financial consultations with schools;
- The current evaluation of the financial outlook for the 2012-13 budget;
- The current position regarding the Council's Job Evaluation exercise.

In response to a question about the reference in the draft 2012-13 budget proposals from the Council about the potential for additional costs to fall on the Schools Budget, the Forum was advised that full details of these proposals would be presented in the new year once the Council's Executive had agreed its budget proposals on 13 December. At this stage, the £3m total pressures detailed in table 1 of the Forum's report was considered accurate.

Reference was also made to the ongoing work on job evaluation. The Forum noted that the Council would not be in a position to implement a new scheme in 2012/13.

The Forum was advised that detailed budget proposals for the Schools Budget would be presented to the Forum for consideration in the new year. The Forum would be asked to comment on the Council's general budget proposals for 2012-13 at the same time.

**RESOLVED** that

- 1 The Budget Strategy at Annex 1 be approved as the guiding document in developing the 2012-13 Schools Budget;

- 2 The key outcomes from the financial consultations with schools should be incorporated into the initial proposals for the 2012-13 Schools Budget that was to be presented to the Schools Forum in February;
- 3 The latest information in respect of the budget for 2012-13 indicating a potential shortfall in funding of £1.844m be noted;
- 4 The Director of Children, Young People and Learning authorise the issuing of indicative 2012-13 budgets to schools, based on the proposals set out in this report;
- 5 The latest position on the Council's Job Evaluation exercise be noted.

**22. Exclusion of Public and Press (S100A)**

**RESOLVED** that pursuant to section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, members of the public and press be excluded from the meeting for consideration of item 12 which involved the likely disclosure of exempt information under category 1 of Schedule 12A of that Act:

- (3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority).

**23. Off Site and Adventurous Activities Service**

The Forum considered a report on proposed changes to the Off-Site and Adventurous Activities Services for schools.

The Forum was reminded that the Offsite & Hazardous Activities Service ensured that arrangements for school visits were suitable and sufficient to ensure the safety and well being of the children, young people and adults who participated in them. Schools were responsible for the duty of care of the pupils in their charge, and for ensuring that arrangements for school visits were suitable and sufficient. For maintained schools the Council had the legal responsibility as the employer, and had a shared interest in ensuring this duty of care across all schools in the Borough. The Council also provided the travel insurance for school visits.

A review of the service had been undertaken, including input from internal audit. The Forum was advised that:

- The new service was to be re-branded as the Offsite and Adventurous Activities Service in line with common practice in other authorities.
- The paper/fax/MSWorks database system was to be replaced by a modern on-line system,
- The manual of guidance was to be updated to make it simpler to use, and posted on the online system in electronic form.
- Travel insurance would no longer need to be put in place on a trip by trip basis as it had been replaced with a single blanket insurance policy that covered all visits undertaken by all schools that bought into the Council's SLA for insurance.

The proposed revisions were to be rolled out during the 2012 Spring Term, including training on and go-live of the online system. A new SLA to schools was to be put in place from April 2012.

In response to questions, the Forum was advised that there would be three charges to schools:

- 1 Insurance – on a pro rata basis according to the number of visits and pupils.
- 2 Consultants – on a pro rata basis according to visits.
- 3 Management Cost – on a pro rata basis.

In effect, the more visits a school undertook, the more they would pay but the unit cost would fall if they made more visits.

In addition, the Forum was advised that the insurance provided did cover international travel, including ski trips.

Tony Reading advised the Forum that he had been trained by Brian Mallett and had found him to be effective and efficient.

The Forum was invited to forward any further comments to Chris Taylor.

#### **NOTED**

#### **24. Dates of Future Meetings**

The Forum noted that its next meeting was scheduled to be held at 4.30pm on Thursday 9 February 2012 in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House.

This page is intentionally left blank

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**DATE: 9 FEBRUARY 2012**

---

**THE SCHOOLS BUDGET – PROPOSED USE OF 2011-12  
FORECAST UNDER SPEND  
(Director, Children, Young People and Learning)**

**1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from the Schools Forum on the proposed use of the 2011-12 forecast under spend on the Schools Budget. This builds on the preliminary information discussed at the Forum on 8 December.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **The investments proposed to be financed from the forecast under spending, summarised at paragraph 5.18 are supported.**

**3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 **It is appropriate for Schools Forum to be involved in decisions around planned expenditure within the Schools Budget.**

**4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Continue to use external providers.

**5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Background

- 5.1 The Department for Education (DfE) funds local authority Schools Budgets through a ringfenced specific grant – the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Regulations govern the type of services the DSG can be used to fund, which includes delegated school budgets, with any year end under or over spending required to be incorporated in a future year's Schools Budget and not into general Council balances.
- 5.2 Provisional budget monitoring information available at the end of the December cycle indicates that the Schools Budget will under spend by £1.3m this year. This forecast variance comprises an under spend of £0.475m against approved budget allocations, additional income of £0.460m against the original estimate made for the DSG and a further £0.365m additional income as a result of the 2010-11 under spend being greater than the amount anticipated when the budget was agreed in March.

- 5.3 The variances anticipated on the Schools Budget have previously been reported, with the most significant amounts being:
1. Combined education and children's social care budgets are expected to under spend by £0.077m. There are two main variances in this area of the budget. Transport costs associated with maintaining looked after children in Bracknell are expected to under spend by £0.047m from a reduction in the required number of journeys, with a £0.017m saving on Margaret Wells Furby Children's Resource Centre which provides support and advice to disabled children and their families including medical support, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech and language therapy and parent support groups.
  2. A saving of £0.180m is forecast on early years provisions. This significant under spending arises as a consequence of the withdrawal of the Standards Fund grant programme. Part of this grant was allocated for childcare and education for 3 and 4 year olds, to be spent between April 2010 and the end of August 2011. Due to actual take up in 2010-11 being lower than the numbers assumed in the grant allocation made by the DfE, the 2010-11 year end under spending of £0.180m has been carried forward into the 2011-12 financial year and will be used to fund expenditure which was originally expected to be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant
  3. Support to schools in financial difficulties will under spend by £0.154m. The Schools Forum has previously agreed an allocation of £0.150m from the £0.304m budget. No further allocations are expected to be required this year, resulting in the £0.154m under spending.
  4. £0.476m additional DSG income. The DfE has confirmed that the final DSG allocation for 2011-12 will be £75m, which is £0.476m more than assumed in the budget. In setting the budget, an allowance of £0.219m was made for the possible over estimation of pupil numbers and to cover potential in-year increases in the volatile, high cost budgets that the LA manages, mainly around special educational needs. Adjusting for this provision means that the DSG was under estimated by £0.257m. This difference is generally accounted for from a funding adjustment for low take-up of the free entitlement to early years education for 3 years. The DfE had originally consulted on the proposal to remove this adjustment, but was not ultimately implemented, but the final calculation by the Council was not updated for this late change. Furthermore, Ranelagh converted to an academy from August and the DfE will now recoup money from service budgets managed by the Council for all schools, to pass on to Ranelagh which will then, for the first time, be responsible for their provision. This has been confirmed at £0.016m.

Proposed use of forecast under spending

- 5.4 When the Schools Budget under spends, the DfE allows LAs and School Forums to consider the following options for use of the DSG:
1. Make proposals to carry forward funding into the following financial year;
  2. Make proposals to increase individual school budgets in the current year;
  3. Make proposals to increase centrally managed expenditure in the current year.

Whilst the legal position is that the council only needs to consult the Schools Forum on the intended use of any under spendings, the council considers it important that the views of the Schools Forum are taken into account before any decisions are taken.

- 5.5 In considering proposals, the budget prospects for 2012-13 also need to be taken into account where there is a provisional funding gap of £1.9m. Therefore, to help manage down next year's gap on the Schools Budget, it is proposed to set aside £0.4m to help finance on a one-off basis expenditure that will occur in 2012-13, thereby reducing next year's gap to £1.5m. The remaining £0.9m under spending is proposed to be allocated to new one-off investments.
- 5.6 Such a significant amount of under spend presents unexpected and rare opportunities that particularly lend themselves to invest to save type projects that usually need pump priming funding to become established during periods when dual provisions may be required, or to pilot new initiatives to determine their likely success before any proposals for permanent DSG funding are made. The council is therefore proposing that of the £0.9m under spend available for in-year allocation, £0.6m is made available for invest to save type schemes and a education out of school pilot scheme, with the remaining £0.3m available for schools and Early Years providers in the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector.
- 5.7 In respect of the £0.6m proposed for centrally managed items, £0.5m is proposed to be deposited into an earmarked reserve to fund building adaptations required to develop SEN resource units. A review of out of borough school placements and local special educational needs provision was undertaken earlier this year with key stakeholders including Head Teachers, parents and Local Authority representatives. This identified the potential to develop resource units within Bracknell Forest schools, which would provide alternative and potentially more cost effective and quality local provision with the following main benefits:
- The placing of a child in a residential school can have significant negative impact on family life;
  - Parents are less able to attend school meetings or be involved in the life of the school;
  - Children and young people become removed from their local communities including their friends and other support networks;
  - Young people find it difficult to make the transition back to Bracknell Forest at the end of their school career, often being removed from

community and friends for a second time when they leave school to return home;

- Increased officer time required to attend annual reviews when the young person is some distance away increases cost;
- Local capacity/expertise is not developed when provision is out of the borough.

- 5.8 The outcome from the needs analysis identified three areas that could potentially be better provided through local SEN resource units:
- A Primary Resource Unit for children of mainstream ability who are on the autistic spectrum and presenting with behavioural issues;
  - A Secondary Resource Unit for children of mainstream ability who are on the autistic spectrum and presenting with behavioural issues;
  - A Secondary Resource Unit for children with speech, language and communication difficulties.
- 5.9 Detailed business plans are being developed to identify capital and revenue costs with initial information indicating that building works can be completed for around £0.500m, but this will be dependent on the final locations for each unit. Discussions are in progress with the governing bodies of schools that are considered appropriate to place the units, which will also require normal planning approvals to proceed.
- 5.10 Calculation of the on-going revenue implications from these units is work in progress. The units are planned to be opened on a phased basis, commencing no sooner than September 2012, with operating costs increasing over time as more pupils are admitted. Savings will then be made as pupils in the more expensive non-maintained sector complete their education with future needs being met from new local provision. Attempts will be made to bring back children from external placements to the new in-house provision, but this will be dependent on parental choice and cannot be imposed.
- 5.11 At this stage, provisional revenue implications have been calculated for the 2 secondary units, one for autism, and one for speech, language and communication difficulties. Detailed calculations on a primary autism unit have yet to commence as a suitable site has yet to be identified. Table 1 below summarises the provisional costings, with Annex 1 providing further details. There is a strong financial case for the autism unit, with the speech and language unit considered a medium risk of resulting in increased costs due to the need to have an 87% occupancy level to break even compared to current costs, some of which are relatively low as a result of a number of pupils attending BF mainstream schools. However, based on current pupil numbers, the unit would be full, and there would be opportunities to sell spare places to other LAs if BF numbers fall.



Table 1: Provisional financial implications from proposed secondary SEN Units

Item	Autism £k	Speech & Language £k	Total £k
<u>Revenue Impact:</u>			
2012-13	15	17	32
2013-14	-8	-51	-59
2014-15	-48	-88	-136
2015-16	-144	-95	-239
2016-17	-298	-63	-361
<u>Capital cost:</u>	300	100	400
<u>Break even point:</u>	8	13	
<u>Required Occupancy rate:</u>	53%	87%	
Provisional opening date	Sept-12	Sept-12	
Capacity	15	15	

- 5.12 A full financial evaluation of these proposals would need to be completed before the capital investment proceeds, and this will include detailed discussions with governing bodies to agree staffing structures etc which may be different from those assumed in the calculations shown in Table 1. However, it is expected that these developments will result in considerable medium to long term savings on placement fees, although as set out in Table 1, there may be a need to provide a relatively small amount of additional resources in the initial implementation period.
- 5.13 In respect of the impact on home to school transport, of which costs are funded by the council and not the DSG, savings of between £0.050m to £0.100m are forecast by the Integrated Transport Unit. The value of potential savings are difficult to predict due to uncertainty around when pupils would move to the new units, the extent that current travel costs would reduce, particularly where pupils share vehicles, or the ability to reduce the number of routes being provided.
- 5.14 It is therefore proposed that the Schools Forum agrees in principle that the SEN Units can be developed, provided that detailed evaluations show that net savings are expected within 2 years of opening, and that there is no adverse financial impact on Council funded home to school transport.
- 5.15 The remaining £0.1m is proposed to be set aside to fund a time limited pilot project for a new provision for pupils at risk of exclusion who would receive specialist support away from the school but still be on the school roll. This new scheme, called Turnaround, is based on successful approaches to working with children and young people which cause them to confront the implications of their future actions. The project would be managed through the Pupil Referral Service and would expect to provide for cohorts of 8 – 10 students, principally from Key Stage 3 but with the potential to work outside of this age range should the need be required.

## Unrestricted

- 5.16 The full year gross cost of the Turnaround project is provisionally estimated at £0.21m. It is proposed that the project runs as a pilot for seven months, with at least 4 cohorts of pupils. A decision on whether a proposal for permanent DSG funding should be sought would be considered in the beginning of 2013 and would be after an evaluation of its success and whether schools support its continuation. This proposal does not require any new funding in 2012-13 and would be fully funded from the 2011-12 under spending. To manage the project to a cost of £0.1m, the schools supported would in aggregate need to contribute £0.02m during the pilot period.
- 5.17 In terms of the remaining £0.300m of funding, it is proposed that this is allocated to schools and PVI early years providers on a pro rata basis to net budget which would be 95% and 5% respectively. For schools, to help finance any additional costs that may arise from the current Job Evaluation (JE) exercise, it is proposed that the £0.285m be set aside in an earmarked reserve that would be available for use when JE is implemented. For PVI providers, it is proposed to use the £0.015m to make an additional allocation based only on January 2011 hours of provision, at around £0.08 per hour, which results in the average sized provider receiving around £310.

Annex 2 sets out anticipated funding allocations to early years providers.

- 5.18 A summary of the investment proposals from paragraphs 5.5 to 5.17 above is:
1. £0.500m set aside in a reserve for building adaptations to allow the creation of SEN resource units on school sites, subject to a suitable business case
  2. £0.100m for time limited funding for the Turnaround project for a new provision for pupils at risk of exclusion who would receive specialist support away from the school but still be on the school roll
  3. £0.285m set aside in an earmarked reserve to help finance any additional costs falling on schools from the JE exercise
  4. £0.015m for Early Years providers in the PVI
  5. £0.400m carried forward into 2012-13 to help managed the funding gap of £1.9m, thereby reducing it to £1.5m.

### Impact from academy conversions

- 5.19 Should any new SEN resource Units be developed, it is important that correct financial and legal precautions are taken to ensure that should the host school convert to academy status, that the SEN facilities are maintained. The intention is that SLAs are agreed with governing bodies that can then be incorporated into the Commercial Transfer Agreement which the DfE requires for all academy conversions.

### Next steps

- 5.20 Should the Forum support these proposals, they will be presented to the Executive Member for Education for final approval, which will be dependent on the detailed financial evaluations confirming net savings.

## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

### Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The more in Borough provision that the LA is able to provide for ASD and SALT, will assist the LA, in being able to reduce the LA's dependence on expensive out of Borough placements for children on the Autistic spectrum and in need of speech and language. The current concentration of this provision in a few schools and particularly in the special school reduces the LA's ability to make cost effective placements and win SEN tribunals. Particularly with parents who want their special needs child educated in a mainstream school rather than a special school. Unless a LA can demonstrate a child will disrupt pupils and staff, a parent has a statutory right to have their autistic or special needs child educated in a mainstream school, even when subject to a statement of SEN.
- 6.2 There is nothing in the SEN Green paper which is likely to remove or reduce the need for this imitative

### Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information.

### Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 There are no specific impacts arising from this report.

### Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 There are no specific strategic risk management issues arising from this report.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 CYPL Departmental Management Team, with comments incorporated into the report.

### Background Papers

Provisional December budget monitoring report

### Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI 4061

Paul Clark, Head CYPL Finance 4054

### Doc. Ref

H:\FIG:\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\54) 090212\Use of schools budget under spend - 25 Jan 2012.doc

**Provisional data for an Autism Unit for Secondary Aged Pupils**

Capacity Current Number in External placements	15 16	Anticipated opening				
		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<u>Cost of provision – DSG funded</u>						
<u>Internal:</u>						
Cost of internal provision - core		£82,000	£165,000	£278,000	£354,000	£354,000
Funding top ups for named pupils		£8,000	£16,000	£24,000	£30,000	£30,000
Estimated number of placements		4	8	12	15	15
<u>External:</u>						
Savings from externally placed leavers		-£75,000	-£189,000	-£350,000	-£528,000	-£682,000
Estimated number of leavers		3	5	9	13	15
Net annual saving (-) / cost (+)		£15,000	-£8,000	-£48,000	-£144,000	-£298,000
Cumulative saving (-) / cost (+)		£15,000	£7,000	-£41,000	-£185,000	-£483,000
<u>Capital expenditure</u>						
Estimated cost	£300,000					
Annual debt charges for 15 years		£0	£31,000	£31,000	£31,000	£31,000
Debt charges illustrative as capital cost proposed to be funded from 2011-12 Schools Budget under spending						
<u>Medium term break even point:</u>						
Number of placements needed to break-even on current costs		8				
<u>Average per pupil cost / saving:</u>		Placement				
Internal provision (assumes full)		£25,600				
External provision		£45,485				
Average saving		£19,885				

Unrestricted

**Provisional data for a Speech and Language Unit for Secondary Aged Pupils**

	Capacity	15	Anticipated opening		Sep-12		
Current Number in mainstream schools	11						
Current Number in External placements	7						
			2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<u>Cost of provision - DSG funded</u>							
Cost of new internal provision		£93,000	£121,000	£174,000	£228,000	£257,000	
Funding top ups for named pupils		£3,000	£6,000	£9,000	£12,000	£15,000	
Estimated number of placements		3	6	9	12	15	
Savings from internally placed leavers		-£37,000	-£65,000	-£70,000	-£91,000	-£91,000	
Estimated number of leavers		5	5	6	8	8	
Savings from externally placed leavers		-£42,000	-£113,000	-£201,000	-£244,000	-£244,000	
Estimated number of leavers		2	4	7	7	7	
Net saving (-) / cost (+)		£17,000	-£51,000	-£88,000	-£95,000	-£63,000	
Cumulative saving (-) / cost (+)		£17,000	-£34,000	-£122,000	-£217,000	-£280,000	

Note: Full cost of unit of £270,000 not to be incurred until 2017-18.

Capital expenditure

Estimated cost	£100,000				
Annual debt charges		£0	£11,000	£11,000	£11,000

Debt charges illustrative as capital cost proposed to be funded from 2011-12 Schools Budget under spending

Medium term break even point:

Number of placements needed to break-even on current costs 13

<u>Average per pupil cost / saving:</u>	Placement
New internal provision (assumes full)	£17,971
Exiting external and internal provision	£21,960
Average saving	<u>£3,989</u>

**PROVISIONAL in-year allocations to early years providers**

Early Years Provider	Actual hours January 2011	Amount
Ascot & Cranbourne Pre-School	3,614	£297.37
Ascot Baptist Church Pre-School	1,683	£138.50
Binfield Pre-School	3,630	£298.73
Birch Hill Pre-School	2,748	£226.15
Bramleywood Nursery	3,120	£256.76
Building Blocks Pre-School	2,052	£168.87
Busy Bees Montessori	3,088	£254.09
Chavey Down Pre School	2,885	£237.45
Cherry Town Nursery	2,430	£199.98
Children's House Nursery	5,610	£461.68
College Town Montessori Nursery Ltd	4,458	£366.87
Crowthorne Village Pre-School	2,173	£178.79
Dolphin Nursery (Bracknell) Ltd	3,414	£280.96
Eagle House School	7,425	£611.04
Footsteps at St Josephs	5,533	£455.34
Garth Under 5's	2,922	£240.47
Harmans Water Pre-School	3,252	£267.62
Holly Spring Pre-School	4,611	£379.46
Lambrook School	7,150	£588.41
Little Acorns Montessori	2,130	£175.29
Little Sandhurst Nursery Group	5,520	£454.27
Meadowbrook Montessori School	6,198	£510.06
Newbold School	3,426	£281.94
Owlsmoor Pre-School	6,156	£506.61
Pavillion Pre-School	2,791	£229.71
P.A.W.S. Nursery	2,437	£200.51
Pines Community Pre-school	2,632	£216.58
Plus Three Nursery - Farley Wood	4,741	£390.16
Plus Three Nursery - Martins Heron	3,839	£315.93
Plus Three Nursery - Newell Green	5,181	£426.37
Rectory Lane Nursery School	2,172	£178.74
RMA - Lakeside Nursery	3,972	£326.88
Sandhurst Nursery School	7,272	£598.45
South Hill Park Pre-School	6,990	£575.24
Sports Centre Pre-School	1,183	£97.31
Squirrels Day Nursery	3,000	£246.89
St Michael's Childcare Trust	5,324	£438.14
Stepping Stones Playgroup	1,644	£135.29
Teddies Nurseries	3,066	£252.32
Teepee Day Nursery	2,400	£197.51
The Ark Pre-School	2,088	£171.83
The College Nursery	4,056	£333.79
The Mortarboard Nursery School	2,994	£246.39
The Oaks Pre-School	2,808	£231.08
The Old School Day Nursery	4,158	£342.18
WASPS Pre-School	7,821	£643.63
Winkfield Montessori School	3,636	£299.22
Greengables Day Nursery	840	£69.13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>182,271</b>	<b>£15,000.00</b>

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**DATE 9 FEBRUARY 2012**

---

**LOCAL AUTHORITY BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2012/13**  
**(Director of Children, Young People & Learning)**

**1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 Under the Council's constitution, the Executive is required to consult on its detailed budget proposals with the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Commission and other interested parties for a period of at least six weeks. This report presents an overview of the Council's budget position and the specific proposals relevant to the Children, Young People and Learning (CYPL) Department to the Schools Forum for comment.
- 1.2 At the time the Executive agenda was published the Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement had not been announced. A Provisional 2012/13 Settlement was announced in January 2011 and the Council has been developing its budget proposals on this basis. It is not expected that the final settlement will differ greatly from the provisional.
- 1.3 All comments received on these budget proposals will be submitted to the Executive on 21 February along with details of the final finance settlement. This will allow the Executive to determine its final budget package and recommend the appropriate Council Tax level to Council, who will formally approve the 2012/13 budget and Council Tax on 29 February 2012.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **That the Schools Forum comments on the 2012/13 budget proposals of the Executive for the Children, Young People and Learning Department in respect of:**
- i. **The revenue budget (Annexes B and C), and**
  - ii. **The capital programme (Annex D).**

**3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 The Executive seeks the views of the Schools Forum as an interested party on the 2012/13 budget proposals.

**4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 The range of options being considered is included in the report and its Annexes.

## 5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### Revenue Budget

Commitment budget 2011/12 – 2014/15

- 5.1 Initial preparations for the 2012/13 budget have focussed on the Council's Commitment Budget for 2012/13 – 2014/15. This brings together the Council's existing expenditure plans, taking account of approved commitments and the ongoing effects of service developments and efficiencies that were agreed when the 2011/12 budget was set.
- 5.2 A number of changes are proposed to the Commitment Budget since it was last considered by the Executive in July and are reflected in the summary. The most significant are set out below:
- Based on the impact of the additional bank holiday for the royal wedding, significant costs are no longer expected to arise from the diamond jubilee. The additional budget built into 2011/12 can therefore be removed a year earlier (-£0.060m).
  - The impact of the national insurance changes introduced on 1 April 2011 was less than originally forecast. This has enabled £0.129m to be removed from the commitment budget.
  - Allowances to cover the Carbon Reduction Commitment in schools have already been provided for centrally within the Schools Budget and can therefore be removed from the Council Wide budget (-£0.072m).
  - Increases in projected landfill tax and waste disposal costs (£0.247m).
  - The additional resources built into the budget for 2011/12 to cover pay increases for staff paid less than £21,000 were not required. However the amount has been retained in the Commitment Budget to provide some flexibility in dealing with any immediate issues that may arise from implementing changes following the job evaluation review that has been undertaken.
- 5.3 Taking account of these changes, Table 1 summarises the position and shows that base expenditure (excluding schools) is planned to rise by £0.145m to £76.400m next year, before consideration is given to allowances for inflation and the budget proposals identified by individual Departments in 2012/13. The commitment budget for CYPL is shown in more detail in Annex A.



Table 1: Summary Commitment Budget 2012/13-2014/15

	Planned Expenditure		
	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000
Base Budget	76,255	76,400	76,735
<i>Movements in Year:</i>			
Chief Executive / Corporate Services	-106	-85	0
Children, Young People and Learning (excluding schools)	4	-110	-160
Adult Social Care and Health	-49	0	0
Environment, Culture & Communities	454	26	23
Non Departmental / Common	-158	504	0
<i>Total Movements</i>	145	335	-137
<b>Adjusted Base</b>	<b>76,400</b>	<b>76,735</b>	<b>76,598</b>

Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2012/13*National Perspective*

- 5.4 The 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review announced in October 2010 set out the national medium term funding proposals for public sector expenditure. In line with these control totals the Local Government Financial Settlement, published on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011, set out detailed funding proposals for local authorities covering the period 2011/12 and 2012/13. As such a Provisional 2012/13 Settlement was announced in January 2011 and the Council has been developing its budget proposals on this basis.
- 5.5 The pre-announced Provisional Settlement reflected a further reduction of £2.97m in Formula Grant for Bracknell Forest (£23.12m in 2012/13m compared to £26.09m in 2011/12) representing a reduction of 10.4% (in line with the maximum reduction possible under the Floor damping mechanism). A number of small increases in Specific Grants for 2012/13 were announced as part of the Settlement including increases in the Early Intervention Grant and the Learning Disability and Health Reform Grant. This additional income is reflected in the summary of proposals in Table 4, below.
- 5.6 In addition to Formula and Specific grants the Government introduced the New Homes Bonus in 2011/12, designed to encourage the development of new homes. The Council received £0.647m in 2011/12 (of which £0.600m is reflected in the commitment budget) and is expected to receive a further £0.787m in 2012/13. As the New Homes Bonus is payable for 6 years, the Council will therefore receive a total of £1.434m in 2012/13. The significant increase reflects the removal from the tax-base of the Enid Wood House properties. Whilst the removal of the approximately 150 properties at Enid Wood House from the Council's Tax Base has reduced potential Council Tax in 2012/13, the calculation of the New Homes Bonus treats their removal as if they were empty properties brought back in to use (as their removal means they are no longer recorded as being empty). As such this represents an anomaly that will

not be repeated in the future. Excluding this exceptional item would have reduced the additional New Homes Bonus to £0.493m in 2012/13.

- 5.7 The Government recently consulted, as part of the Local Government Resource Review, on comprehensive changes to the funding of local government through the localisation of Business Rates. The Government's ambition is to introduce these changes from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013. As such the level of funding for Bracknell Forest in 2013/14 and 2014/15 is considerably uncertain. The most robust information available to the Council is therefore the change in Departmental Control Totals published as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review, which indicates further reductions of 2% in 2013/14 and 4% in 2014/15. As such these levels of reduction in Formula Grant have been applied to the short-term funding model.

#### *Council Tax*

- 5.8 The collection fund is expected to break even in 2011/12. Following the zero increase in the current year, Council Tax at present levels will generate total income of £48.473m in 2012/13. In addition a further £0.339m will be generated from the increase in tax base arising from the occupation of new properties and other changes in exemptions and discounts during 2012/13.
- 5.9 The Government has prioritised keeping Council Tax increases to the minimum possible next year. To support this aim, the Department for Communities and Local Government has announced that it will give councils who agree to freeze or reduce Council Tax in 2012/13 a one-off grant equivalent to a 2.5% increase in Council Tax.
- 5.10 The Executive intends to accept the Coalition Government's offer to work in partnership with local authorities to protect council tax payers with a Council Tax freeze, thereby passing on the benefit to the council tax payers. The working assumption upon which the proposals in this report are based at this stage, therefore, is that there will be no increase in Council Tax and that the Council will receive additional grant from central Government of £1.220m to offset this.
- 5.11 In contrast with 2011/12's Council Tax Freeze Grant, the grant for 2012/13 is one-off which will lead to an additional pressure in 2013/14 when the grant is withdrawn. In effect this means that, unless the government changes its position and extends the 2012/13 grant, the level of savings required in subsequent years will increase by £1.220m. The alternative would be an increase in Council Tax of 2.5% more than that which is needed to fund any year on year changes between 2012/13 and 2013/14, which is unlikely to be acceptable.

#### Budget Proposals for 2012/13

##### *Service pressures and Developments*

- 5.12 In the face of significant reductions in public expenditure in general and in grants to Local Government in particular the scope to invest in new service provision is self evidently severely restricted. Nevertheless, it is important to retain a clear focus to ensure that the Council continues to improve services where possible and to invest in the Borough, focussing on protecting front line services and delivering the Council's new Medium Term Objectives. In preparing the 2012/13 draft budget proposals each department has evaluated the potential pressures on its services and these are summarised below in Table 2:

Table 2: Service Pressures/Development

	£'000
Chief Executive / Corporate Services	150
Children, Young People and Learning (excluding schools)	1,029
Adult Social Care and Health	405
Environment, Culture & Communities	<u>275</u>
<b>Total Pressures/Developments</b>	<b>1,859</b>

5.13 Many of the pressures are simply unavoidable and respond only to changing demographic trends, particularly as they principally relate to increases in children and young people in care, increases in client numbers within Adult Social Care or the economic climate. They do, however, also support the Council's six overarching priorities and medium term objectives in the following way:

- Promote health & achievement (£1.029m)
- Create a Borough where people are safe and feel safe (£0.405m)

5.14 The Children Young People and Learning pressures include proposals to support and recruit more foster carers and adoptive families with the intention of reducing placement costs for looked after children, thereby generating future savings or, at least, containing the costs of further increases in the number of such children. There is also a substantial pressure to cover the care and accommodation costs of children currently being looked after where there has been a 20% increase in numbers. The full proposals from CYPL are detailed in Annex B.

5.15 In addition to these revenue proposals the Council continues to invest in its priorities through targeted capital expenditure, details of which are set out below in the paragraphs that present the proposed capital programme.

*Service Economies /Balancing the Budget*

5.16 Since March 2011 the Executive and CMT have held regular meetings to determine options for savings in order to balance the budget and a list of potential draft budget savings has been developed. This list totals £5.123m and is summarised in Table 3. As in previous years, these economies focus as far as possible on central and departmental support rather than on front-line services. However, since it became a Unitary Authority the Council has successfully delivered savings of around £50m in total. Against this background of continually bearing down on costs and driving to improve efficiency it is becoming increasingly difficult to find further savings in these areas, which would not compromise the Council's ability to function effectively.

Table 3: Summary Service Economies

	£'000
Chief Executive / Corporate Services	673
Children, Young People and Learning (excluding schools)	1,607
Adult Social Care and Health	1,149
Environment, Culture and Communities	<u>1,694</u>
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>5,123</b>

The potential economies which the Executive is considering for the CYPL Department are outlined in Annex C.

*Council Wide Issues*

5.17 Apart from the specific departmental budget proposals there are some Council wide issues affecting all departments' budgets which need to be considered. The precise impact of these corporate budgets is likely to change before the final budget proposals are recommended. However the current view on these issues is outlined in the following paragraphs:

a) Capital Programme

The scale of the Council's Capital Programme for 2012/13 will impact upon the revenue budget and is itself subject to consultation over the coming weeks. All new spending on services will need to be funded from new capital receipts or borrowing from internal resources. The proposed Council Funded Capital Programme for 2012/13 is £9.485m. After allowing for projected receipts of £3m in 2012/13, but excluding the self-funding Invest to Save schemes, the additional revenue costs will be £0.032m in 2012/13 and £0.164m in 2013/14.

b) Interest and Investments

Growth in the UK economy is expected to be weak over the next two years and there is a risk of a technical recession. Bank Rate, currently at 0.5%, underpins investment returns and is not expected to start increasing until quarter 3 of 2013 despite inflation currently being well above the Monetary Policy Committee inflation target. Hopes for an export led recovery appear likely to be disappointed due to the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis depressing growth in the UK's biggest export market. The comprehensive Spending Review which seeks to reduce the UK's annual fiscal deficit will also depress growth during the next few years.

This challenging and uncertain economic outlook has several key treasury management implications.

- The Eurozone sovereign debt difficulties, most evident in Greece, provide a clear indication of much higher risk in lending money. This continues to suggest that only organisations with high credit ratings should be used and for shorter time periods
- Investment returns are likely to remain relatively low during 2012/13

The Council continues to regard security of the principal sum it invests as the key objective of its treasury management activities.

The 2012/13 budget is therefore based on an average rate of return of approximately 1% and reflects the lower cash balances as a result of the 2011/12 and 2012/13 Capital Programmes. The 2011/12 budget was based on a return of 0.9% and as such expected interest income is projected to increase marginally from the higher interest rate. However additional income will be generated resulting from additional cash flow resulting from the expected repayment of Icelandic deposits and the increase in capital grants from DfE during 2011/12. Given the level of cash balances the Council can once again make maximum use of the arrangement to make a pre-payment on its pension fund contributions and thus earn a higher discount than could be earned through its own investment opportunities. Taken together this should generate additional income of £0.152m. However should interest rates

## Unrestricted

fall further, every 0.1% reduction in the average rate of return would add a £0.025m pressure to the General Fund.

The Council reviews the annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement under the requirement of the 2011 revised CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes (“the CIPFA TM Code”). The Local Government Act 2003 required the Council to “have regard to the Prudential Code” and to set Prudential Indicators for the next three years to ensure that the capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable.

### c) Provision for Inflation and Pay Awards

The Commitment Budget excludes the cost of inflation on both expenditure and income. In past years, the Council has restricted the provision for inflation on prices as a general economy measure, to help address the underlying budget gap, although pay awards have been fully funded. In the context of the Council’s overall financial position, it is again prudent to consider where the provision for inflation on prices can be limited as an economy measure, although some exceptions will be necessary to reflect actual increases that will not be containable without real service reductions and to meet contractual commitments. In particular it will be important to have realistic discussions with key providers about what level of inflation is genuinely necessary on some contracts and placements.

At this stage the inflation provision is not finalised, although for planning purposes a sum of £1.500m has been added to the budget. This compares to a provision of £0.545m last year and reflects the higher rates of inflation this year (consumer price inflation at 5.2% and retail price inflation at 5.6% in September). Containing the inflation provision to this level could be achieved by:

- Freezing pay budget lines;
- Having zero inflation for a number of budget lines rather than the Retail Price Index;
- Using 2% inflation for a number of budget lines;
- Negotiating to minimise inflation on contracts;
- Increasing fees and charges by 4.0% unless this is inconsistent with the Council’s income policy.

The Council will need to consider where it is appropriate and necessary to provide for inflation over the coming weeks so that the actual inflation provision can be added to the final budget report in February 2012.

### d) Fees and Charges

The Council established a policy for the review of fees and charges when setting the 2001/02 budget. This requires each Department to consider the level of charges against the following criteria:

- Fees and Charges should aim, as a minimum, to cover the costs of delivering the service;
- Where a service operates in free market conditions, fees and charges should at least be set at the market rate;

## Unrestricted

- Fees and charges should not be levied where this is an ineffective use of resources, i.e. the cost of collection exceeds any income generated.

It is estimated that most prices, where the Council charges users a fee for services, will need to increase by around 4.0% to recover the costs of those services. However, where current economic conditions and the market rate indicate a different percentage, for example for leisure income, this has been applied. Certain other fees also attract a different percentage as they are determined by statute. The proposed fees and charges that can be determined by CYPL that are not proposed to increase by around 4% are as follows:

- Tea and coffee at the Education Centre to increase by 6.9% - 7.7%
- Photocopying at the Education Centre to increase by 4.7 – 25% (note this reflects increases on very low process e.g. from 4p to 5p per copy)
- Attendance fees for Youth Clubs not to change
- Tuck shop goods in Youth Centres to increase by up to 6.3%
- Sessional fees in Children's Centres to increase by 5%

### e) Corporate Contingency

The financial risks facing the Council are at a similar overall level to those experienced last year. The Council manages these uncertainties in the budget through the use of a general contingency added to the Council's budget. A sum of £1m is currently included for contingency in the budget proposals for 2012/13.

During the next year the Council will continue to face significant risks on its budget particularly in relation to demand led budgets. Therefore the Borough Treasurer recommends that the general contingency should be set at £1m which is equal to the contingency for 2011/12.

The Executive will need to make a judgement on the appropriate level of contingency at its February meeting, taking advice from the Borough Treasurer who will need to certify the robustness of the overall budget proposals in the context of the Council's remaining general and earmarked reserves. All the reserves will be reviewed to ensure that they are sufficient to manage the financial risks facing the Council in the coming years.

### *Spending on Schools*

- 5.18 The Schools Budget – both delegated school funding and centrally managed items such as Special Educational Needs placements made outside of the Borough - is funded by a specific Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) with any year end balance, either surplus or deficit, required to be ring-fenced within the Schools Budget. Therefore, use of this funding is outside the control of the Council. The draft budget proposals assume the Schools Budget is set at the level of DSG and that any accumulated deficit or surplus is managed to a nil balance by the end of the three year budget period.
- 5.19 However, Local Authorities have a legal duty to set the overall level of Schools Budget and individual budgets for each of their schools by 31 March. This must be no

## Unrestricted

lower than the level of anticipated DSG, but can be higher, if the Council decides to add a top up.

- 5.20 Decisions around the final balance of the budget between spending by schools and that on pupil services managed by the Council is the responsibility of the Executive Member for Education, although the Schools Forum must be consulted, and in certain circumstances, agree to spending increases on the services managed by the Council.

### *Summary position on the Revenue Budget*

- 5.21 Adding the draft proposals to the Commitment Budget and taking account of the corporate issues identified above would result in total expenditure of £73.099m as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary of proposals:

	£'000
Commitment Budget	76,400
2012/13 Budget Pressures	1,859
2012/13 Budget Economies	(5,123)
Capital Programme	32
Changes in Investment Income	(152)
Inflation Provision	1,500
Additional Specific Grants	(583)
Additional New Homes Bonus 2011/12	(47)
New Homes Bonus 2012/13	(787)
<b>Draft Budget Requirement 2012/13</b>	<b>73,099</b>

- 5.22 The Council can anticipate income of up to £73.156m. This arises from Government grants (£23.124m), additional Council Tax Freeze Grant (£1.220m) and Council Tax (£48.812m). While this creates a broadly balanced budget there is still uncertainty surrounding the final Local Government Financial Settlement and inevitably between December and February that additional information will become available which could impact on the budget proposals. The results of the consultation exercise will also need to be factored into the Council's final budget proposals.

### *Balances*

- 5.23 The Council will have an estimated £8.4m available in General Reserves at 31 March 2012. Based on keeping the minimum prudent level of reserves of £4m there is £5.4m available to support future expenditure. This assessment is based on the financial risks which face the Council and the Borough Treasurer considers these in the February report to the Executive.

## **Capital Programme**

### **Introduction**

- 5.24 The Local Government Act 2003 requires Councils to have regard to the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities when setting their capital expenditure plans, which must be affordable, prudent and sustainable.
- 5.25 The proposed capital programme for 2012/13 has been developed, therefore, on the assumption that it will be funded by a combination of Government grants, other external contributions and some internal borrowing in addition to the £3m of capital receipts from the Council's share of right-to-buy sales of houses and miscellaneous sales of surplus land and property. The financing costs associated with the General Fund Capital Programme have been provided for in the Council's revenue budget plans as set out above.

### **New Schemes**

- 5.26 Within the general financial framework outlined above, Service Departments have considered new schemes for inclusion within the Council's Capital Programme for 2012/13 - 2014/15. Given that both capital and revenue resources are under pressure, each Department has evaluated and prioritised proposed schemes into the broad categories, set out in the Council's Corporate Capital Strategy and in line with the Council's Asset Management Plan. Having done this, only the very highest priority schemes and programmes are being recommended for inclusion in the Capital Programme.

#### **Unavoidable (Including committed schemes)**

This category covers schemes which must proceed to ensure that the Council is not left open to legal sanction and includes items relating to health and safety issues, new statutory legislation etc. Committed schemes also include those that have been started as part of the 2011/12 Capital Programme. Also included within this category are those schemes that were previously funded from the General Fund Revenue Account, but which by their nature could be legitimately capitalised, thereby reducing pressure on the revenue budget. Schemes in this category form the first call on the available capital resources.

Within these categories provision has been made to address the disabled access requirements to Council buildings (£0.1m). The works have been identified through independent access audits and have been prioritised to meet the needs of users of these buildings. Significant progress has been made in past years and a programme of works has been planned across a range of service areas.

#### **Maintenance (Improvements and capitalised repairs)**

An assessment has been made of the condition of the Council's property assets to arrive at an estimate of the outstanding maintenance works required. These are based on surveys carried out in 2011.

An assessment is made of the state of each building element and its repair priority with a condition rating and repair urgency as follows.



<b>Definition of Condition Categories</b>
<p>A: Good – Performing as intended and operating efficiently.                      B: Satisfactory – Performing as intended but showing minor deterioration.                      C: Poor – Showing major defects and/or not operating as intended.                      D: Bad – Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure.</p>
<b>Priority:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Urgent works that will prevent immediate closure of premises and/or address an immediate high risk to the health and safety of the occupants and/or remedy a serious breach of legislation.</li> <li>2 Essential work required within two years that will prevent serious deterioration of the fabric or services and/or address a medium risk to the health &amp; safety of the occupants and/or a minor breach of the legislation.</li> <li>3 Desirable work required within 3 to 5 years that will prevent deterioration of the fabric or services and/or address a low risk to the health &amp; safety of the occupants and/or a minor breach of the legislation.</li> <li>4 Long-term work required beyond a period of 5 years that will prevent deterioration of the fabric or services.</li> </ol>

In line with the policy adopted in previous years the AMG has considered only those works that fall within categories 1C and 1D. Examples of key areas to be undertaken:

- Boiler & heating system replacement
- Roof works
- Electrical work - replace switchgear
- Swimming pool filters - replace
- Ventilation & Air Handling Units – Replace
- Fire Alarm & Security systems
- Insulation & fire protection - replace

The implications of failing to maintain Council buildings and to address the backlog will be a significant issue for the Council over the coming years and efforts will be focussed on ensuring that the highest priority items are tackled first, that efficiencies are maximised in the procurement of works and that maintenance which will result in energy efficiencies are undertaken through the invest-to-save programme, as set out in the Council’s Asset Management Plan 2010.

**Rolling programmes**

These programmes cover more than one year and give a degree of certainty for forward planning schemes to improve service delivery. They make an important contribution towards the Council’s Medium Term Objectives and established Asset Management Plans.

**Other Desirable Schemes**

In addition to the schemes identified in the above categories, each service has requested funding for other high priority schemes that meet the needs

and objectives of their service and the Council's Medium Term Objectives. The net cost of schemes which attract partial external funding are included in the schemes put forward.

#### **Invest To Save Schemes**

These are schemes where the additional revenue income or savings arising from their implementation exceeds the internal borrowing costs. The Council's approach to Invest to Save schemes is included in its Capital Strategy and in accordance with the Capital Strategy it is proposed that a further £1m be included in the 2012/13 capital programme for potential Invest to Save schemes.

- 5.27 Scheme details relating to the CYPL Department are set out in Annex D, and these show Council funded expenditure proposed at £0.040m. The overall proposed capital programme requires £9.485m of funding from the Council. The following table summarises the draft programme for the CYPL Department.

Table 5: Summary of CYPL capital proposals:

Draft Capital Programme	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000
Committed	0	700	1,700
Unavoidable	5	0	0
Maintenance – non-schools	5	0	0
Rolling Programme/other desirable – non-schools	30	0	0
<b>Total Council Funding</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1,700</b>
External Funding – school related	5,913	1,995	2,765
<b>Total draft programme</b>	<b>5,953</b>	<b>2,695</b>	<b>4,465</b>

Schemes highlighted in years subsequent to 2012/13 are indicative only and not subject to approval at this stage. Those included within the programme to be funded by the Council will be reviewed before the commencement of each financial year.

#### Externally Funded Schemes

- 5.28 A number of external funding sources are also available to fund schemes within the capital programme, amounting to £12.945m of investment in 2012/13. External support has been identified from two main sources:

##### *Government Grants*

- 5.29 A number of capital schemes attract specific grants. It is proposed that all such schemes should be included in the capital programme at the level of external funding that is available. However the capital programme will now include more detail on these programmes in that every project costing more than £50k is included or will be included in the February 2012 report as a "named" scheme.

The majority of the grant-funded capital programme relates to the planned investment in Schools. In 2011/12 the Department for Education (DfE) changed the way in which it delivered funding to local authorities, moving from supported borrowing approvals to capital grant. This simple change had a significant impact on the authority, as the supported borrowing approvals represented little or no cash increase to the Council's

resources, whereas the move to cash grants means the Council can effectively invest every £ of allocation from DfE.

The schools investment programme included in this report (and outlined in Annex D) is based on the latest available information on requirements, both maintenance and basic need, whilst at the same time reflecting the estimated level of funding that could be received in 2012/13 through the grant allocation process, based on the 2011/12 allocation. The actual level of grant received by the authority will not be known until the publication of the Local Government Finance Settlement which is due in December 2011. As such there is a presumption that the final agreed programme will be re-prioritised based on the level of funding actually received.

*Section 106*

- 5.30 Each year the Council enters into a number of agreements under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 by which developers make a contribution towards the cost of providing facilities and infrastructure that may be required as a result of their development. Usually the monies are given for work in a particular area and/or for specific projects. The total money available at present, which is not financially committed to specific projects, is £4.15m, although conditions restricting its use will apply to almost all of this.

Officers have identified a number of schemes that could be funded from Section 106 funds in 2012/13, where funding becomes available. These are summarised below

<b>Department</b>	<b>Schemes</b>	<b>Budget</b>
		<i>£000</i>
CYPL	Schools	£697
ECC	Local Transport Plan	£750
ECC	Leisure, Culture & Visual Environment	£100
	<b>Total</b>	£1,547

As with grant funded schemes, in order to increase transparency, all capital schemes to be funded from S106 money costing more than £50k are included in the draft programme as specific named schemes or will be when it is finally agreed in February 2012.

Funding options

- 5.31 There are a number of important issues concerning the long term funding of capital expenditure. Following the transfer of the housing stock in 2008, the Council's capital receipts are limited to miscellaneous asset sales and the contribution from the VAT Shelter Scheme and Right-to-Buy claw back agreed as part of the transfer. These receipts are likely to be depressed by the general economic conditions and as such receipts in 2012/13 are estimated to be in the region of £3m.
- 5.32 The proposed capital programme for 2012/13 has been developed, therefore, on the assumption that it will be funded by a combination of £3m of capital receipts, Government grants, other external contributions and some internal borrowing. The financing costs associated with the Capital Programme have been provided for in the Council's revenue budget plans.

## Unrestricted

- 5.33 Should any additional capital receipts be generated in 2012/13 the interest earned on these will be used to mitigate the revenue cost of the capital programme.
- 5.34 For 2012/13 it is unlikely that the Council will need to resort to external borrowing as it will be able to utilise revenue resources held internally. However the Capital Finance Regulations, require the General Fund to set aside an amount which would be broadly equivalent to the amount the Council would need to pay if it borrowed externally. If any amendments are made to the capital programme the revenue consequences will need to be adjusted accordingly. Executive Members will therefore need to consider the impact of the capital programme as part of the final revenue budget decisions.
- 5.35 The reduction in available capital receipts has placed greater emphasis on the capital programme and its impact on the revenue budget. Following the introduction of the Prudential Borrowing regime local authorities are able to determine the level of their own capital expenditure with regard only to affordability on the revenue account. In practice this represents the amount of borrowing they can afford to finance, and will necessitate taking a medium-term view of revenue income streams and capital investment needs.
- 5.36 To achieve its aim of ensuring that capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable, the Local Government Act requires all local authorities to set and keep under review a series of prudential indicators included in the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities. The Capital Programme recommended in this report can be sustained and is within the prudential guidelines. Full Council will need to agree the prudential indicators for 2012/13 to 2014/15 in March 2012, alongside its consideration of the specific budget proposals for 2012/13 and the Council's medium-term financial prospects.
- 5.37 Given the known revenue budget gap, there will need to be a careful balance between the level of the Capital Programme in future years against other revenue budget pressures and a thorough review, including the prioritisation of those schemes planned for 2013/14 onwards, will need to be undertaken during next summer.

### *Conclusion*

- 5.38 When the final settlement is known, the Executive can consider the prudent use of revenue balances and appropriate level of Council Tax to support expenditure in line with the overall medium term financial strategy along with further possible reductions to augment the "core package". In doing this, it will be important to manage the budget process effectively so that the inevitable important service pressures can be responded to whilst, as far as possible, front-line services are maintained with minimal disruption and without creating long term problems for the Council.
- 5.39 All comments from the Schools Forum and others on the revenue and capital budget proposals will then be submitted to the Executive on 21 February 2012. This will allow the Executive to determine the final budget package and recommend the appropriate Council Tax level to the Council on 29 February 2012.

### Update on Education Capital Grants

- 5.40 Paragraphs 5.24 to 5.39 reflect the Executive's budget proposals that were published on 8 December. Subsequent to this, the DfE has confirmed Education Capital Grant allocations for 2012/13 and these are different from the assumptions made at the

time of publication. An addition grant allocation has also been made for 2011/12 to LAs facing the greatest difficulties in providing sufficient school places. Table 6 below sets out the new unringfenced Education Capital Grants that have recently been confirmed to the Council.

Table 6: Education Capital Grants:

Grant	2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	Total £000
Basic Need – pupil places	2,212	3,786	5,998
Maintenance	0	1,885	1,885
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,212</b>	<b>5,671</b>	<b>7,883</b>

- 5.41 At this stage it is assumed that the Executive will propose that the full grant amounts are allocated for the intended purpose and therefore will be fully spent on Education related items. If agreed, this would remove the funding gap on the current work programme of schemes. Work is underway to prioritise their use which will be considered by the Executive in February.
- 5.42 In addition to the capital grants allocated to the Council, schools will continue to receive direct capital funding through the Devolved Formula Capital scheme. The DfE has confirmed that funding rates will remain at the significantly reduced levels that came into effect in 2011/12. Each school will receive a lump sum allocation of £4,000 and per pupil funding of £11.25 for primary schools, £16.88 for secondaries, and £33.75 for special schools. The average sized primary school in the borough will receive around £7,000 next year, with the average sized secondary school receiving around £22,000.

## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

### Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires the Council to set the level of the Council Tax by 11 March each year. It is impossible to achieve this without having agreed an affordable revenue budget for the year in question.
- 6.2 The authorisation for incurring capital expenditure by local authorities is contained in the legislation covering the service areas. Controls on capital expenditure are contained in the Local Government Act 2003 and regulations made thereunder.

### Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out within the supporting information.

### Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 The Council's final budget proposals will potentially impact on all areas of the community. A detailed consultation process is planned in order to provide individuals and groups with the opportunity to comment on the draft proposals. This will ensure

that in making final recommendations, the Executive can be made aware of the views of a broad section of residents and service users. A number of the budget proposals require specific equality impact assessments to be carried out of which draft versions have been prepared. Consultation with equalities groups that are likely to be affected by the proposal is part of the assessment process. In respect of the Capital Programme, where necessary, impact assessments on specific schemes will be undertaken before work commences

#### Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.3 A sum of £1m is currently proposed to meet the costs of unpredictable or unforeseen items that would represent in year budget risks. This is equal to the level of contingency set for 2011/12. The Executive will need to make a judgement on the level of contingency at its meeting in February.
- 6.4 The Borough Treasurer, as the Council's Chief Finance Officer (section 151 officer), must formally certify that the budget is sound. This will involve identifying and assessing the key risk areas in the budget to ensure the robustness of estimates and ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place to manage those risks, including maintaining an appropriate level of reserves and contingency. This formalises work that is normally undertaken each year during the budget preparation stages and in monthly monitoring after the budget is agreed. The Borough Treasurer will report his findings in February, when the final budget package is recommended for approval.
- 6.5 The most significant risk facing the Council from the capital programme is its impact on the revenue budget. All new spending on services will need to be funded from new capital receipts or borrowing from internal resources. This effect is compounded by future year's capital programmes. As revenue resources are limited it is clear that a capital programme of this magnitude is not sustainable in the medium term without significant revenue economies. The generation of capital receipts in future years may mitigate the impact on the revenue budget, but as the timing and scale of these receipts is uncertain their impact is unlikely to be significant.
- 6.6 There are also a range of risks that are common to all capital projects which include:
- Tender prices exceeding the budget
  - Planning issues and potential delays
  - Uncertainty of external funding
  - Building delays due to unavailability of materials or inclement weather
  - Availability of staff with appropriate skills to implement schemes
- 6.7 These can be managed through the use of appropriate professional officers and following best practice in project management techniques. The report also identifies the risk associated with the shortfall in maintenance expenditure compared to that identified by the latest condition surveys. With only those highest priorities receiving funding in 2012/13, there will be a further build up in the maintenance backlog and a risk that the deterioration in Council assets will hamper the ability to deliver good services.

## CONSULTATION

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 The Overview & Scrutiny Commission will be consulted on the budget proposals and may also choose to direct specific issues to individual overview and scrutiny panels. Targeted consultation exercises will be undertaken with business rate payers, the Senior Citizens' Forum, the Schools Forum, Parish Councils and voluntary organisations. Comments and views will be sought on both the overall budget package and on the detailed budget proposals. In addition, this report and all the supporting information are publicly available to any individual or group who wish to comment on any proposal included within it. To facilitate this, the full budget package will be placed on the Council's web site at [www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk](http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk). There will also be a dedicated mailbox to collect comments.
- 7.2 The timetable for the approval of the 2012/13 Budget is as follows

Executive agree proposals as basis for consultation	13 December 2011
Consultation period	14 December 2011 - 24 January 2012
Executive considers representations made and recommends budget.	21 February 2012
Council considers Executive budget proposals	29 February 2012

- 7.2 Due to the nature of some of the budget proposals an extended 12 week consultation process is planned for the proposals relating to:
- Youth Service
  - Public Transport / Concessionary Fares
  - Community Transport

As this ends on 6 March and after the Council tax has been set the Council will need to make separate decisions on whether these proposals are to be implemented.

### Background Papers

None.

### Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer : SR&E (01344 354061)  
[David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance (01344 354054)  
[paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

### Doc. Ref

Doc. Ref NewAlluse\Executive\Schools Forum\54) 090212\LA Budget Proposals for 2012-13.doc

## Commitment Budget 2012/13 to 2014/15

Item	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000	2014/15 £'000
<b>Children, Young People and Learning</b>				
Approved Budget	13,026	13,326	13,330	13,220
<u>Suitability surveys</u> Suitability and access surveys are undertaken every three years to update the Asset Management Plan in order that up to date information is available to inform investment decisions on the capital programme.		20	-20	
<u>Schools Music Festival</u> Biennial event which enables pupils from BF Primary schools to participate in a large scale production which links music, dance and art.		-10	10	-10
<u>Wide Area Network</u> Wide Area Network circuit replacement based on wireless technologies.		-6		
<u>Local foster home placements</u> The investments in staffing proposed in the 2012-13 base budget are expected to result in more children being placed in local foster homes instead of expensive independent foster homes. The savings proposed reflect the current looked after children population which is volatile, and therefore subject to change, often at very short notice and which may impact on the level of savings that can be achieved.			-100	-150
<u>Virements</u> Net Inter Departmental Virements (1).	300			
<b>Children, Young People and Learning Adjusted Budget</b>	<b>13,326</b>	<b>13,330</b>	<b>13,220</b>	<b>13,060</b>

(1) These transfers net off to nil in the Council's budget, and most significant virement in CYPL relates to removing the accounting adjustment to reflect income received from Adult Social Care and Health Department during the period that CYPL provided support for Finance, HR, IT and Performance Management.



## Revenue budget: proposed PRESSURES for CYPL Department

Description	2012/13 £'000
<p><b>Children Looked After – costs of care and support</b></p> <p>Based on the current costed schedule of known placements, a pressure has been identified to ensure the fulfilment of statutory duties for children and young people in care. This reflects an increase in the number of children being looked after and requiring care and support from 60 when the budget requirement for 2011/12 was established, to 87.</p>	750
<p><b>Children’s Social Care/Social Work Teams</b></p> <p>To meet demand as a result of the increased numbers of looked after children and young people recruitment of extra staff for the Under 11's and Family Placement Teams and Quality Assurance function is proposed. This amounts to 4.6 full time equivalent staff at a cost of £170,000 and as well as meeting the increased demand is expected to result in more children being placed in local foster homes instead of expensive independent foster homes generating net savings in the medium term. Demand for external specialist legal advice to help support care proceedings has also increased as number rise resulting in costs increasing by £65,000.</p>	235
<p><b>Berkshire Adoption Advisory Service (BAAS)</b></p> <p>BAAS is an independent organisation that provides expert adoption advice, training and support for the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities. This includes the recruitment of adoptive families, carrying out the initial home visits and relevant checks and running preparation groups. It will also provide support to birth fathers, mothers and grandparents, thereby meeting the adoption requirements to provide services to those affected by adoption. Adoption generally provides better outcomes for children and is cost effective.</p>	19
<p><b>Life Chances Co-ordinator</b></p> <p>In order to increase the number of local foster carers and adoptive families, a multi agency Life Chances Team will be created to provide better support to looked after children. This team will provide intensive support to children and young people in care in Bracknell-Forest and their foster carers/adoptive families. A 0.6 full time equivalent Co-ordinator is required for effective management and support.</p>	25
<p><b>CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND LEARNING TOTAL</b></p>	1,029

## Revenue budget: proposed ECONOMIES for CYPL Department

Description Impact	2012/13 £'000
<p><b>Youth Service</b></p> <p>A range of measures are proposed which are intended to make efficiencies and target resources more to the areas of greatest need. Efficiency savings have been identified in management, administrative support, supplies and services and additional income that total £92,000. This will result in less management, administrative and development support to youth workers with no one on site to attend to the needs of community groups and others renting youth centres.</p> <p>Reductions of £35,000 are proposed in grants to young people to create new opportunities, £17,000 on those targeted to individuals on the provision of positive activities and £5,000 on the support to schools in the delivery of sexual health services. The closure of 3 Youth Centres from Edgbarrow, North Ascot, Whitegrove and Sandhurst will save a further £56,000. Reduced funding increases the risk of anti-social behaviour, reduces the opportunity for young people to showcase their achievements and increases the risk for more young people needing more intensive interventions at a later stage. There will also be reduced support to schools to help reduce teenage pregnancy and improve attitudes to sexual health and behaviour.</p> <p>The closure of youth centres will enable a consequential reduction of one youth worker and associated resources, saving £45,000.</p>	<b>-250</b>
<p><b>Early Years</b></p> <p>A range of measures are proposed to better target the use of resources. The graduate leader programme and bursary support and training will be restricted to the voluntary and non-profit making providers only, with a consequential staffing reduction which supports the programme saving £119,000. This will result in a less qualified workforce providing support and care to young children.</p> <p>Support to the educational development of primary aged pupils will reduce through the advisory teacher post moving from full time to half time together with removal of other resource budgets that support vulnerable children will save £39,000. There will be a consequential reduction in professional advice and support to the Early Years Foundation Stage.</p> <p>The satellite children's centres at Maples (Warfield &amp; Winkfield); The Hollies (Binfield); The Chestnuts (Crowthorne &amp; Little Sandhurst); and The Sycamores (Crown Wood &amp; Harmans Water) will be closed saving £42,000. These areas will in future be supported exclusively through outreach work, and not in dedicated facilities.</p> <p>Deletion of staff that support the 39 parent and toddler groups in the private, voluntary and independent sector will save £38,000. The service will cease and will result in less guidance and advice to parents regarding the quality of available provision.</p>	<b>-238</b>

<b>Description Impact</b>	<b>2012/13 £'000</b>
<p><b>Connexions</b></p> <p>Connexions is a contracted service that provides information, advice and guidance to young people. From September 2012 the responsibility for the universal services will pass to schools with the Council retaining statutory responsibility for the more vulnerable, including national data returns. The reduction in the value of the contracted services will result in less support being available for vulnerable young people who have a high risk of being Not in Education, Employment of Training (NEET).</p>	<b>-150</b>
<p><b>Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS)</b></p> <p>TaMHS was a time limited project intended to develop the capacity of schools to work with children who may be experiencing, or are at risk of developing, mental health problems. The project will now cease with the risk that the early intervention and support for children who have mental problems may lose momentum without the direction and support provided by this project.</p>	<b>-125</b>
<p><b>Efficiencies through better procurement</b></p> <p>The Council has withdrawn as a member of a Pan-Berkshire group (SRG) established to commission and develop post 16 education following the closure of the Learning and Skills Agency with the service now being provided more efficiently in-house, saving £56,000.</p> <p>The contract for the Family Information Service, which provides information on childcare and a wide range of other services for parents and carers of children up to the age of 20 is also now provided in house. This saves £78,000 through more efficient use of staffing and better targeting of outreach to vulnerable families, with a reduction in service promotion.</p>	<b>-134</b>
<p><b>Review of services to schools</b></p> <p>A review of services for schools funded by the Council has identified a small number of non-statutory functions that should be funded by schools, either through new traded services or in partnership with the Council.</p> <p>Traded services are proposed for areas of the Education Psychology Service related to the assessment of pupils' learning needs and the Education Welfare Service in connection with pupil attendance, behaviour and safeguarding. Each Service will seek to generate £18,000.</p> <p>In addition, funding will in future be sought from the Schools Budget to continue support to schools in Ofsted categories of concern (£40,000) and families experiencing multiple problems through intensive interventions through the Family Intervention Project (£100,000). This project supports families experiencing multiple problems and there is a wide range of intensive interventions to assist children and families to achieve positive outcomes.</p>	<b>-176</b>

Description Impact	2012/13 £'000
<p><b>School Improvement Team</b></p> <p>The team of general and specialist advisers implement the Borough's policy for school improvement providing challenge and support to schools as well as bespoke training. There will be a restructure of responsibilities within the Team and cessation of some activities including provision of specialist advice, staff training and intervention in schools causing concern. Overall, there will be a reduction of 3.5 full time equivalent staff. These changes put at risk the ability to generate current levels of income and there will be consequential additional workload for remaining team members in order to meet school and departmental expectations.</p>	-184
<p><b>Aiming High for Disabled Children (AHDC)</b></p> <p>AHDS provides short breaks to help disabled children, young people and their families to get the support and chances they need to live ordinary lives. This includes day, evening, overnight and weekend activities for disabled children and young people with parents and families receiving a break from their caring responsibilities. In future there will be a reduction in the number of short breaks for disabled children and therefore support to their families. There is an increased risk of more high need disabled children needing support from the Disabled Children's Team and longer term provision.</p>	-80
<p><b>Children's Social Care</b></p> <p>A range of measures are proposed in Children's Social Care which is responsible for assessing the help and support needed for children and their families with specialist needs, including Child Protection, Looked After Children, Youth Offending and Special Educational Needs.</p> <p>Reductions of £13,000 can be made in home care support for disabled children, resources used to prevent children and young people coming into care and the purchase of computer equipment for looked after children.</p> <p>The Youth Offending Service will be reshaped with a 0.5 full time equivalent reduction in staffing saving £20,000. This reduction will impact on the ability to manage statutory youth justice orders in line with national standards and will result in less time being available to work with young people at risk of offending.</p> <p>Demand for financial support to young people, who have been in care, as they move to independence has reduced and a saving of £30,000 can be made. The reduction is possible but there is a risk that demand increases due to increased numbers in care and the recent change in the Care Leavers legislation in April 2011 which enables young people to have an assessment up until their 25th birthday</p>	-63

Description Impact	2012/13 £'000
<p><b>Departmental restructure and general efficiencies</b></p> <p>A range of efficiencies have been identified, mainly within the Strategy, Resources and Early Interventions Branch</p> <p>The statutory requirement to implement the Contact Point national children's database has been withdrawn and therefore no further development will now be undertaken on this project, saving £68,000.</p> <p>A 0.7 full time equivalent Accountancy Assistant post will be deleted saving £20,000 with a further £10,000 saving from reduced administrative support in Performance and Governance by a 0.4 full time equivalent. This will result in essential activities performed by these posts absorbed within the remainder of the Teams with a number of lower level tasks delayed or not undertaken.</p> <p>Efficiencies will be made in the recruitment process through limiting use of specialist professional journals and maximising use of on line recruitment facility (Jobs Go Public), saving £30,000. Assuming recruitment activity and appointment success rates remain at the level experienced over the past two years, there will be no adverse impact from this.</p> <p>Further efficiencies on general supplies and services and office costs will also be managed by making spending decisions in future at departmental level rather than by individual team managers, saving £20,000.</p> <p>The funds held to develop new aspects of work such as the Child Poverty Strategy will be deleted, saving £12,000. This can be managed, assuming no new responsibilities arise from the various reviews being undertaken into Children's Social Care, for example Munroe.</p>	<b>-160</b>
<p><b>Pyramid for Children project</b></p> <p>The Pyramid for Children project is a contracted service which screens Year 3 pupils for emotional well-being and provides specific support. The contract will be reconfigured through linking with in-house projects to effect a saving resulting in minimal impact as existing screening will be integrated into the work of Targeted Services team and schools following the completion of the targeted mental health in schools project.</p>	<b>-24</b>
<p><b>Support for Children and Families Team</b></p> <p>The Children and Families Team supports pupils and families who have difficulties in attending school and will be reconfigured as part of a review of Targeted Services which is expected to result in a 0.6 full time equivalent reduction in staffing. There will be a consequential reduction in services to schools, pupils and families resulting in reduced capacity to develop provision and provide services beyond the statutory minimum.</p>	<b>-23</b>
<b>CHILDREN YOUNG PEOPLE AND LEARNING TOTAL</b>	<b>-1,607</b>

## CYPL Proposed Capital Programme

	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000
<b>Committed</b>			
Additional School Places - Primary	0	700	1,700
	<b>0</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1,700</b>
<b>Unavoidable</b>			
Asbestos (Control of Asbestos) - <i>Non-Schools</i>	5	0	0
	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>			
Improvements & Capitalised Repairs - <i>Non-Schools</i>	5	0	0
	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Rolling Programme / Other Desirable</b>			
Larchwood Outdoor Play Surface - <i>Non Schools</i>	30	0	0
	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUEST FOR COUNCIL FUNDING</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1,700</b>
<b>External Funding</b>			
<b>Capital Maintenance / Condition</b>			
Improvements & Capitalised Repairs	2,545	200	200
Fire Safety (Fire Safety Order)	450	330	100
Asbestos (Control of Asbestos) - Schools	25	20	20
Legionella (COSHH)	5	0	0
Disabled Access - Schools	90	90	90
<b>Basic Need (School Places)</b>			
Additional School Places - Brakenhale Expansion	787	0	0
Additional School Places - Edgbarrow Expansion	110	0	0
Additional School Places - Secondary	0	700	1,700
<b>Departmental Bids</b>			
Suitability Improvements	200	200	200
School Kitchen Refurbishments	100	100	100
School Caretakers Houses	25	25	25
Carbon Reduction Measures	80	80	80

Unrestricted

	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000	2014/15 £000
<b>School Bids</b>			
Sandhurst Boilers and Lighting Controls	203	0	0
Ascot Heath Infants Classroom Extension	200	0	0
Easthampstead Park DT Block Roof Replacement	45	0	0
Easthampstead Park Distribution Board Replacements	43	0	0
Easthampstead Park Humanities Block Roof Repl'ment	50	0	0
The Brakenhale Paving replacement	50	0	0
Holly Spring Junior Kitchen Refurbishment	40	0	0
Wood Hill Internal Alterations Phase 2	100	0	0
<b>Other</b>			
Section 106 Contributions - Schemes less than £50k	180	250	250
Section 106 Brakenhale	103	0	0
Section 106 Crown Wood	414	0	0
Section 106 Jennetts Park	68	0	0
Schools Devolved Formula Capital (ex VA Schools)	tbc	tbc	tbc
Aiming High	tbc	tbc	tbc
PVI Funding - School Foundation Years	tbc	tbc	tbc
<b>TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING</b>	<b>5,913</b>	<b>1,995</b>	<b>2,765</b>
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>5,953</b>	<b>2,695</b>	<b>4,465</b>

## Capital Programme 2012/13 – Children, Young People and Learning

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Additional School Places - Secondary</b>	<b>897</b>
This is the last of the funding required to complete the creation of additional teaching accommodation at Brakenhale (£787k) and Edgbarrow (£110k). The final secondary S106 contribution of £103k from The Parks development will be used to reduce the Council's costs to create additional capacity at Brakenhale. This could be met from DFE Basic Need grant if this is received.	
<b>Fire Safety (Fire Safety Order)</b>	<b>450</b>
The fire risk remedial works has involved improving signage and emergency lighting, the installation of new and the upgrading of fire systems and improved compartmentation in 5 schools. This work is in addition to the works previously identified on the last round of fire risk assessments which did not take into account the need for fire compartmentation e.g. above suspended ceilings. The schemes to be undertaken in 2012/13 are as follows : Brakenhale £150k (from 2010 Fire Safety Audit) Crown Wood £40k (from 2009 Fire Safety Audit) Kennel Lane £50k (from Electrical Test Report 2011) Fire Risk Assessments – minor works various schemes £100k Automatic Fire alarm Monitoring (20 different schools) £20k Compliance works and further fire safety audits £100k	
<b>Asbestos (Control of Asbestos) – Schools</b>	<b>25</b>
Works to prevent exposure to asbestos containing materials under the Asbestos Management plans put in place to comply with the Control of Asbestos Regulations. Works include encapsulation or removal where asbestos is damaged.	
<b>Asbestos (Control of Asbestos) – Non Schools</b>	<b>5</b>
Works to prevent exposure to asbestos containing materials under the Asbestos Management plans put in place to comply with the Control of Asbestos Regulations. Works include encapsulation or removal where asbestos is damaged.	
<b>Legionella (COSHH)</b>	<b>5</b>
A budget for the prevention or control of legionella in accordance with the HSE's Approved Code of Practice under the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations. This budget is to provide for new/updated risk assessments and schemes of prevention to keep water systems (tanks and pipework) safe and free from harmful bacteria.	



Unrestricted

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Disabled Access - Schools</b>	<b>90</b>
A budget to implement access works to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act. There is £700k of priority 1 (urgent) access works in schools identified in the access audits in the CYPL Asset Management Plan. In addition the Council is obliged to pay for access works for individual children & young people and staff. Schools are unique in that Parts 1, 2 and 3 of the DDA apply in respect of pupils, staff and members of the public who have use of the buildings. The approach taken is risk based to minimise the cost in any one year by dealing with specific needs of individuals first rather than a blanket approach of implementing all access works at all properties.	
<b>Improvements &amp; Capitalised Repairs – Non Schools</b>	<b>5</b>
This is the estimated total value of the Priority 1 (urgent) items from the condition surveys. It will be for Corporate Services to set an appropriate budget to meet this need, is consistent with H&S, and the operation of services (no closures). This includes 6 individual areas of concern where heat gain is having a direct impact on the quality of the service.	
<b>Improvements &amp; Capitalised Repairs - Schools</b>	<b>2,545</b>
This is the estimated total value of the Priority 1 (urgent) items from the condition surveys. It will be for Corporate Services to set an appropriate budget to meet this need taking into account the expectation that schools will pay for some (on average 7%) of the planned maintenance works using their Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) Funding. This includes 48 individual areas of concern where heat gain is having a direct impact on learning.	
<b>Suitability Improvements</b>	<b>200</b>
To address the items from the suitability surveys in the CYPL Asset Management Plan. There are 5 Priority 1 items and they are all in schools, including undersized classrooms and the shortage of specialist areas. The proposed budget would be sufficient to address all of these over a five year programme.	
<b>Larchwood Outdoor Play Surface – Non Schools</b>	<b>30</b>
The replacement of the current surface of bark with a safe and durable play surface in Larchwood's rear garden that will also be accessible to all children with mobility problems and wheelchair users.  The bark is an health and safety issue with children putting objects in their mouths, and foxes and cats accessing the site.	
<b>School Kitchen Refurbishments</b>	<b>100</b>
Refurbishment of two of the 30 school meal kitchens, which have intensive use and require periodic capital investment to keep them operating in line with statutory compliance issues such as gas safety and environmental health. The Highest priorities are at Ascot Heath and Meadow Vale.	

Unrestricted

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>School Caretakers Houses</b>	<b>25</b>
A budget to bring school caretakers houses up to the same national "Decent Homes" standard as for Council housing. Works include kitchens, bathrooms and heating systems. Surveys indicate £220k of need, and the proposed budget would enable all this work to be completed over five years.	
<b>Carbon Reduction Measures</b>	<b>80</b>
Energy works in schools with a payback period of under 5 years to reduce carbon emissions and the "carbon tax" under the government's Carbon Reduction Commitment.	
<b>Sandhurst Boilers and Lighting Controls</b>	<b>203</b>
This is a bid from the school to replace old oil-fired boilers with new energy efficient boilers. This work will also address zoning and heating controls and make savings especially during times of lettings. The school also want to install light sensor/microwave controls which would save on energy costs. The school will contribute £22k for a total project cost of £225k.	
<b>Ascot Heath Infants Classroom Extension</b>	<b>200</b>
A bid from the school to relocate the class currently accommodated in open plan shared space into a purpose built classroom. This involves an extension to the school's main building. The works also include creation of a group withdrawal space / PPA room, and a new server/hub room. EC Harris have confirmed the feasibility & cost of this project.	
<b>Easthampstead Park DT Block Roof Replacement</b>	<b>45</b>
A bid from the school to replace the roof on the Design Technology block which currently has roof leaks and is ranked as 1C on the latest condition survey. A new roof would make the building watertight and protect the specialist equipment contained in this specific curriculum area. The school will contribute £5k for a total project cost of £50k.	
<b>Easthampstead Park Distribution Board Replacements</b>	<b>43</b>
A bid from the school to address electrical distribution boards identified as non-compliant to current regulations and parts are obsolete and/or difficult to replace. The latest condition survey ranks this work as 1B. The school have been advised that although they cannot be condemned, they will be placed into a category under an advisory which could have insurance implications. The school will contribute £4.8k for a total project cost of £48k.	
<b>Easthampstead Park Humanities Block Roof Replacement</b>	<b>50</b>
A bid from the school to replace the Humanities/Canteen block roof which leaks and is ranked as 1C on the latest condition survey. A new roof would make the building watertight and protect the specialist equipment contained in this area. The school will contribute £5.5k for a total project cost of £55k.	

Unrestricted

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>The Brakenhale Paving Replacement</b>	<b>50</b>
A bid from the school to replace the broken paving and repair the failed tarmac to footpaths and external areas to reduce the number of accidents from trips and slips that have occurred. The paving works are ranked as a 2D on the latest condition survey, however this work is being given a high priority by the school because of the health & safety risks of not addressing this need. The school will contribute £5k for a total project cost of £55k.	
<b>Holly Spring Junior Kitchen Refurbishment</b>	<b>40</b>
A bid from the school to refurbish/modernise the school meals kitchen, to include the upgrade of ventilation and heating. N.B. This kitchen is currently ranked 11 <sup>th</sup> out of 30 kitchens in order of priority on the Council's building surveys. School would contribute £20k for a total project cost of £60k.	
<b>Wooden Hill Internal Alterations Phase 2</b>	<b>100</b>
A bid from the school to strengthen the Foundation Stage Provision by undertaking Phase 2 of a project to upgrade and refurbish the existing Foundation and Key Stage 1 classrooms. School would be required to contribute £20k for a total project cost of £120k	

This page is intentionally left blank

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**DATE 9 FEBRUARY 2012**

---

**INITIAL 2012/13 SCHOOLS BUDGET PROPOSALS  
AND OTHER FINANCIAL MATTERS  
(Director of Children, Young People & Learning)**

**1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update members of the Schools Forum on preliminary budget information provided to schools on their potential 2012/13 budget and to seek views on the latest proposals from the Council for the 2012/13 Schools Budget. Initial views of the Schools Forum are now being sought so that any necessary amendments can be made in advance of the March Forum meeting where final recommendations will need to be made to the Executive Member in order to meet the statutory deadline for setting the budget.
- 1.2 The proposals in this report build on the outcomes from the financial consultation undertaken with schools in the autumn and now provide updated cost estimates for a number of the potential new developments.
- 1.3 Whilst the Executive Member is responsible for making most of the budget decisions, a number are for the Forum to determine, and these are also identified now, together with an initial assessment as to whether a request will be made for them to be exercised in March.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That the Schools Forum:**

- 2.1 **NOTES that based on current information, a funding gap of £1.459m exists (Table 1, paragraph 5.17).**
- 2.2 **AGREES that in light of the financial position:**
- i. **the items set out in Table 2 are not affordable (paragraph 5.18 - 5.21).**
  - ii. **and subject to other decisions in this paper relating to funding pressures and savings, the funding rates to be used in the BF Funding Formula for 2012/13 remain unchanged from the 2011/12 values (paragraph 5.23).**
  - iii. **the hourly funding rates paid to providers of the free entitlement to early years education and childcare for 2012/13 remain unchanged from 2011/12 values, subject to previously agreed transitional adjustments (paragraph 5.23).**
  - iv. **the budget proposals set out in Table 3 are included in the provisional Schools Budget for 2012/13 (paragraph 5.24).**

- 2.3 **NOTES that schools face real terms reductions in funding (paragraph 5.26);**
- 2.4 **AGREES the self balancing budget virement relating to the Looked After Children's Education Service (paragraph 5.29);**
- 2.5 **NOTES the changes introduced by the DfE in respect of funding school through the Pupil Premium (paragraphs 5.32 – 5.34);**
- 2.6 **AGREES that the arrangements in place for the following are appropriate (paragraph 5.37):**
  - a. **provisions for statemented pupils (where not delegated).**
  - b. **pupil referral units and other education out of school.**
  - c. **arrangements for insurance.**
  - d. **administrative arrangements for the allocation of central government grants.**
  - e. **arrangements for free school meals.**
  - f. **arrangements for early years.**
- 2.7 **NOTES the extent to which the Forum is expected to be requested to exercise its statutory powers (paragraph 5.38).**
- 2.8 **NOTES that the Council will receive £5.7m of un-ring fenced education related capital grants that are intended to meet pressures for additional pupil places and improving the condition of school buildings (paragraph 5.39).**
- 2.9 **NOTES that in order that final budgets reflect the most up to date data, there will be a need to revisit any preliminary budget decisions agreed now in March (paragraph 5.41).**
- 2.10 **AGREES now any further work required in respect of the 2012/13 Schools Budget (paragraph 5.41).**

### **3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 Statutory Regulations require the Schools Forum to be consulted on relevant budget proposals and arrangements in place for the provision of services to schools.
- 3.2 Further views of the Schools Forum are now being sought so that a budget package can be finalised at the next meeting in March and be recommended to the Executive Member for a final decision on the 2012/13 Schools Budget within the statutory deadline.
- 3.3 The Schools Forum also needs to consider whether any request to exercise their statutory decision making powers will be agreed.

### **4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 These were set out in the finance consultation documents and previous reports to the Schools Forum.

## 5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### Background and update from previous meetings

- 5.1 By 31 March 2012, all Local Authorities (LAs) have a statutory duty to provide each of their schools and early years providers with an actual budget for 2012/13. There are no forecast budgets available for 2013/14 and beyond as the Government have presented a one year funding settlement pending a detailed review of education funding which is likely to include significant changes from April 2013, of which the Department for Education (DfE) has indicated that detailed information will be available early in 2012.
- 5.2 This report presents the Forum with the latest stage in the development of the 2012/13 Schools Budget and builds on the key decisions and headline information that was available at the last meeting on 8 December, namely:
- a) To help planning, a budget strategy was agreed, as attached at Annex A.
  - b) It was agreed that the outcomes from the financial consultations with schools to identify and prioritise budget pressures, should be built into the initial budget proposals in this report.
  - c) A small number of other financial matters were agreed, including changing the data to be used to fund schools with Looked After Children through the BF Funding Formula for Schools.
  - d) The key information from the Spending Review, announced in October 2010 was the most up to date information and should be used in budget planning until any changes are confirmed by DfE. The key elements are as follows:
    1. There will be annual real terms growth of 0.1% for 5-16 year olds;
    2. That there is an assumed £1 billion of savings to be made by schools in back office functions and procurement;
    3. That overall, there will be a 60% reduction in capital spend;
    4. That funding for the Pupil Premium, to be targeted at disadvantaged pupils, will reach £2.5 billion by 2014/15.
  - e) Taking account of the available information, the following funding assumptions are being used in the initial preparations of next year's budget.
    1. Funding allocated through the Pupil Premium to double, which when taken into account with the assumed £1bn savings in back office functions and procurement, will absorb the 0.1% real terms growth.
    2. Per pupil funding from the DfE through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will therefore remain at the same amount as that received in 2011/12 i.e. a cash standstill for the second consecutive year, meaning no increase has been made to reflect rising inflation.
    3. The Minimum Funding Guarantee to remain unchanged at a maximum decrease in per pupil funding of 1.5%. This means the maximum reduction in per pupil funding that a school can receive next year compared to now is 1.5%.

## Unrestricted

- f) The calculations made in December indicated a provisional funding gap of £1.844m, which is a similar position to that faced at the same stage last year at the initial review of the 2011/12 budget position
- g) That to help schools with their financial planning, the Director of Children, Young People and Learning was authorised to produce indicative 2012/13 budgets to schools, on the basis of the above decisions, and these were distributed on 12 December.

### Proposals for the 2012/13 Schools Budget

#### *Overview of the Schools Budget*

- 5.3 The details of the Local Government Finance Settlement, which were in line with expectations and our initial preparations, were announced on 13 December, just after indicative budgets were sent to schools.
- 5.4 The Schools Budget is funded by a 100% ring fenced government grant called the DSG. Any under or overspending in a year must also be ring fenced and applied to a future Schools Budget. LAs can add to this grant from their own resources, but are not allowed to plan to spend at a lower amount. The strategy of the Council is to plan for the Schools Budget to be funded to the level of external funding.
- 5.5 The DfE requires the DSG to fund delegated school budgets and certain pupil related budgets that the Council manages on behalf of schools. Annual increases in spending on budgets managed by the Council are ordinarily limited to the average percentage change on both delegated school budgets and payments to early years providers in the private, voluntary and independent sector (PVI). However, if there are unavoidable cost increases on Council managed budgets that require a greater percentage rise, or new developments are considered desirable, the Forum has the power to agree to larger increases.
- 5.6 Each school's budget is protected through the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) which limits the change in per pupil funding a school can receive each year. As set out above, the DfE has again set the MFG at a negative amount and schools can receive a **reduction** in per pupil funding of no more than 1.5%. This is the same rate as applied in 2011/12.

#### *Estimated income from the DSG and accumulated balances*

- 5.7 Income for each financial year from the DSG is based on actual pupil numbers in schools at the January prior to the start of each financial year multiplied by per pupil LA funding amounts set by the DfE. BFC is funded at £4,861 per pupil. A relatively accurate assessment of pupil numbers will not be available for budget setting purposes until the middle of February, after returns from schools and other providers from the January census have been collected and summarised.
- 5.8 Therefore, the final cash amount of DSG is unknown at this stage as it will be determined by multiplying the guaranteed per pupil amounts by the actual number of pupils on roll, which the DfE does not confirm until June each year which is after the start of the relevant financial year. As there is a statutory requirement to publish the Schools Budget before the start of each year, it will always be set on provisional data, and may therefore be subject to change when final DSG amounts are confirmed.



## Unrestricted

- 5.9 It is worth reminding members of the Forum that this calculation is not just based on pupil numbers in maintained schools, but also those on roll in private special schools, those receiving education out of school, e.g. in a pupil referral unit, and early years pupils in the PVI, which means that a sizeable element of head count data (around 870 full time equivalent pupils, 6% of the total) is subject to estimation.
- 5.10 For current planning purposes, the October 2011 maintained school census has been used as a projection for January 2012 statutory aged pupil numbers in BFC schools, with pre-statutory aged pupil numbers based on estimates provided by individual schools. We do not have any up to date data for DSG pupils in other settings, so at this stage are using the numbers on roll in January 2011.
- 5.11 An added complication on the calculation of DSG is funding for 3 and 4 year olds. This arises as each LA will be funded at a minimum of 90% of its total 3 year old population, irrespective of how many 3 year olds are receiving childcare and education. This methodology has been adopted to encourage take-up.
- 5.12 Estimating the number of 3 and 4 year olds in the PVI sector has proved to be the most difficult element of this calculation. Therefore, at this stage it is assumed that there will be no financial impact from changes in numbers of 3 and 4 year olds with any change in DSG funding being matched by an equivalent change in funding allocated to providers. This will need to be reviewed when census data is confirmed and may result in a net pressure or saving, which may be significant.
- 5.13 In terms of balances available to the Schools Budget, these are estimated at £0.4m. This amount will need to be kept under review and may be subject to change.
- 5.14 A contingency has been built into the pupil forecasts used to estimate the level of DSG income to cover a possible over estimation of numbers or an under estimation of costs, including the potential impact from more schools converting to academy status. This has initially been set at £0.243m, equivalent to DSG income from 50 pupils, and reflects the uncertainty around the exact number of pupils on roll, and therefore level of income to be received. It also provides a buffer in the management of high cost, volatile central budgets that can rapidly change, mainly around Special Educational Needs. The level of contingency will need to be reviewed in March as part of setting the final budget.
- 5.15 Provision also needs to be made in the budget to finance the loss of funding on centrally managed Schools Budget items as a result of academies. This is because the DfE reduce DSG funding in respect of budgets that academies are responsible for, rather than the council. This is part of the national funding process for academies which receive funding from a Local Authority Central Services Equivalent Grant (LACSEG grant). Based on the current position of academies in the borough, £0.086m is proposed to be set aside for this purpose.
- 5.16 Taking account of the above information and assumptions, the initial estimate of likely income from the DSG after the £0.086m LACSEG top-slice for academy schools is £75.627m, an increase of £1.103m from the current budget. Adding the £0.400m estimated surplus in accumulated balances from 2011-12 results in an increase in total funding of £1.503m. Full details of estimated income are set out in Annex B.

*Budget pressures and developments*Current position

- 5.17 Taking account of the preliminary decisions of the Schools Forum, the Local Government Financial Settlement and the latest calculations of all pressures, economies and developments i.e. it includes absolutely everything, Table 1 below summarises the current position on next year's Schools Budget. This indicates an estimated funding shortfall of £1.459m. Annex C provides more information on pressures, economies and developments.

Table 1: Provisional summary of 2012/13 Schools Budget changes

Item	Amount £ 000
<b><u>Net Pressures:</u></b>	
Net pressures on delegated school budgets	2,387
Net pressures on LA managed budgets	575
<b>Total net pressure</b>	<b>2,962</b>
<b><u>Additional Income:</u></b>	
Estimated under spend from 2012/13	400
Estimated increase in DSG	1,103
<b>Total additional income</b>	<b>1,503</b>
Funding shortfall	1,459

Proposals to manage the budget gap

- 5.18 Clearly, there is a significant budget gap to bridge and this will require a number of difficult decisions, however, it is similar to the position faced last year. Table 2 below sets out proposals that remove the funding gap which the Forum are asked to agree are adopted at this stage. The numbered references correspond to those in Annex C if more detail is required.
- 5.19 The proposals to manage the budget gap follow three themes: national cost pressures that have not been reflected in the funding settlement and not therefore affordable; desirable budget developments that are not essential items; lowest priority and not affordable in the current climate.
- 5.20 In respect of funding schools for the full time admission of 4 year olds from September (item 6 in Table 2 and Annex C), due to the difficult budget settlement and the fact that excepting one school, all others took some form of admissions for 4 year olds in September without receiving any funding, it is proposed that no further funding is allocated for this item at this stage.
- 5.21 The following proposals reduce costs by £1.525m and result in an unallocated balance of £0.066m which will be recalculated with the most up to date information, and will be taken into account when final budget proposals are presented to the Forum in March.

**Table 2: Summary of proposals to reduce the budget gap (these items are NOT proposed to be funded)**

Ref	Item not to be funded	2012/13 current estimates		
		Delegated to schools £ 000	Managed by LA £ 000	Total £ 000
<b><u>Cost pressures not recognised in the funding settlement</u></b>				
1	Inflation	250	120	370
2	Increase in employer LGPS rate	40	10	50
	Net cost pressures not funded by DfE	290	130	420
<b><u>Desirable budget developments (not essential)</u></b>				
3	Additional 0.5% inflation to minimum costs	230	30	260
4	Building maintenance	50	0	50
5	Learning Support Units	185	0	185
6	4 year olds from September 2011 – balance of pressure not funded in 2011-12	460	0	460
7	Additional speech and language support	0	50	50
	Net non-essential budget developments	925	80	1,005
<b><u>Alternative funding source identified</u></b>				
8	Capital expenditure	0	100	100
	Net alternative funding source	0	100	100
	<b>Total pressures not to be funded</b>	<b>1,215</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>1,525</b>
<b>Current Estimated Shortfall</b>				<b>1,459</b>
<b>Unallocated balance</b>				<b>66</b>

- 5.22 If the above proposals are not supported, alternative cost reductions will need to be presented in order to balance the budget.
- 5.23 In line with the national funding settlement, the above proposals do not include funding for inflation or other known pressures. The consequence of this is that the funding values used in the BF Funding Formula for Schools will be mainly unchanged in 2011/12. Funding rates payable to providers of the free entitlement to early years education and childcare will also need to remain at current rates, subject to changes previously agreed through the transition arrangements.

**Summary Schools Budget position**

- 5.24 The budget proposals set out above have been formulated in accordance with responses from schools to the financial consultation and the agreed objectives as set out in Annex A. They also comply with how the statutory Funding Regulations are expected to be framed. Overall, delegated school budgets are proposed to increase by £1.173m, and those managed by the LA by £0.265m. The proposed changes are summarised below in Table 3, with more details in Annex D.

Table 3: Summary proposed budget changes

Ref	Item	2012-13 Estimates		
		Delegated to schools £ 000	Managed by LA £ 000	Total £ 000
1	Mainstream pupil number changes – includes impact from Jennett’s Park	596	0	596
2	KLS pupil number changes	142	0	142
3	SEN statements number / needs changes	65	0	65
4	SEN statements – cost review	70	0	70
5	Non pupil data changes	232	0	232
6	SEN Resource Units	32	0	32
7	Traded Service – Education Welfare	18	0	18
8	Traded Service – Education Psychology	18	0	18
9	Alternative Education Provision	0	60	60
10	Increase in external SEN placements	0	80	80
11	Increase in incidence of maternity leave	0	25	25
12	Family Intervention Project	0	100	100
	<b>Total pressures and savings</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>1,438</b>

5.25 There are five new pressures that are proposed to be funded compared to the items presented to the Forum in December:

- a) Mainstream statements – cost review at £0.070m (item 4 in table 3). This item was identified by schools in the financial consultations and suggested that funding allocated to support statemented pupils was not sufficient to cover costs. A detailed review has now been undertaken which concluded that there was a funding shortfall.
- b) SEN resource units at £0.032m (item 6 in table 3). This item was also included on the financial consultations with schools and related to the possibility that the development on more SEN resource units could save money in the medium to long term, but may require some short term additional funding while the units are being established. More information on this proposal is provided on a separate agenda item.
- c) Traded Service – Education Welfare at £0.018m (item 7 in table 3). The Education Welfare Service works with schools, children and families to improve attendance and arranges prosecutions where all other strategies have failed. The service is currently fully funded from the Council, but from April 2012, it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.018m to support non-statutory activities such as additional support to schools and families to secure high levels of pupil attendance.
- d) Traded Service – Education Psychology at £0.018m (item 8 in table 3). The Educational Psychology Service provides specialist consultation and assessment for vulnerable children together with a range of intervention, research, development and training services. These focus on issues arising from the social, emotional and cognitive development of children and young people, and involving or affecting their carers and/or

educators. The service is currently funded by the Council but from April 2012 it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.018m to allow schools to purchase additional services to increase the frequency of visits or commission training and support.

- e) Family Intervention Project at £0.100m (item 12 in table 3). The Family Intervention Project (FIP) works with families who are experiencing multiple problems and supports all members of the family regardless of age. Intervening to support families with multiple problems can have a big impact on behaviour and attainment. Research suggests a third of excluded children are from these families and also that where intervention occurs, there is a 54% reduction in school truancy, exclusion and bad behaviour. The service is currently fully funded from the Council, but from April 2012, it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.100m to reflect the benefits to pupil education.

#### Unavoidable cost increases

5.26 Whilst proposals have been made that at the moment allow for a balanced budget to be set, it does not result in all of the unavoidable pressures schools will face next year being fully funded. This means there will be a real terms reduction in funding for schools that will need to be managed through greater efficiencies or reducing or stopping some current activities / provisions or a combination of all these options. The key areas for cost increases that schools will need to take account of when setting their budgets are:

- Contractual increments due to staff.
- Increase in contribution to the employers Local Government pension scheme to reduce the level of accumulated deficit.
- General inflation on non pay at around 2.5%.

#### Potential for further changes

5.27 The main area that could still be subject to significant change relates to updating the October 2011 budget data with actual January 2012. This is the single most significant variable in terms of both the level of DSG income and budget allocations to individual schools and early years providers.

5.28 The DfE have yet to release the statutory funding regulations that LAs must follow in issuing school budgets. Any unexpected requirements from the regulations may impact on current proposals and required changes.

#### Other items

##### Self financing budget transfer (budget virement)

5.29 A separate paper on this agenda sets out increasing pressures on council budgets arising from additional numbers of looked after children. There is also an impact on the Looked After Children's Education Service (LACES Team) who work with looked after children to ensure that they are integrated into their schools and obtain the maximum benefit from their education. In order to better support these children, it is proposed to increase staff support by a 0.4 full time equivalent. This is estimated to cost £0.020m and would be funded by an equivalent saving from the cost of transport

to school. This part of the budget has under spent on average by £0.020m in each of the past 4 years. Therefore, there is a net nil financial effect from this proposal.

Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)

- 5.30 The MFG must be applied to ensure that all schools receive the minimum per pupil funding increase determined by the DfE if this is not ordinarily received through the application of the Funding Formula. With the rate now set at a maximum reduction of 1.5%, and unavoidable cost pressures for schools estimated at around 0.6%, schools funded at the MFG will face a real terms cost pressure of 2.1%. The LA is available to assist schools with advice and support in such situations, but there is the potential that an increased number of schools will be facing financial difficulties. There is currently £0.304m in the budget to support schools in financial difficulties, which is expected to be sufficient to meet future needs.

Limit on central expenditure (CEL)

- 5.31 If the budget package set out above is supported, it seems likely that a proposal will be brought to the next meeting of the Forum requesting consent to exceed the central expenditure limit. These proposals are estimated to exceed the CEL by £0.073m.

The Pupil Premium

- 5.32 Funding arrangements have also been confirmed for the Pupil Premium which is the only source of new money for schools in the local government financial settlement. The majority of the funding will be allocated to schools on the basis of pupils on roll each January who have been eligible to a free school meal at any point in the last 6 years. This is called the 'Ever 6' methodology. This is a change from the current year, which allocated funds based purely on pupils on roll who were eligible to a free school meal at the time of the January census.
- 5.33 The core funding for the free school meals element of the Pupil Premium will rise from £488 per eligible pupil to £600, with children looked after for more than 6 months also qualifying for the £600 funding. Children whose parents are in the armed forces will be funded at £250, up from £200. Overall, Bracknell schools are estimated to receive in total around £1.2m from the free school meals element of the grant, an increase of £0.480m compared to the current year, which is the only area of new money announced for next year. To maximise income from this new grant, schools have been reminded to ensure relevant parents and carers provide the evidence to support eligibility at the January 2012 census.
- 5.34 There is also other information from the DfE relating to new reporting requirements associated with the Pupil Premium, and whilst there are still gaps on exactly what will be required from September 2012, the various documents mention "we will include new measures in the performance tables, to report the attainment of pupils who are eligible for the pupil premium" and "Schools will have to publish [on-line] details of their Pupil Premium allocation and plans to spend in the current year. For the previous year a statement confirming allocation and how the money was spent and the impact this had on educational attainment [will be required]".

Other Grant funding

- 5.35 Secondary schools will continue to receive grant funding to finance their sixth forms (initially £5.249m in 2011/12) from the Education Funding Agency (the replacement for the Young People's Learning Agency). Detailed budget information is not

expected to be available for schools before March. However, a statement on the provisional funding settlement has been published with the key elements being:

- a. The 16-19 bursary Fund will continue for the coming academic year;
- b. Transitional protection will be put in place during the period of funding reduction, with a maximum 3% fall in per learner funding;
- c. Reduction in the success factor will be limited to 2%, but increases in success factor will be fully funded.

Additional delegation

- 5.36 The new funding arrangements that are anticipated from April 2013 include requiring council's to delegate further responsibilities and funds to schools. To help prepare for this requirement, a number of services are currently being reviewed to determine whether it would be beneficial to delegate them to schools from April 2012. If appropriate, proposals on potential areas will be brought to the Forum for consideration in March.

Other budget matters

- 5.37 The LA is also required to formally consult with the Forum on an annual basis in respect of the arrangements put in place to deliver a number of specified functions. Listed below are the relevant items, with no changes proposed to service delivery, although some budgets are recommended to be increased to meet changes in demand or to fulfil new statutory duties:
- a. The education of pupils with statements of special educational needs (where not delegated);
  - b. For the use of pupil referral units (PRUs) and the education of children otherwise than at school;
  - c. Insurance;
  - d. Administrative arrangements for the allocation of government grants paid to schools;
  - e. Arrangements for free school meals.
  - f. Arrangements for early years.

Decisions for the Schools Forum

- 5.38 In certain circumstances, the Schools Forum has a statutory decision making power. These are set out below with a comment at the end of each item to indicate the likelihood of the Council requesting a decision, which where necessary, will be brought to the March meeting of the Forum:
- a. a Local Authority proposal to increase its central expenditure to exceed the limit. At this stage it is likely that the Council will seek this permission from the Forum;
  - b. a Local Authority proposal to increase its central expenditure in relation to either the initial determinations or any subsequent redeterminations of a future year's Schools Budget (even where this does not result in a breach of the central expenditure limit). This regulation is not relevant for 2012/13 as this is a one year budget period; and

## Unrestricted

- c. a Local Authority proposal to deduct from its Schools Budget expenditure under the following circumstances:
1. expenditure on financing capital debt, where there is at least an equivalent saving on revenue allocations to schools. There are no plans from the Council to seek this permission;
  2. expenditure in respect of premature retirement of, or for the purposes of securing the resignation of, any person employed in a maintained school. Any proposal should be able to demonstrate that there are accompanying revenue savings to the Schools Budget that are equal to or greater than the costs incurred. There is approximately £0.050m set aside in the Schools Budget for this purpose which the Council considers an appropriate level;
  3. expenditure on school specific contingency. Local Authorities are required to hold centrally any funding required to implement amendments to school budget shares as provided for by their Funding Formula, in a school specific contingency. Funding held in the school specific contingency centrally should only be needed where, as a result of the recalculations of school budget shares under the provisions of a local authority's Funding Formula, there is a net cost arising. For Bracknell this will mainly cover support to statemented pupils, including any redeterminations required for Kennel Lane Special School and changes in participation rates relating to the provision of the free entitlement to early years education and childcare. It can also be used, in accordance with the previously agreed criteria to provide additional funds to schools experiencing significant in-year growth in pupil numbers. The March meeting of the Forum will need to agree an appropriate budget for this item and a proposal will be made by the LA at that time;
  4. expenditure by schools on unexpected costs. This basically covers the type of allocations historically made by the LA. There is approximately £0.015m set aside in the Schools Budget for this purpose which at this stage, the Council considers an appropriate level;
  5. expenditure on combined services with Children's Social Care. The Forum has previously agreed funding of £0.591m for these types of activity (subject to annual uplift for inflation), and there are proposals to increase this amount by £0.100m relating to part funding the Family Intervention Project, as set out above in paragraph 5.25 (e);
  6. SEN transport. Limited to where there are consequential savings made in the Schools Budget due to the placement of a pupil in maintained provision who was previously placed in non-maintained provision, the transport costs arising from this, which would otherwise fall in the LA Budget, can be charged to the Schools Budget on condition that they are less than the savings generated and the Schools Forum agrees. There are no plans to seek consent to this type of budget.
- d. To approve changes to the scheme for financing schools, provided the scheme meets the minimum requirements specified in regulations. A separate paper on the agenda makes proposals for changes to the scheme for



financing schools.

- e. To agree abatement of the MFG where aspects of it produces anomalous outcomes that affects less than 50% of pupils in schools. At this stage it not anticipated that such permission will be sought from the Forum.
- f. Approval to changes to the funding formula for schools after the start of a three year budget period. At this stage it not anticipated that such permission will be sought from the Forum.

#### Capital Funding

- 5.39 The council will receive un-ring fenced education related capital grants of £5.7m - £3.8m to allow for capacity increases at schools facing rising rolls and £1.9m for planned maintenance. Funding that goes directly to schools through the Devolved Formula Capital grant will also continue, with the average sized primary school in the borough receiving around £7,000, with £22,000 going to the average sized secondary school. More information on capital budgets is set out on a separate report on this agenda.

#### Conclusions

- 5.40 The financial settlement made available for schools through the LA provides no new money, other than for increases in pupil numbers, and expansion of the Pupil Premium, which is a specific grant and therefore, not available as part of the funding which the Schools Forum can influence. Therefore, very few budget pressures can afford to be funded and schools are faced with real terms reductions in funding.
- 5.41 Further data changes from the January School Census are expected, and depending on their significance, revisions to this proposed budget may be required in March when final decisions on these matters will need to be taken together with requests to the Forum to agree matters relating to its statutory powers. Further work on changes to these proposals or new areas for consideration can be undertaken in the meantime if required by the Forum, but they will need to be identified now if the resultant work is to be complete within the budget setting timetable.
- 5.42 The Executive Member is responsible for deciding where the increase in DSG should be applied in the Schools Budget, and in making these decisions will consider any comments arising from this report and any further comments that may be made at the next meeting of the Forum on 15 March. These final Executive Member decisions are expected to be taken later in March, with schools receiving their actual 2012/13 budget notifications shortly afterwards.

## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

#### Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal requirements are contained within the body of the report.

#### Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out within the supporting information. These are provisional calculations and subject to review once data is available from the January 2012 school census and other appropriate returns. The

final Schools Budget will be limited to the level of available external funding, mainly from the DSG and other specific government and non-government grants. Due to the tight financial settlement, there is the potential for an increase in the number of schools facing financial difficulties.

#### Impact Assessment

- 6.3 There are no specific impact assessments arising from this report. These will be considered should any of the proposals be agreed.

#### Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 A sum of £0.243m has been deducted from the anticipated level of DSG income to meet the possibility of an over estimation of pupil numbers in the calculation of DSG income and the costs of unpredictable or unforeseen items that would represent in year budget risks, including further academy conversions. The Executive Member will need to consider whether this is an appropriate amount in March.

#### Other Officers

- 6.5 There are no issues arising from this report that are relevant to other officers.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

#### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 Schools.

#### Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Written consultation document with written responses to the Director of Children, Young People & Learning.

#### Representations Received

- 7.3 Included in this report.

#### Background Papers

Various reports to Schools Forum and DfE guidance notes

#### Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: Performance and Resources (01344 354061)  
[David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance, (01344 354054)  
[paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Doc. Ref NewAlluse\Executive\Schools Forum\54\090212\2012-13 Schools Budget proposals – Feb 2012.doc

### **Budget Strategy Agreed for 2012-13**

Taking account of the need to minimise the number of changes to budgets within a Spending Review Period, and to have regard to government spending priorities, the following strategy has been agreed for setting the Schools Budget:

1. To help schools with their financial planning, indicative budgets should be made available to schools before the end of autumn term. This requires outline agreement from the Schools Forum on all areas of the Schools Budget – both delegated and LA retained – for each remaining year of the Spending Review Cycle.
2. Aim for steady and consistent changes to delegated school budgets in each year, thereby removing the potential for significant fluctuations in funding.
3. Fund unavoidable school and LA managed pressures and developments as a first priority. This ordinarily covers meeting the Minimum Funding Guarantee, inflation, change in pupil numbers and other data used for funding purposes, such as pupil eligibility to a FSM, numbers and needs of SEN pupils, including those places outside of the Borough. It also applies to funding full year effect costs from a new development that started part way through the previous year. Any agreed funding changes relating to unavoidable pressures will be allocated to schools on the basis of where the pressure is expected to arise, and will not, therefore, be applicable to all schools.
4. All schools should receive a reasonable change in funding.
5. After taking account of these objectives, views of schools and the Schools Forum to be taken into account in agreeing the allocation of the remaining “headroom” to new budget developments.
6. Should any funds remain after meeting all identified budget pressures, they will be allocated 85% based on an equal amount per pupil, and 15% as an equal amount per school. This method of allocation also to be used if no obvious alternative method exists.
7. Should there be insufficient funds to meet all unavoidable budget pressures, then any over allocation will be removed through a reduction to the general inflation allocation that is applied equally to all schools, rather than by reducing funding on unavoidable pressure which will be targeted to where cost increases are expected to arise.

### Breakdown of estimated DSG and available balances for 2012-13

Ref	Item	Value
<u>January 2011 headcount data</u>		
1	DSG pupil numbers in maintained schools	14,522.1
2	DSG pupil numbers other than maintained schools	906.9
3	Final adjusted pupil numbers for 2010/11 DSG	15,429.0
<u>Estimated changes to January 2011 headcount data</u>		
4	Change in numbers in maintained schools as at October 2011 census	+232.6
5	Change in numbers other than in maintained schools	-35.9
6	Contingency for overstatement of pupil numbers, unforeseen cost pressure	-50.0
7	Total estimated change in pupil numbers	+146.7
<u>Estimated January 2012 headcount data</u>		
8	Total estimated pupil numbers	15,575.7
9	Annual change	1.0%
<u>Calculation of available income</u>		
10	Total Guaranteed DSG	£4,860.95
11	Total Estimated DSG Income	£75.713 m
12	Less provision for Academies funding deduction	-£0.086 m
13	Available DSG Funding	£75.627 m
14	Current DSG Base Budget	£74.524 m
15	Change in DSG funding	£1.103 m
16	Estimated balances	£0.400 m
17	Increase in income	£1.503 m

## Items NOT proposed to be funded in the 2012-13 School Budget – PROVISIONAL estimates

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>1. Inflation</b> Most items have traditionally been increased at level of Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG), the rate of which is set by the government and has previously been based on unavoidable national cost increases, less 1% for school efficiency gains. Exceptions have been applied, where previously agreed, for inescapable costs such as rates and insurance. Due to the public sector spending reductions, including the public sector pay freeze, the current budget assumption is that the national funding settlement will not include a provision for inflation. However, there will be an inflationary pressure on schools on non-pay items, and this is included at 2.5% on the 25% of school costs not linked to pay.</p>	250	120	370
<p><b>2. Employer contribution to pension schemes</b> The employer contribution to pension schemes is contractually committed and subject to change. An increase is expected to contribute to the Local Government pension scheme deficit.</p>	40	10	50
<p><b>3 Additional 0.5% inflation allowance</b> This is intended to be top up funding to the MFG rate to ensure all schools benefit from any additional resources that may be available.</p>	230	30	260
<p><b>4 Day to day building maintenance</b> Pressure is being experienced relating to the cost of undertaking day-to-day reactive maintenance of schools buildings. Adequate maintenance of school buildings is important from a health and safety perspective.</p>	50	0	50

Unrestricted

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>5 Creation of Learning Support Units at all secondary schools</b>                      Learning Support Units are funded at four secondary schools to reduce the number of permanent exclusions. This funding has been allocated to the schools facing the most challenging circumstances, and supports the Council's strategy for reducing fixed period and permanent exclusions, thereby aiding the reintegration of pupils. Requests have previously been made to consider extending the funding to all six secondary schools.</p>	185	0	185
<p><b>6 Full time admissions for 4 year olds</b>                      With effect from September 2011, schools were required to offer full time admissions for 4 year olds from the September following their fourth birthday, where this is requested by parents, rather than the previous provision for admission from the September following the fifth birthday. Due to the cash freeze in national per pupil funding in 2011/12, it was only possible to fund one third of the extra cost and an unfunded pressure remains. Prior to this statutory change, with the exception of one school, all were operating some form of admissions at September and were funding the impact from their overall budget. The £0.460m pressure would fully fund the remaining two thirds estimated cost.</p>	460	0	460
<p><b>7 Additional speech and language resources</b>                      This funding would be used to provide for assessments, individual speech and language therapy, small group work and to train teaching and learning support assistants to implement speech and language techniques within their schools. A needs gap analysis undertaken with key stakeholders including schools, health services and parents earlier this year has identified the level of provision as just meeting our statutory requirements at the cost of early intervention and prevention. Additional speech and language therapy would enable an ongoing plan of work to be developed to ensure schools have the right skills to implement basic speech and language techniques benefiting the whole school.</p>	0	50	50

Unrestricted

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>8 Planned Maintenance</b>                      The Planned Works Programme is ordinarily capital investment in maintained schools over £2,000 that can be foreseen and planned for, such as planned maintenance, disabled access, fire safety etc. These works are essential to ensure safe and continuous operation of school buildings. A summary of school condition works from the 2010 Asset Management Plan, which is in the process of being updated, identified £13.7m of condition works across all schools of which £4.2m is Priority 1 (Urgent). Combining funding from the Schools Budget with resources from the Council and government grants, this will allow for better progress in tackling the backlog.</p>	0	100	100
<p><b>TOTAL ITEMS NOT PROPOSED TO BE FUNDED</b></p>	<p><b>1,215</b></p>	<p><b>310</b></p>	<p><b>1,525</b></p>

**Items proposed to be funded in the 2012-13 School Budget – PROVISIONAL estimates**

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>1 Mainstream School pupil numbers – including the impact from new Jennett’s Park Primary School</b> Information from the October census has been used to provide a provisional figure for 2012/13. The new primary school for Jennett’s Park opened in September 2011 and is planned to expand from a 1 form of entry to a 2 form of entry at September 2012. During the rapid expansion in pupil numbers, funding will need to be allocated outside the normal Funding Formula as there will be significantly fewer pupils on roll at January 2012, the normal point to determine a school’s budget, compared to the start of the 2012-13 academic year which will determine the majority of costs.</p>	596	0	596
<p><b>2 Changes in numbers / needs in special schools</b> There is a statutory requirement to meet the needs of pupils set out in statements of special educational needs, with the most complex cases needing support from special schools which can either be maintained by BFC, other LAs or private, voluntary or independent sector providers. There are expected to be cost increases both at Kennel Lane Special School and non-maintained schools.</p>	142	80	222
<p><b>3 Mainstream School SEN statements – change in numbers / needs</b> There is a statutory requirement to meet the needs of pupil set out in statements of special educational needs, with the majority of children having their needs met in BFC schools. During the last 3 years, the average annual increase in cost of support has totalled £0.045m.</p>	45	0	45
<p><b>4 Mainstream School SEN statements – cost review</b> A review has been undertaken to compare actual costs incurred in schools in supporting named statemented pupils and the resources allocated through the funding formula. This indicated that costs exceed allocated funding.</p>	70	0	70



Unrestricted

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>5 Non-pupil data changes</b> Besides pupil numbers changes, there are other data changes that can impact on funds allocated to schools. The main cost increase in 2011/12 related to a rise in the number of pupils eligible to a free school meal, and due to the prevailing economic conditions, this trend is expected to continue, although the October census indicates a reduction in the number of eligible pupils. Other data changes that impact on budgets include the number of newly qualified teachers, significant school redevelopments, attainment data, pupil mobility and rating revaluations.</p>	232	0	232
<p><b>6 SEN resource units</b> Work has been undertaken to determine the merits of opening addition SEN resource units in the borough and this is subject to a report on a separate agenda item. Current information indicates that significant savings can be achieved in the medium to long term, but there would be a small cost increase as the new units become established.</p>	32	0	32
<p><b>7 Education Welfare Service</b> The Education Welfare Service works with schools, children and families to improve attendance and arranges prosecutions where all other strategies have failed. The service is currently fully funded from the Council, but from April 2012, it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.018m to support non-statutory activities such as additional support to schools and families to secure high levels of pupil attendance.</p>	18	0	18
<p><b>8 Education Psychology Service</b> The Educational Psychology Service provides specialist consultation and assessment for vulnerable children together with a range of intervention, research, development and training services. These focus on issues arising from the social, emotional and cognitive development of children and young people, and involving or affecting their carers and/or educators. The service is currently funded by the Council but from April 2012 it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.018m to allow schools to purchase additional services to increase the frequency of visits or commission training and support.</p>	18	0	18

Unrestricted

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><b>9 Alternative education provision</b>                      In the 2010 schools White Paper, <i>The Importance of Teaching</i>, there was a commitment from the government to ensure that all pupils in alternative education provision should receive suitable full time education. The main impact on BF is that additional support will be required for pupils who are unable to attend school by reason of accident, illness or pregnancy or who are described as 'school-phobic'. A separate report on this change has previously been presented to the Forum.</p>	0	60	60
<p><b>10 Maternity leave cover</b>                      Schools are reimbursed for the net cost of classroom staff on maternity leave. This is in accordance with statutory employment conditions, with cost determined by the incidence of maternity leave cases, which has increased in the current year.</p>	0	25	25
<p><b>11 Family Intervention Project</b>                      The Family Intervention Project (FIP) works with families who are experiencing multiple problems and supports all members of the family regardless of age. Intervening to support families with multiple problems can have a big impact on behaviour and attainment. Research suggests a third of excluded children are from these families and also that where intervention occurs, there is a 54% reduction in school truancy, exclusion and bad behaviour. The service is currently fully funded from the Council, but from April 2012, it is proposed that the DSG contributes £0.100m to reflect the benefits to pupil education.</p>	0	100	100
<p><b>TOTAL ITEMS PROPOSED TO BE FUNDED</b></p>	1,173	265	1,438

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM**  
**DATE: 9 FEBRUARY 2012**

---

**UPDATE TO THE SCHEME FOR FINANCING SCHOOLS**  
**Director of Children Young People & learning**

**1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from members of the Schools Forum to update the Bracknell Forest Scheme for Financing Schools.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **The changes proposed to the Scheme for Financing Schools as set out in the consultation document are AGREED, and become effective from 1 March 2012, after making the following amendments:**
- I. **That the provisions to claw-back significant surplus school balances is implemented from the 2012-13 final accounts;**
  - II. **That the text to govern arrangements for school staff undertaking paid consultancy work outside their normal terms of employment is as set out in paragraph 5.14.**

**3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 **To make effective the changes proposed by the Council requires the consent of the Schools Forum.**

**4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Comments received through the consultation are included in this report.

**5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Background

- 5.1 Each Local Authority (LA) is required to publish a Scheme for Financing Schools (the "Scheme"). This sets out the financial relationship between the LA and the maintained schools which it funds, so does not apply to academy schools. It is a legally binding document on both the LA and schools relating to financial management and associated issues. The current Bracknell Forest Scheme was agreed following consultation in March 2011, and was updated on a provisional basis to reflect the latest requirements from the Department for Education (DfE). This report presents a more detailed review, with a number of further changes now being proposed by the LA.

Changes now being proposed

- 5.2 A summary of the changes is set out below, with the numbered references corresponding to the relevant paragraphs in the proposed BF Scheme (64 pages). In making any proposed changes, LAs must consult with all their schools and receive approval from the Schools Forum before they can become effective. The DfE can be asked to adjudicate where a Schools Forum does not agree an LA proposal.
- 5.3 Annex A sets out the new text proposed for the changes that are considered the most significant. The full text of the current BF Scheme and that proposed for the revised BF Scheme can be found at the download section (right hand side) of:

<http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/learn-financial-guidance.htm>

Due to the length of these documents and for reasons of cost effectiveness, neither the current scheme, nor that now proposed have been printed with this agenda. Should any Forum member require paper copies, please email [paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk) with a mailing address.

Significant changes proposed:

- 5.4 The following sets out a summary of the significant changes now being proposed, and which are shaded yellow on the document:
1. The role and responsibilities of governing bodies and headteachers have been clarified with additional examples of key areas added. The need for the governing body to agree on an annual basis the specific powers delegated to the headteacher has also been added (1.1.1 and 1.1.2).
  2. To add the requirement that if staff are engaged by schools on consultancy type activities, outside their normal contract conditions, that appropriate agreement is received from governors in advance of the commencement of any work, and that proper account is taken of employment terms and any Inland Revenue requirements (2.1.3). See also paragraph 5.14 below.
  3. The provisions under which a governing body's right to a delegated budget can be suspended have been specified. This would be after the issue of a warning and can be for finance or non-finance related matters. This section of text – but not the Annex - was omitted in error from the previous scheme so states existing policy. (2.17 and Annex B).
  4. It is proposed to reinstate the scheme to control excess surplus balances which was withdrawn in March. This is intended to ensure that schools consider the need to spend sufficient resources each year on the pupils in school and not to build up unnecessarily large balances. Whilst there is no longer a statutory requirement to operate a system of claw-back from schools, which had generally been determined where surplus balances were in excess of 8% of budget for primary and special schools, and 5% for secondaries, the Council believes that such a scheme should be in operation. The School Financial Value Standard, which all schools are required to comply with by 31 March 2013 identifies good practice as governing bodies reviewing their balances to ensure it is at a reasonable level and to have plans in place for its use. It is therefore proposed to reinstate the former scheme, which as well as containing appropriate thresholds, the Council also believes contains sufficient flexibility to allow for the build up of reserves above the normal limits where there is clear medium term planning and that money is being held for suitable purposes.

Therefore, the proposed scheme contains a number of exceptions where schools can retain balances above the general limits. Any money clawed-back from this scheme would be redistributed within the schools budget and not used on general Council expenditure. No changes are proposed from the scheme that was in operation up to March 2011 (4.2 and Annex D).

5. The existing licensed deficit arrangements, whereby the Schools Forum can agree a temporary over spend by a school which will be repaid from future budget allocations, is proposed to be replaced by a loan agreement. These agreements are considered a more flexible way of offering additional financial support to schools, especially where funding is required for new investments and not to cover a temporary over spend against the budget share. The term available for loans and the application of interest charges have also been updated and clarified. Much of the text remains unchanged from that previously used for licensed deficits (4.9).
6. The funding arrangements to apply for redundancies have been specified. There is no change proposed to current arrangements whereby new early retirements and redundancies are met from the central Schools Budget, provided advice from the Council is followed. The cost of premature retirements will ordinarily be met from the relevant school's budget. (11.17).

#### Summary of other changes

- 5.5 In addition to some minor amendments and improvements to text, all of which are shaded blue on the proposed scheme, the following less significant changes are planned:

1. Clarification that there are a small number of instances where it is appropriate for different conditions or limits that apply to schools compared to those for the rest of the Council, as set out in Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders (2.1.1).
2. Requirements surrounding the control of assets have been updated and clarified (2.1.4).
3. Requirement for a copy of the audited accounts of private funds to be sent to the council within six months of the end of the accounting period of the fund(s) (2.8).
4. Updating the requirements for a register of business interests, including the requirement to provide for an opportunity to declare any conflicts of interest at the beginning of each governing body meeting (2.9).
5. Additional information and clarification of matters relating to responsibility for repairs and maintenance, including the requirement for schools to contribute to the cost of significant building maintenance costs (12.1 to 12.4). Again this specifies current practices that have previously been subject to consultation with schools.

#### Results of the consultation and other proposed changes

- 5.6 The consultation with schools ran from 9th November to 16th December, with the relevant documentation also posted on the public access website. A summary of the outcomes is set out below, with the paragraph numbers corresponding to the consultation questions. Overall there was a fair response rate from schools with 13 replies received (35%).

1. All 13 schools (100%) agreed with the revisions proposed to roles and responsibilities of governing bodies and head teachers.

## Unrestricted

2. 12 schools (92%) agreed with the proposals relating to requiring consent of the governing body before staff undertake consultancy work for the school outside their normal contract. In response to a comment received, the wording will be clarified to make clear that this requirement only relates to paid consultancy. See paragraph 5.14 below.
3. All 13 schools (100%) agreed to insert the text relating to the criteria for suspending a governing body's right to a delegated school budget, which was omitted in error when the previous update was agreed.
4. 7 schools (54%) agreed to reinstate the scheme to claw back from schools significant surplus balances. 6 schools (46%) disagreed. This proposal is further considered below at paragraphs 5.7 to 5.13.
5. All 13 schools (100%) agreed to replace the licensed deficit scheme with formal loan arrangements, which contain very similar arrangements.
6. All 13 schools (100%) agreed to adopt the text proposed for dealing with funding responsibilities for school staff redundancies, which reflects current practice.
7. All 13 schools (100%) agreed to adopt all of the minor changes.

Annex B sets out a summary numerical analysis of the responses received, with Annex C recording the specific comments made by schools.

- 5.7 With the exception of the proposal to reintroduce the scheme to claw back significant surplus balances from schools, question 4, the significant majority of school replies agreed with the proposals set out in the consultation. However, in view of 6 schools opposing the proposed scheme to claw back excessive surplus balances (46% of respondents, 16% of all schools), this question warrants further consideration.
- 5.8 Analysis of school responses to question 4 at Annex C shows that some schools:
- considered that other elements of the scheme are sufficient to manage down significant school balances.
  - believed that if surpluses are achieved through good financial management or increased income streams, the school should not be penalised through the threat of claw-back.
  - thought the threat of claw back did not encourage best value as funding may need to be spent by a specific deadline which removes the existing flexibilities that allow schools to make purchase when it is right for the school.
- 5.9 The first bullet point in paragraph 5.8 makes reference to point 5 of Annex B of the Scheme in respect of suspending a school's right to a delegated budget through "accumulation of unreasonably high under spendings, without prior LA approval". The LA does not consider that a school's delegated budget should be suspended solely to ensure proper use of surplus balances, but rather this would be a contributory factor with other concerns. Suspension of a delegated budget would only be considered as a last resort and surplus balances can be managed better through a defined scheme.
- 5.10 For the second and third bullet points, the Council believes that sufficient exemptions are included in the proposed scheme to allow funds to be carried forward in these circumstances. Good financial management can help to achieve under spendings

## Unrestricted

and earn additional income, but would also be used to develop clear spending plans linked to properly assigned areas of expenditure, which the proposed claw-back scheme defines as.

- i. Capital building and construction projects
- ii. Furniture, IT and other one-off expenditure of a capital nature
- iii. Infrastructure, maintenance and refurbishment
- iv. Staffing remodelling and restructuring
- v. Specific curriculum resources
- vi. Balances held in respect of pupil focused extended activities
- vii. Money held to fund budget deductions known to be occurring in the next financial year e.g. fall in pupil numbers.
- viii. Other high cost activities, of a long term nature, agreed in advance with the Director of Children, Young People and Learning and the Schools Forum.

- 5.11 The proposed scheme also allows schools to delay expenditure to achieve best value, as the spending would be delayed for one of the criteria specified above. The purpose of the intended expenditure is the relevant factor, not the timing. Any request to exceed the normal carry forward limits arising from a delay in expenditure would not ordinarily be repeated by a school. If a similar delay in spend did occur in the following year, for around the same value, then there would be no overall impact on the carry forward in that year. This is because the delayed spending incurred at the beginning of the next year would then be offset by an under spending at year end on the new-year budget.
- 5.12 On balance, the Council still proposes that the claw back scheme is reintroduced because revenue funding should generally be spent for the benefit of pupils in the school each year and should not be held back unnecessarily. Based on the 2010-11 accounts, the proposed thresholds allow the smallest primary school to freely retain £30,000 and the largest £109,000, with secondaries able to freely retain between £352,000 and £523,000. These amounts are considered sufficient for working balances and schools should be able to readily explain why money is being held above these thresholds if asked.
- 5.13 Funding was never clawed back from a school when the scheme was previously in operation, with three schools assessed as having a significant surplus in 2009-10, the final year of operation. Despite these outcomes, the Council proposes reintroducing the claw-back scheme to ensure that all schools regularly monitor the level of their balances and make appropriate and timely plans for their use. Despite the current economic climate, school balances increased during 2010-11 by £1.153m (44%) and on average now amount to 5.7% of total funding. To help schools manage any change in this provision, it is proposed that implementation is deferred for 1 year, and takes effect from financial year 2012-13.
- 5.14 One further change from the text included on the consultation documents is also now proposed by the LA which reflects on recent findings from a school audit relating to staff undertaking consultancy work outside the normal terms of their contract of employment. In particular, text has been added to require governors to fully consider the financial and operation impact of agreeing to any such work, such as any consequential absence from school of key staff. Paragraph 2.13 of the scheme refers, with the following text now proposed. Underlined wording is new.

Where school staff are engaged in paid work outside their normal terms and conditions, the terms of engagement must be formally reviewed and agreed by the

relevant governor committee before the work commences. This review should consider both the full financial and operational implications to ensure there is no detrimental effect for the school in allowing staff to undertake this work and include seeking Legal and HR advice where necessary to ensure that remuneration is in accordance with relevant employment terms, such as School teachers Pay and Conditions Document, and correctly complies with Inland Revenue requirements in particular in relation to consultancy provided on a self-employed basis.

Attention is drawn to section 12.4.1 of the School Teachers Pay and Conditions document 2011 in relation to discretionary payments to headteachers.

#### Action requested from Forum Members

- 5.15 Based on the responses to the consultation received from schools, the Forum is recommended to authorise the proposed changes, reflecting the amendments set out above in the light of comments received.

## **6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

### Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 No legal issues arise directly from the matters discussed in this report.

### Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The Borough Treasurer is satisfied that no significant financial implications arise from this report.

### Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 Not required

### Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 None identified.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 Schools (Bursars, Head Teachers and Chairs of Governors).

### Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Formal consultation.

### Consultation Responses

- 7.3 Incorporated into the body of this report.

### Background Papers

BF Scheme for Financing Schools

Statutory guidance for local authorities [on Schemes]: Issue5



Unrestricted

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SREI  
[david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

(01344 354061)

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance  
[paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

(01344 354054)

Doc. Ref

\_NewAlluse\Executive\Schools Forum\54)Scheme for financing schools – Feb 2012 update.doc

## NEW TEXT PROPOSED FOR THE MORE SIGNIFICANT CHANGES PROPOSED TO THE BF SCHEME

Changes or additions to current text are shaded.

### CHANGE 1

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded
---

#### 1.1.1 Role and responsibilities of governing bodies

Within the statutory national and local framework, the governing body controls the running of a school with a delegated budget. Whilst the responsibilities detailed below are not exhaustive, it covers the following:

- to deploy resources freely within the school's budget, subject to the conditions of the scheme;
- to determine the number of teaching and non-teaching staff at the school, to select for appointment and be able to require dismissal, taking account of the professional advice of the Director of Children Young People and Learning and the headteacher.
- where there are regularly other staff on site in a school e.g. health authority personnel, whilst the day to day management of these staff is within the headteacher's remit, the governing body has no entitlement to suspend such staff,
- in the case of special schools, where a member of the school's staff accompanies its pupils to a mainstream school for outreach/integration purposes, the member of staff remains within the overall management of the special school,
- to develop and implement the School Development Plan, in consultation with the headteacher and within the general conditions and requirements of the LA's scheme. In developing such a plan, the governors need to take account of all their responsibilities, including the implementation of the National Curriculum, and ensuring that appropriate provision is made available for all pupils with special educational needs, with or without a statement;
- to ensure that the requirements specified in a child's statement of special educational needs are met by the school. This may include the provision of appropriate outreach and integration facilities, in accordance with each child's statement of special educational needs.
- to determine the extent to which it wishes to delegate its powers to other committees, or to the headteacher.
- to approve the first formal budget plan of each financial year (this can be delegated to a committee of the governing body but not the head teacher) and any subsequently agreed changes to the plan that fall outside the powers delegated to staff.

### 1.1.2 Role and responsibilities of the headteacher

Each governing body is required to consider the extent to which it wishes to delegate its powers to the headteacher. Any such decisions should be reviewed on an annual basis, be specific and clearly recorded in the minutes of the governing body.

Although it is for each governing body to determine the extent to which it wishes to delegate to the headteacher, as a guide, the authority would suggest that the following responsibilities be considered:

- to manage the school in accordance with the policies of the governing body and the LA;
- to prepare the annual budget plan for approval by the governing body;
- to be responsible to the governing body for the management of the school's budget share in accordance with the extent of delegation agreed by the governing body, such as the writing off of debts, agreeing adjustments to the original budget plan, agreeing the authorisation of expenditure;
- to be responsible for the day to day management of all aspects of the school's work, including provision for children with special educational needs;

The authority would suggest the following areas form part of the role of the headteacher in the context of this scheme:

- to offer advice and support to the governing body;
- to have a key role in helping the governing body formulate the School Development Plan and in securing its implementation with the collective support of the school's staff;
- ensure that the required improvement actions arising from internal audit and other relevant reviews are implemented and reported to the governing body;
- to be responsible to the governing body for ensuring all other financial requirements of this scheme are adhered to;
- to keep the governing body fully informed.

In undertaking day to day management of the school, the headteacher should have particular regard to Part IX of the school teachers pay and conditions document, paragraphs 33-37.

Reason for change
-------------------

To make responsibilities clearer, with specific examples mentioned, and also making it a requirement that governors review and agree on an annual basis the specific powers to be delegated to the head teacher.

## **CHANGE 2**

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded

### **2.1.3 Payment of salaries and wages; payment of bills**

The authority will arrange for the payment of all salaries and wages due to employees, together with associated deductions, upon receipt of a signed agreement appropriately authorised by the governing body (or suitably authorised school employee). Schools will be responsible for making all other payments to creditors, up to the maximum amount delegated by the governing body.

Where school staff are engaged in consultancy work outside their normal terms and conditions, the terms of engagement must be formally agreed by the relevant governor committee before the work commences, which also needs to ensure that remuneration is in accordance with relevant employment terms and correctly complies with Inland Revenue requirements in particular in relation to consultancy provided on a self employed basis.

Section 3.6 sets out the availability of bank and building society accounts for schools to facilitate all payment types.

Reason for change

To ensure appropriate agreement is received from governors for staff undertaking consultancy work for the school and that proper account is taken of employment terms and any Inland Revenue requirements.

## **CHANGE 3**

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded

### **2.17 Suspension of right to a delegated budget**

The governing body's right to a delegated budget may be suspended under certain circumstances. Schedule 15 to the SSFA, as applied by Section 51 of the SSFA, provides that suspension may take place if a school's governing body has persistently or substantially breached a requirement or restriction relating to its delegated budget, or has not managed its budget share satisfactorily. An LA may also suspend a delegated budget for reasons arising from the powers in Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006: Sections 59–66, which allow an LA to intervene in schools causing concern.

Before any suspension can commence, the Council will send a copy of the notice to the governing body and the headteacher. Suspension of powers of delegated responsibility would normally take effect one month after the notice has been served. The school's formula budget would then be managed centrally. Where the Council suspends delegation, the related staffing powers are also restricted.

In cases of gross incompetence or mismanagement or other emergency circumstances, delegated responsibilities could be suspended more quickly or immediately, and the Council would notify the school of its emergency action.

In all cases of suspension, the Director of Children Young People and Learning would provide a written explanation to the governing body, with a copy to the headteacher. The governing body would have a right of appeal by.

Where the Council decides to suspend delegation, it would be able to devolve back to the governing body such decision making powers as it considers appropriate, allowing the Council to be selective in identifying the areas in which it needs to take decisions. For example, the Council might have direct involvement in staffing decisions, if that is the area causing concern, while still leaving the governing body to take decisions on non-staffing expenditure.

The Council would review any suspension on at least a termly basis. Where delegated powers are restored, the decision would take effect from the start of next term.

Annex B [as shown immediately below] lists the outline criteria to be taken into account by the Council in considering the need to suspend delegated powers from a governing body.

## **Annex B from the Scheme for Financing Schools**

### **OUTLINE CRITERIA FOR SUSPENSION OF DELEGATED POWERS FROM A SCHOOL**

#### Finance Related

1. Serious fraud or deception
2. Consistent failure to set a balanced budget
3. Consistent failure to keep spending within budget, without prior LA approval
4. Accumulation of high budget deficit or failure to make repayments on approved budget deficits
5. Accumulation of unreasonably high under spendings, without prior LA approval.
6. **Mismanagement of community facility funds**
7. Failure to comply with Financial Regulations, Contract Standing Orders or the Procurement Manual (especially relating to the award of contracts)
8. Serious instances of false accounting
9. Serious failure to achieve value for money
10. Continual failure to deal with serious weaknesses in internal control as identified by Internal Audit or LA
11. Continual contravention of UK legislation
12. Persistent failure to comply with requirements of the Scheme for Financing Schools,
  - i. Spending only for the general purposes of the school
  - ii. Persistent failure to supply financial and other information which might reasonably be required by the LA e.g. timely submission of budget plans and bank account returns
  - iii. Persistent disregard of LA advice where this could place additional expenditure burden on the school or LA e.g. in respect of premature retirement or securing resignations, or any other legal matters

#### Other Reasons

1. Appointment of headteacher without taking account of the professional advice of the Director of Children Young People and Learning/Diocesan Director of Children Young People and Learning or his representative
2. Failure to manage the leadership of the school in accordance with the recommendations of the LA/School Code of Practice and School Improvement Policy
3. Failure to develop and implement a School Development Plan which aligns priorities with available resources
4. Failure to adhere to advice and guidance to Personnel matters
5. Failure to meet the needs of pupils with SEN where funding has been delegated for that purpose
6. Failure to meet responsibilities in respect of delegated Health and Safety
7. Failure to meet responsibilities in respect of delegated repair and maintenance of buildings as set out in individual Asset Management Plans

A decision to withdraw delegated power from a school will be taken by the **Executive Member for Education who may refer the matter to the full Executive**, following recommendation from the Director of Children, Young People and Learning.

Reason for change
-------------------

This section of text – but not the Annex - was omitted in error from the previous scheme.

## **CHANGE 4**

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded

### **4.2 Control on excessive surplus balances**

Where primary and special schools have a year end revenue balance greater than 8% of their annual budget, or secondary schools 5%, the excess above these thresholds is considered a significant surplus balance and will therefore be subject to claw-back and redistribution within the Schools Budget, unless it is being held for a valid reason. This is on the basis that annual funding should be spent on pupils in school that year and not held back unnecessarily.

Full details of the claw-back scheme are set out in Annex D [as set out immediately below], including a definition of valid reasons for holding significant surplus balances.

#### **Annex D from the Scheme for Financing Schools**

##### **Control on surplus school balances**

Normal text indicates the wording for the BFC Scheme. Words in italics are offered as an explanation to the Scheme text and are not part of the Scheme.

##### **Controls on surplus balances**

Surplus balances held by schools as permitted under this scheme are subject to the following restrictions:

- a. the Authority shall calculate by 30 June each year the surplus balance, if any, held by each school as at the preceding 31 March. For this purpose the balance will be the recurrent balance as defined in the Consistent Financial Reporting Framework;

*Balances held on Devolved Formula Capital and any other specific grant funded activities are excluded, unless allowed for in the relevant grant conditions.*

- b. the Authority shall deduct from the calculated balance any amounts for which the school has a prior year commitment to pay from the surplus balance from the previous financial year;

*In this context, a prior year commitment is defined as a project previously agreed with the Authority to be excluded from the claw-back calculation, for example, capital building and construction projects – see c.i to viii below for full criteria to be used to establish a valid commitment against a surplus balance.*

- c. the Authority shall then deduct from the resulting sum any amounts which the governing body of the school has declared to be assigned for specific purposes permitted by the authority, and which the authority is satisfied are properly assigned. To count as properly assigned, amounts must not be retained beyond the period stipulated for the purpose in question, without the consent of the Authority. In considering whether any sums are properly assigned the Authority may also take into account any previously declared assignment of such sums but may not take any change in planned assignments to be the sole reason for considering that a sum is not properly assigned.



## Unrestricted

The criteria to consider whether sums are properly assigned are as follows:

- ix. Capital building and construction projects
- x. Furniture, IT and other one-off expenditure of a capital nature
- xi. Infrastructure, maintenance and refurbishment
- xii. Staffing remodelling and restructuring
- xiii. Specific curriculum resources
- xiv. Balances held in respect of pupil focused extended activities
- xv. Money held to fund budget deductions known to be occurring in the next financial year e.g. fall in pupil numbers.
- xvi. Other high cost activities, of a long term nature, agreed in advance with the Director of Children, Young People and Learning and the Schools Forum.

*The condition outlined here is intended to ensure schools can build up reserves towards particular projects but cannot defer implementation indefinitely. A change in the plans of a school is not allowed to be the only criterion by which a sum can be considered to be properly assigned or not. After the accounts are closed each year, the Authority will contact schools with significant surplus balances to agree whether any of the balance has been properly assigned for a specific purpose and can therefore be deducted from the claw-back calculation.*

*The above specified criteria have previously been approved by the Schools Forum following consultation with schools where they were supported by the vast majority of respondents.*

- d. if the result of steps a-c is a sum greater than 5% of the current year's budget share for secondary schools, 8% for primary and special schools, then the Authority shall deduct from the current year's budget share an amount equal to the excess.
- e. the calculation will be made against the final budget for the year in question i.e. after any contingency funding, significant in-year pupil growth allocation etc. The deduction will be made annually in arrears i.e. the final balance at 2011-12 calculated against the final budget for 2011-12 (known around June 2012) will be deducted at the start of the 2013-14 financial year.

*This paragraph has been added to make clear that the calculation will be made against final and not initial budgets. It is also proposed to delay any claw-back for one year to allow relevant schools time to plan for the change when setting subsequent budgets.*

Funds deriving from sources other than the Authority will be taken into account in this calculation if paid into the budget share account of the school, whether under provisions in this scheme or otherwise.

The total of any amounts deducted from schools' budget shares by the Authority under this provision are to be applied to the Schools Budget of the Authority.

### Reason for change

Whilst there is no longer a statutory requirement to operate a system of claw-back from schools that generate significant surplus balances, generally in excess of 8% of budget for primary and special schools, and 5% for secondaries, the Council believes that such a scheme should be in operation because the thresholds allow sufficient flexibility to build up reserves whilst at the same time placing a limit to ensure that sufficient resources are spend

## Unrestricted

each year on the pupils in school. The proposed scheme contains a number of exceptions where schools can retain balances above the general limits. If any money is clawed-back from this scheme it would be redistributed within the Schools Budget and not used on general Council expenditure.

## **CHANGE 5**

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded

### **4.9 Loan arrangements – NB this replaces the former licensed deficit scheme as the route to secure agreement to temporarily over spend**

In exceptional circumstances, in agreement with the Schools Forum and Executive Member for Education, the authority will permit schools to receive a loan in advance of future budget allocations. The funding of such agreements would be through the collective surplus of school balances held by the authority on behalf of schools, and will be considered on an individual basis. General features of the scheme are detailed below:

#### Circumstances in which a loans may be agreed:

1. if in the opinion of the Director of Children Young People and Learning a school could not otherwise achieve its improvement targets (there will still be a requirement of the governing body to demonstrate repayment),
2. if in the opinion of the Director of Children Young People and Learning and Borough Treasurer a school could not reasonably be expected to effect immediately the savings required as a result of a significant reduction in pupil numbers (there will still be a requirement of the governing body to demonstrate repayment),
3. where major capital projects which would otherwise result in the project not being undertaken (there will be a requirement of the governing body to demonstrate repayment),
4. to finance invest to save schemes e.g. energy efficiency investments which result in net annual savings after making the required loan repayments.

#### Outline features of the scheme.

- the maximum length over which schools may repay the loan is 3 years (i.e. reach at least a zero balance), where the loan is granted under 1 and 2 above, with longer periods available for items 3 and 4., which will be determined on a case by case basis, linked to the expected useful life of the asset and the ability of individual schools to repay any loan.
- arrangement for a loan will only be agreed where the governing body produces a plan which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Director of Children Young People and Learning and Borough Treasurer the savings or additional income required to repay the deficit within an agreed timescale,

In general the minimum size of loans which may be agreed will be the lesser of the following:

Primary schools	£10,000
Special schools	£20,000
Secondary schools	£30,000

**OR**

## Unrestricted

For all types of school, 5% of the size of the budget share as determined by the authority.

In general the maximum size of loans which may be agreed will be the greater of the following:

Primary schools	£50,000
Special schools	£150,000
Secondary schools	£250,000

### OR

For all types of school, 15% of the size of the budget share as determined by the authority.

- interest will be charged at 1% above the Council's cost of borrowing on the date on which the loan is advanced unless the authority agrees for it to be waived. The requirement to pay interest will be assessed on the merits of each individual application, and in general, loans under categories 1 and 2 above will not attract interest with loans under categories 3 and 4 likely to attract interest.

### Outline controls on loans

- the maximum proportion of the collective balances held by the authority which will be used to support the arrangement shall not exceed 40%,
- the Director of Children Young People and Learning and the Borough Treasurer of the authority will make recommendations to the Schools Forum and Executive Member for Education to agree any loans and the terms on which they are offered.

The authority may request those schools operating external bank accounts to allow some or all of those balances to support the above arrangements.

Reason for change
-------------------

The proposed loan arrangements are considered a more flexible way of offering additional financial support to schools compared to the current licensed scheme, especially where funding is required for new investments and not to cover a temporary over spend against the budget share. The term available for loans and the application of interest charges has also been updated. Much of the text remains unchanged from the current section on licensed deficits.

## **CHANGE 6**

Proposed Text – changes from existing text are shaded

### **11.17 Responsibilities for redundancies**

The costs of new early retirements or redundancies will continue to be charged to the central part of the Schools Budget where the local authority can demonstrate that the revenue savings achieved by any termination of employment are equal to or greater than the costs incurred. This will be done on the basis that any redundancy situation the school finds itself will be treated as a staffing re-organisation. The Council's Redundancy procedures must be followed to enable the redundancy costs being met through this central schools budget. This includes early notification of the staffing re-organisation to ensure adequate time for consultation with staff and trade unions. Failure to follow these procedures could result in costs being charged against the delegated school budget.

The severance costs will be calculated under the local authority's policy. Where a school decides to offer more generous terms than the authority's policy, then the excess charge will be made to the delegated school budget.

The Schools Forum must agree to any increase in this budget over the previous financial year. The local authority will make a best estimate of what may be needed, based on past experience, local knowledge of the financial position of individual schools and the context of that year's funding settlement. To achieve best use of resources, the local authority will actively pursue a redeployment policy, to match staff at risk to vacancies.

Any costs incurred by the local education authority in respect of any premature retirement of a member of the staff of a maintained school shall be met from the school's budget share for one or more financial years except where the authority has agreed with the governing body in writing (whether before or after the retirement occurs) to meet these costs centrally.

Reason for change

The funding arrangements to apply for redundancies have been clarified. There is no change proposed to current arrangements whereby new early retirements and redundancies are met from the central Schools Budget. The cost of premature retirements will ordinarily be met from the relevant school's budget.

**Summary responses from schools to the changes proposed to  
the Scheme for Financing Schools**

QUESTION	TOTAL RESPONSES				
	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL	ALL	
<b>Significant proposals on the revised Scheme for Financing Schools</b>					
<p><b>1 Do you agree that the role and responsibilities for the governing body's and headteachers should be updated, to make the key areas more clear and require annual review of the responsibilities delegated to headteachers?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response</p>	9	4	0	13	100%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	0	0	0	0%
<p><b>2 Do you agree that where staff undertake consultancy work for the school, outside their normal contract conditions, that appropriate agreement must be received from governors prior to the commencement of any work and that proper account is taken of employment terms and any Inland Revenue requirements?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response</p>	9	3	0	12	92%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	1	0	1	8%
<p><b>3 Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the suspension of a governing body's right to a delegated budget? Note, this text was omitted in error from the previous scheme and therefore states existing policy.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response</p>	9	4	0	13	100%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	0	0	0	0%
<p><b>4 Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the scheme to claw back excessive surplus balances from schools? Note, this is unchanged from the claw back arrangements in place up to March 2011.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response</p>	5	2	0	7	54%
	4	2	0	6	46%
	0	0	0	0	0%
<p><b>5 Do you agree with the text proposed for loan arrangements for schools? Note, this replaces the former provision for licensed deficits, with most of the text unchanged other than revised provisions for the length of agreements and the basis for changing interest, when relevant.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response</p>	9	4	0	13	100%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	0	0	0	0%

Unrestricted

QUESTION	TOTAL RESPONSES				
	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL	ALL	
<b>6</b> Do you agree with the text proposed for the funding responsibilities for redundancies? Note, this reflects current policy.  Yes No No response					
	9	4	0	13	100%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	0	0	0	0%
<b><u>Minor proposed changes to the revised Scheme for Financing Schools</u></b>					
<b>7</b> Do you agree that all of the minor changes being proposed, and shaded blue on the revised scheme text should now be adopted?  Yes No No response					
	9	4	0	13	100%
	0	0	0	0	0%
	0	0	0	0	0%
Number of responses: Maximum number of responses Response rate	9 31 29.03%	4 5 80.00%	0 1 0.00%	13 37 35.14%	

**Comments received from schools to the changes proposed to  
the Scheme for Financing Schools**

<b>School</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b><u>Question 1</u></b>	Do you agree that the role and responsibilities for the governing body's and headteachers should be updated, to make the key areas more clear and require annual review of the responsibilities delegated to headteachers?
St Michaels Sandhurst	On a tangential issue, one change we would propose is that the headteacher's annual review is done before not after those of the other teachers.
<b><u>Question 2</u></b>	Do you agree that where staff undertake consultancy work for the school, outside their normal contract conditions, that appropriate agreement must be received from governors prior to the commencement of any work and that proper account is taken of employment terms and any Inland Revenue requirements?
Brakenhale	Need to clarify that this is PAID consultancy work only
Garth Hill College	Yes in theory. However, for us it raised the question of all consultancy work, including for a third party. Presently with schemes such as LLE (Local Leaders of Education), PIXL (Partners in Excellence) and other programmes that might involve consultancy work, there is the possibility that work would not be carried out directly for the school, but for a third party, whilst at the same time indirectly benefitting the employee's school (ie. through professional development and dissemination).
<b><u>Question 3</u></b>	Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the suspension of a governing body's right to a delegated budget? Note, this text was omitted in error from the previous scheme and therefore states existing policy.
St Josephs RC Primary	In existing policy, clarification is sought regarding level that would be considered as 'accumulation of unreasonably high under spending'.
<b><u>Question 4</u></b>	Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the scheme to claw back excessive surplus balances from schools? Note, this is unchanged from the claw back arrangements in place up to March 2011.
Sandy Lane Primary	Schools should be allowed to manage their budgets within the constraints set down in the scheme for financing schools. If the LA believes that the schools are not spending the budget appropriately then there are actions that may be taken as shown in point 5 of annex B.
St Michaels Sandhurst	Our GB finds it difficult to understand why the LA proposes to resurrect this scheme after it was dropped by the gov` t. The amount held by a school in reserve does not, by itself, indicate whether a school is spending the full year`s budget allocation – surely that requires a year-on-year assessment of change to the reserve. We believe the re-introduction of this measure could encourage some schools to spend up to the amount needed to reduce the surplus below the claw-back amount, without full regard to timing and value for money considerations. That is not in the pupils` best interests. We would also question the right of the authority to "claw-back" funds that have already been allocated to schools when this provision is, presumably, no longer gov` t policy. We would also ask whether the LA actually clawed back any funds previously. If not, is it really likely that they will now when school budgets are, arguably, much tighter. We are totally against the re-introduction of the claw-back scheme.



School	Comment
<b><u>Question 4</u></b> <b><u>(continued)</u></b>	Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the scheme to claw back excessive surplus balances from schools? Note, this is unchanged from the claw back arrangements in place up to March 2011.
Edgbarrow	<p>We are aware that money is much tighter and that finances will become more difficult over the next couple of years. As a result, we do not anticipate having excessive surpluses to carry forward for the foreseeable future. However, as a school we are always striving to achieve best value, and we feel very strongly that it is crucial that we have the flexibility to make purchases when it is right for the school to do so.</p> <p>Furthermore, we consider that the operation of a scheme to claw back balances does not provide an incentive to obtain best value, and indeed risks penalising schools for good financial management. In the absence of a statutory requirement for such a scheme we are unable to support this proposal. Furthermore, if the proposal is agreed, we would ask that its implementation be deferred for one year until the financial year 2012-13 as schools were not expecting it this financial year and need the additional time to plan for it properly.</p>
St Josephs RC Primary	<p>In the current climate where budgets are expected to tighten, schools are encouraged to actively seek ways to increase their income streams. Those that may be successful in this venture may therefore manage to continually have surplus balances over the proposed percentage(s) i.e. 5% or 8%.</p> <p>It is not appropriate that such schools be penalised and effectively discouraged from longer term, more expensive investments in school infrastructure/capital projects.</p> <p>Provided that they can demonstrate that the annual funding provided is being spent on pupils in school and that the surplus balance is being accumulated due to these income streams? Obviously well managed schools will be properly assigning such balances – but our concern is that if this happens year on year, claw back may still be exercised.</p> <p>We absolutely saw a movement to shorter term financial planning and accelerating expenditure at year end to avoid claw-back when the threshold was in previously place, because although it was possible to ‘justify’ money carried forward it still required approval and the indication was that approval would be given for known/visible short or medium term items of expenditure.</p> <p>In fact we feel we also need a level of contingency or sinking fund to cover unforeseen costs or to move the school towards a different teaching method that is not always apparent at the time of initial surplus e.g. Learning through Play and the adaption of early years for cross-fertilisation of learning or a move towards the importance of physical education and sport in the curriculum and the recent development of 3G pitches which could not as easily be foreseen.</p> <p>Should the surplus claw back be implemented, we may well decide that a move to academy status is required. I am also absolutely against this Yo-Yo effect of now you see the clawback now you don’t, a decision was made for the better to remove claw back and just at the point of starting to form more strategic plans there is a proposal to swing back again and schools would be required to spend / justify or lose money.</p>

Unrestricted

School	Comment
<b><u>Question 4 (continued)</u></b>	Do you agree with the text and criteria proposed for the scheme to claw back excessive surplus balances from schools? Note, this is unchanged from the claw back arrangements in place up to March 2011.
Garth Hill College	No, we do not agree. Overall we think the LA should trust governors to manage the budget in a balanced way so that they will ensure surplus budgets are spent in-year wherever possible but that prudent planning of spend over the long-term is also applied. This may be due to careful financial management which has helped to secure good value for money (shame that the global economy is not run on the same basis). Ultimately the LA has the power to withhold funds from schools it does not think are demonstrating good fiscal management and these powers should be sufficient without requiring additional justification for year to year difference in surpluses. Given the present economic climate and the possibility of tougher budget settlements in future years, schools should not be penalised for having a significant surplus for good reason. Finally, if you do decide to proceed with this proposal following the consultation responses, we feel very strongly that this should NOT apply to the current financial year as no advance notice has been provided.
<b><u>Question 5</u></b>	Do you agree with the text proposed for loan arrangements for schools? Note, this replaces the former provision for licensed deficits, with most of the text unchanged other than revised provisions for the length of agreements and the basis for changing interest, when relevant.
St Michaels Sandhurst	We support this solution to end the practise of licensing agreed deficits and replace it with what is a more "commercial" solution
<b><u>Question 7</u></b>	Do you agree that all of the minor changes being proposed, and shaded blue on the revised scheme text should now be adopted?
St Michaels Sandhurst	We support this, but only in the context of there being major changes to introduce at the same time. In general we would be against making a host of minor alterations, and endeavour to keep the Financing Scheme unchanged for several years to encourage a greater degree of stability and certainty

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM  
DATE: 9 FEBRUARY 2012

---

**EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES FINANCIAL BENCHMARKING -  
2011-12 ORIGINAL BUDGET DATA  
(Director of Children, Young People and Learning)**

**1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This is an annual information report that provides members of the Forum with financial benchmarking data in respect of the 2011-12 original budget that has been made available by the Department for Education (DfE). It can be used to help identify budget areas that may require review due to their relative high or low cost when compared to other Local Authorities (LAs) in England or our statistical neighbours.

**2 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

**Background**

- 2.1 Section 251 of the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children & Learning Act 2009 provides a statutory requirement for each Local Authority (LA) to publish financial data in a format prescribed by the DfE – the Section 251 Statements. The DfE has recently released financial benchmarking data relating to 2011-12 budgets, and whilst this has not been nationally published, the DfE has indicated that this information should be made available to Schools Forums. The tables include benchmarking data for both Education and Children's Social Care Services.
- 2.2 The relevant data in respect of Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) is attached in the following Appendices:
- Annex A is a copy the Authority's Section 251 Statement used in the DfE benchmarking exercise.
  - Annex B (137 columns of data) shows all available financial data expressed as a net amount of budgeted spend per capita. The DfE has also made this information available on a gross cost basis, but only the net amount has been included in this report.
  - Annex C (10 columns of data) highlights expenditure for year on year comparisons.
  - Annex D (26 columns of data) provides some additional data, including information in respect of guaranteed per pupil Dedicated School Grant (DSG) amounts, year on year budget changes, the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and Central Expenditure (CE).

**Interpretation of the data**

- 2.3 To aid comparisons, the appendices show both the mean (simple average from dividing the total value by the number of values) and median averages (the middle value when all figures are listed in ascending order), as well as maximum and minimum amounts for all Authorities in England. It is also possible to make comparisons with the 10 other LAs deemed by the DfE to have characteristics that most closely match those in BFC i.e. 'our statistical neighbours'.

- 2.4 These are, in order of closeness to the BFC profile, Hertfordshire, Central Bedfordshire, West Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire, Surrey, Windsor and Maidenhead, Cheshire East, Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Whilst these LAs have the closest characteristics to BFC, it needs to be noted that 6 of this group are significantly larger County Council's that benefit to a far greater extent from economies of scale than smaller unitary authorities like BFC which leads to some BFC costs being relatively higher when expressed on a per pupil basis on the Section 251 tables.
- 2.5 As more academies open, this impacts on the comparability of data. The schools budget lines are divided only by the number of pupils at LA-maintained schools, while the LA budget lines are divided by the number of pupils at schools and academies. Taking this approach, for example, with academy pupils excluded, per pupil values in categories such as home-to-school transport (lines 2.1.3 and 2.1.4) will be significantly higher for those LAs that have a large proportion of their secondary pupils in academies.
- 2.6 In interpreting the data, it needs to be borne in mind that a number of authorities have commented on the unclear and brief guidance from the DfE on how to complete the Section 251 Statements. Therefore, it is likely that not all authorities have completed the statements on the same basis.

#### **Analysis of the tables**

- 2.7 The following comments have been provided in respect of the largest variations in BFC spend compared to the statistical neighbours. All comparisons in this report relate to the average median as this comparator is considered the least sensitive to distortion from extreme values. Many variances are similar to previous years and therefore the same explanation is reported.

#### **Appendix B – Per capita table (net)**

##### *Schools Budget Items – 100% funded from the Dedicated Schools grant*

Statutory Regulations require that the total spent within the Schools Budget is at least at the level of grant funding provided by the government for this purpose. BFC has always set the budget at the level of approved grant, and therefore whilst there will be above and below average spend within different parts of the Schools Budget that reflect the decisions agreed by the Schools Forum, overall, the total planned spend will be equivalent to total government grant made available to support the Schools Budget.

The following items are highlighted for comment:

1. Support to schools in financial difficulty (7) is the highest amount and reflects the budget decisions supported by the Forum to assist schools meeting the agreed criteria. This budget has made a significant impact at the very small number of schools facing budget problems that cannot be managed through the normal budget allocation.
2. Schools specific contingencies and early years contingencies (8). The budget reflects a detailed calculation of the need to make in-year allocations for changes against the agreed criteria. It reflects recent trends and anticipated changes and

## Unrestricted

has been set at what is considered at the right level. Having a relatively low contingency means more funding is included in budgets delegated to schools.

3. Special Educational Needs (SEN) expenditure (17). This is relatively high and reflects the limited provisions maintained by the Council and the need to use more expensive out of Borough providers or special schools maintained by other local authorities. Work is underway to establish further options to reduce these costs, including the potential development on SEN resource units attached to BF maintained schools.
4. Behaviour Support Services (20) is the highest and reflects the continuation of the service initially developed through a time limited specific grant following consultation with schools.
5. 14-19 more practical learning options (23), licence fees (33) and staff cost supply cover (36) are the highest values in the group which reflects local decisions around whether this funding should be delegated to schools or retained by the LA for central planning and management. The Forum has previously agreed that the best model for these items is a centrally retained budget.
6. Overall, BFC stands very close to the median average spend on the Schools Budget of the 10 LAs in the neighbourhood grouping (44). This funding has been allocated to the different budget headings in accordance with the budget decisions of the Schools Forum reflecting local priorities and is particularly influenced by the capacities around SEN provisions.

### *Local Authority Budget – Funded by BFC*

7. Therapies and other health related services (47) is above average and reflects the need to purchase additional specialist support to compliment expertise provided directly by schools and services provided by the Council.
8. Home to school transport (53-57) is below that of our statistical neighbours and reflects the efficiency improvements introduced in the last few years around the method of procurement. Further savings have accrued from the continued phasing out of free discretionary transport on denominational and post 16 travel.
9. School Improvement (59) has the second highest spend and reflects the priorities of the Council to limit the impact on the service from the reduction in related grant funding for the service following the 2010 Spending Review savings. The 2012-13 budget proposals will result in a reduction in per capita spend from next year.
10. Total Early Years (80) has the highest figure. The figures attributable to this area of the return produce a number of unexpected figures, including zero spend for Oxfordshire, and £3 per head for Cheshire East. Spending in this area is close the amount of specific grant funding previously provided by the DfE.
11. Universal services for young people (Youth Work) (116) is the highest average cost, and whilst this is partially balanced by lower costs for targeted services, these costs overall are relatively high. The current review of Youth Services will reduce costs from 2012-13.
12. Statutory / Regulatory Duties (124) remain relatively high but are falling as the council introduces a number of cost reductions.

*Summaries (columns 134 to 137)*

13. These summaries show that at this level, our costs are in line with our statistical neighbours.

Annex C – year on year changes

*Schools Budget – 100% funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant*

1. The changes highlighted through this section will arise from changes agreed to the budget each year which are subject to consultation with the Forum. In some instances, the explanations given above to Annex B are the reason for changes shown in Annex C.
2. The increase in Education out of School (3) reflects the additional funding added to these budgets following the mainstreaming of Standards Fund and other grants into the Dedicated Schools Grant.
3. The rise in School Specific Contingency (4) is a consequence of the Forum agreeing to increase funding for pressures arising on SEN and rising pupil numbers. These budgets are allocated to schools in-year on the basis of actual changes and are held in the contingency until relevant data becomes available.

*LEA Budget – Funded by BFC*

4. School Improvement (7) has increased. Some of the service has previously been funded by specific grant and the BFC data was previously reported on a net cost basis. The mainstreaming of these grants removes the income and the net cost of service increases. Some other LAs previously included the gross cost of this service without taking account of the grant funding. This line of the S251 table provides a good example of the inconsistencies between LAs in making the returns due to incomplete guidance from the DfE

Annex D – Additional Information

1. The Dedicated Schools Grant per pupil allocation (1) is above the average and mainly reflects the additional resources received to reflect the high cost of living in the south east.
2. Per pupil funding for primary schools (4) shows the smallest increase from last year. This is due to moving to a September intake for non-statutory 4 year olds in main schools, but funding is limited to 80% but children are attending full time. The effect of this has been to significantly increase the head count data used for the benchmarking exercise without fully increasing funds. This has an impact on the number of schools funded at the minimum rate (10).
3. In accordance with the decisions of the Forum, central expenditure from the Schools Budget increased at the same rate as that delegated to schools (13).
4. Education out of school (16 and 22) records an error in that the cost divisor use was for 2 year olds in alternative provision, when it should have used 3-19 year olds. The reported figure should be around £15,000.

**Next Steps**

- 2.8 The Council uses this data to help inform on areas of budget that need to be reviewed to assist in obtaining value for money.

**3 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 3.1 Not applicable.

**4 STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

- 4.1 None.

**Background Papers**

Benchmarking Tables of LA Expenditure: 2011-12 – DfE document

**Contact for further information**

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SREI

(01344 354061)

[David.Watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:David.Watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance

(01344 354054)

<mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk>

**Doc. Ref**

Doc. Ref NewAlluse\Executive\Schools Forum\54) 090212\Financial Benchmarking 2011-12.doc

## 2011-12 Section 251 Statement – Bracknell Forest Council Table 1

Description	Gross	Income	Net
<b>1. SCHOOLS BUDGET</b>			
1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget	70,027,890	0	70,027,890
1.0.2 Pupil premium allocated to schools	585,350	585,350	0
1.0.3 Pupil premium managed centrally	22,790	22,790	0
1.0.4 Threshold and Performance Pay (Devolved)	0	0	0
1.0.5 Central expenditure on education of children under 5	236,140	12,000	224,140
1.1.1 Support for schools in financial difficulty	304,470	0	304,470
1.1.2 School specific contingencies	449,750	0	449,750
1.1.3 Early Years contingency	125,000	0	125,000
1.2.1 Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	669,010	0	669,010
1.2.2 SEN support services	485,540	106,280	379,260
1.2.3 Support for inclusion	17,990	0	17,990
1.2.4 Fees for pupils with SEN at independent special schools & abroad	3,850,000	0	3,850,000
1.2.5 SEN transport	0	0	0
1.2.6 Fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN	30,000	0	30,000
1.2.7 Inter authority recoupment	1,725,600	709,750	1,015,850
1.2.8 Contribution to combined budgets	462,529	0	462,529
1.3.1 Pupil Referral Units	736,910	13,850	723,060
1.3.2 Behaviour Support Services	516,430	7,490	508,940
1.3.3 Education out of school	291,780	3,520	288,260
1.3.4 14-16 More practical learning options	220,360	0	220,360
1.4.1 Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners	128,740	0	128,740
1.5.1 School meals - nursery, primary and special schools	0	0	0
1.5.2 Free school meals eligibility	0	0	0
1.5.3 Milk	30,970	19,760	11,210
1.5.4 School kitchens repair and maintenance	0	0	0
1.6.1 Insurance	0	0	0
1.6.2 Museum and Library Services	0	0	0
1.6.3 School admissions	139,690	0	139,690
1.6.4 Licences/subscriptions	181,730	0	181,730
1.6.5 Miscellaneous (not more than 0.1% total of net SB)	40,390	0	40,390
1.6.6 Servicing of schools forums	21,440	0	21,440
1.6.7 Staff costs supply cover (not sickness)	332,880	0	332,880
1.6.8 Supply cover long term sickness	0	0	0
1.6.9 Termination of employment costs	53,651	0	53,651
1.6.10 Purchase of carbon reduction commitment allowances	80,180	0	80,180
1.7.1 Other Specific Grants	0	0	0
1.8.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Schools)	0	0	0
1.8.2 Prudential borrowing costs	0	0	0
<b>1.9.1 TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET</b>	<b>81,767,210</b>	<b>1,480,790</b>	<b>80,286,420</b>



## Unrestricted

Description	Gross	Income	Net
<b>2. OTHER EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY BUDGET SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>			
2.0.1 Educational psychology service	337,972	0	337,972
2.0.2 SEN administration, assessment and coordination	189,577	0	189,577
2.0.3 Therapies and other health related services	136,004	0	136,004
2.0.4 Parent partnership, guidance and information	22,700	0	22,700
2.0.5 Monitoring of SEN provision	56,048	0	56,048
2.0.6 Total Special Education	742,301	0	742,301
<b>2. OTHER EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY BUDGET LEARNER SUPPORT</b>			
2.1.1 Excluded pupils	8,908	0	8,908
2.1.2 Pupil support	0	0	0
2.1.3 Home to school transport: SEN transport expenditure	1,447,456	0	1,447,456
2.1.4 Home to school transport: other home to school transport expenditure	330,786	0	330,786
2.1.5 Home to post16 provision transport: SEN/ LLDD transport expenditure (aged 16-18)	124,704	0	124,704
2.1.6 Home to post16 provision transport: SEN/ LLDD transport expenditure (aged 19-25)	0	0	0
2.1.7 Home to post16 provision transport: other home to post 16 transport expenditure	0	0	0
2.1.8 Education welfare service	274,242	0	274,242
2.1.9 School improvement	1,209,254	226,850	982,404
2.1.10 Total Learner Support	3,395,350	226,850	3,168,500
<b>2. OTHER EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY BUDGET ACCESS</b>			
2.2.1 Asset management education	111,824	0	111,824
2.2.2 Supply of school places	25,000	0	25,000
2.2.3 Music services	193,900	165,000	28,900
2.2.4 Visual and performing arts (other than music)	0	0	0
2.2.5 Outdoor education including environmental and field studies (not sports)	0	0	0
2.2.6 Total Access	330,724	165,000	165,724
<b>3. YOUNG PEOPLE'S LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
3.0.1 16-18 Provision other than schools and FE	0	0	0
3.0.2 14-19 Reform	159,210	0	159,210
3.0.3 Total Young people's learning and development	159,210	0	159,210
3.1.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Young people's learning and development)	0	0	0
<b>4. ADULT AND COMMUNITY</b>			
4.0.1 Adult and Community learning	591,580	591,580	0
4.0.2 - Total Adult and Community Learning	591,580	591,580	0
4.1.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Adult & Community)	0	0	0
<b>5. YOUTH JUSTICE</b>			
5.0.1 Secure accommodation (youth justice)	0	0	0
5.0.2 Youth Offender Teams	644,100	225,750	418,350
5.0.3 Other Youth Justice Services	11,940	9,770	2,170
5.0.4 Total Youth Justice	656,040	235,520	420,520

## Unrestricted

Description	Gross	Income	Net
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES EARLY YEARS</b>			
6.0.1 Funding paid to early years providers to deliver free early education places for two year olds	136,687	0	136,687
6.0.2 Other early years funding	1,314,191	32,850	1,281,341
6.0.3 Total Early Years	1,450,878	32,850	1,418,028
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES SURE STARTS CHILDREN'S CENTRES</b>			
6.1.1 Funding for individual Sure Start Children's Centres	883,534	10,150	873,384
6.1.2 Funding on local authority provided or commissioned area wide services delivered through Sure Start Children's Centres	254,064	9,500	244,564
6.1.3 Total Sure Start Children's Centres	1,137,598	19,650	1,117,948
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER</b>			
6.2.1 Residential care	1,542,920	0	1,542,920
6.2.2 Fostering services	1,435,210	22,940	1,412,270
6.2.3 Other children looked after services	355,600	0	355,600
6.2.4 Secure accommodation (welfare)	0	0	0
6.2.5 Short breaks (respite) for looked after disabled children	290,550	35,770	254,780
6.2.6 Children placed with family and friends	0	0	0
6.2.7 Advocacy services for children looked after	20,170	0	20,170
6.2.8 Education of looked after children	13,470	0	13,470
6.2.9 Leaving care support services	478,320	0	478,320
6.2.10 Asylum seeker services children	68,000	68,000	0
6.2.11 Total Children Looked After	4,204,240	126,710	4,077,530
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SAFETY</b>			
6.3.1 Child death review processes	7,960	0	7,960
6.3.2 LA functions in relation to child protection	397,104	0	397,104
6.3.3 Local safeguarding children's board	92,820	21,020	71,800
6.3.4 Total Children and Young People's Safety	497,884	21,020	476,864
6.4.1 Direct payments	95,970	0	95,970
6.4.2 Short breaks (respite) for disabled children	768,430	0	768,430
6.4.3 Home care services	30,590	0	30,590
6.4.4 Equipment and adaptations	29,450	0	29,450
6.4.5 Other family support services	926,010	0	926,010
6.4.6 Contribution to health care of individual children	10,870	0	10,870
6.4.7 Intensive family Interventions	354,700	0	354,700
6.4.8 Total Family Support Services	2,216,020	0	2,216,020
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES OTHER CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES</b>			
6.5.1 Adoption services	261,520	54,060	207,460
6.5.2 Special guardianship support	42,870	0	42,870
6.5.3 Other children's and families services	67,516	0	67,516
6.5.4 Total Other Children's and Families Services	371,906	54,060	317,846

Unrestricted

Description	Gross	Income	Net
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES- CHILDREN'S SERVICES STRATEGY</b>			
6.6.1 Partnership costs	0	0	0
6.6.2 Central commissioning function	56,470	0	56,470
6.6.3 Total Children's Services Strategy	56,470	0	56,470
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES SOCIAL WORKERS</b>			
6.7.1 Commissioning and social work	2,668,380	0	2,668,380
6.8.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue ((CERA) (Children's and young people's services)	0	0	0
<b>6. CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE</b>			
6.9.1 Universal services for young people (including youth work, positive activities and IAG)	1,932,830	153,180	1,779,650
6.9.2 Targeted services for young people (including youth work, positive activities and IAG)	152,980	6,030	146,950
6.9.3 Substance misuse services (Drugs, Alcohol and Volatile substances)	39,060	12,100	26,960
6.9.4 Teenage pregnancy services	66,010	0	66,010
6.9.5 Discretionary Awards	0	0	0
6.9.6 Student Support	4,554	0	4,554
6.9.7 Total Services for young people	2,195,434	171,310	2,024,124
6.10.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Services for young people)	0	0	0
<b>7. Local Authority Education functions</b>			
7.0.1 Statutory/ Regulatory Duties	1,462,870	51,910	1,410,960
7.0.2 Premature retirement costs/ Redundancy costs (new provisions)	0	0	0
7.0.3 Existing early retirement costs	261,260	0	261,260
7.0.4 Residual pension liability (eg FE, Careers Service, etc)	0	0	0
7.0.5 Joint use arrangements	0	0	0
7.0.6 Insurance	0	0	0
7.0.7 Monitoring national curriculum assessment	15,000	0	15,000
7.0.8 Total Local Authority Education Functions	1,739,130	51,910	1,687,220
<b>7. Local Authority Education functions SPECIFIC GRANTS</b>			
7.1.1 Other Specific Grant	0	0	0
7.2.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (LA Education Functions)	0	0	0
8.1.1 Total Schools Budget, Special Education, Learner Support, Access, Young People's Learning and Development, Services for Young People and Adult and Community Budget	86,986,375	2,464,220	84,522,155
8.1.2 - Total Youth Justice, Children and Young People's Services Budget (including CERA)	15,454,850	661,120	14,793,730
8.1.3 Total LA Education Functions Budget (Including CERA)	1,739,130	51,910	1,687,220
9 - Total Education, Young People's Learning and Development, Services for Young People and Adult and Community Budget, Youth Justice, Children and Young People's Services and Local Authority Education Functions Budget	104,180,355.23	3,177,250.00	101,003,105.23
10 Capital Expenditure (excluding CERA)	6,151,000	5,940,000	211,000

## Unrestricted

Description	Gross	Income	Net
<b>11 - Expenditure covered by YPLA Grant - Include below the part of the expenditure recorded in individual lines in the Schools budget that is supported by the YPLA</b>			
11a.1 SIXTH FORM YPLA allocation for 16+ funding for secondary schools (included in expenditure 1.0.1 column (c))	4,847,011	4,847,011	0
11b.1 SIXTH FORM – Element included at lines 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	0	0	0
11b.2 SIXTH FORM – Element included at 1.2.4 above for pupils at independent special schools and abroad	285,288	285,288	0
11b.3 SIXTH FORM – Element included at 1.2.6 above for pupils at independent schools (without SEN)	0	0	0
11c.1 YPLA Threshold and Performance Pay Costs (included in expenditure at 1.0.1 columns c and d)	144,731	144,731	0
11c.2 YPLA Threshold and Performance Pay Costs (included in expenditure at 1.0.4 columns c and d)	0	0	0
<b>12. Sure Start Children's centres</b>			
12a.1 Funding on evidence based, early intervention services delivered through Sure Start Children's Centres (whether provided by children's centres using delegated budgets or commissioned by the local authority)	0	0	0
12a.2 Funding on local authority management costs relating to Sure Start Children's Centres (included in expenditure at 7.0.1)	0	0	0
<b>13. Services for young people</b>			
13a.1 Youth work (included in expenditure at 6.9.1 and 6.9.2)	2,085,810	159,210	1,926,600

Unrestricted

Annex B

Per Capital Table (net)

	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13	Col 14	Col 15
	1.0.1 Individual Schools Budget	1.0.2 Pupil premium allocated to schools	1.0.3 Pupil premium managed centrally	1.0.4 Threshold and Performance Pay (Devolved)	1.0.5 ISB (lines 1.0.1 to 1.0.4)	1.0.5 Central expenditure on education of children under 5	1.1.1 Support for schools in financial difficulty	1.1.2 School specific contingencies	1.1.3 Early Years contingency	1.2.1 Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	1.2.2 SEN support services	1.2.3 Support for inclusion	1.2.4 Fees for pupils with SEN at independent special schools & abroad	1.2.5 SEN transport	1.2.6 Fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4,519</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>4,511</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,526</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>2,274</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,289</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>7,277</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>7,277</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Average (median)</b>	4,336	0	0	0	4,381	14	0	75	8	41	23	12	99	0	0
<b>Minimum</b>	2,289	0	0	0	2,289	0	0	5	0	9	7	0	38	0	0
<b>Maximum</b>	4,818	45	1	0	4,818	63	19	121	22	108	95	52	300	5	114
867 Bracknell Forest	4,294	0	0	0	4,294	14	19	28	8	41	23	1	236	0	2
919 Hertfordshire	4,571	0	0	0	4,571	0	0	50	9	66	18	6	99	0	0
823 Central Bedfordshire	4,384	0	0	0	4,384	16	0	103	0	40	36	6	38	0	0
869 West Berkshire	4,818	0	0	0	4,818	12	19	5	22	53	12	40	167	0	0
825 Buckinghamshire	4,278	0	0	0	4,278	23	0	81	13	56	29	52	179	0	0
850 Hampshire	4,256	0	0	0	4,256	26	0	121	0	55	13	0	63	0	0
936 Surrey	4,410	0	0	0	4,410	10	0	56	14	34	36	0	232	0	0
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	4,509	0	0	0	4,509	8	0	13	6	17	11	32	300	0	0
895 Cheshire East	4,336	45	1	0	4,381	41	0	86	8	36	7	12	97	0	114
931 Oxfordshire	4,267	42	0	0	4,310	63	0	104	0	9	95	14	75	5	0
873 Cambridgeshire	2,289	0	0	0	2,289	0	0	75	0	108	70	40	84	0	0
	Col 16	Col 17	Col 18	Col 19	Col 20	Col 21	Col 22	Col 23	Col 24	Col 25	Col 26	Col 27	Col 28	Col 29	
	1.2.7 Interauthority recoupment	1.2.8 Contribution to combined budgets	Schools Budget SEN (sum of lines 1.2.1 to 1.2.8)	1.3.1 Pupil Referral Units	1.3.2 Behaviour Support Services	1.3.3 Education out of school	PRUs/ Behaviour Support/ Education Otherwise £ / pupil (Sum of 1.3.1 to 1.3.3)	1.3.4 14-16 More practical learning options	1.4.1 Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners	1.5.1 School meals - nursery, primary and special schools	1.5.2 Free school meals eligibility	1.5.3 Milk	1.5.4 School kitchens repair and maintenance	Schools Budget Access £ / pupil (Sum of 1.5.1 to 1.5.4)	
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>-366</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-124</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>91</b>	
<b>Average (median)</b>	2	10	309	44	12	11	83	4	6	0	0	0	0	1	
<b>Minimum</b>	-71	0	123	23	1	2	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Maximum</b>	68	116	453	73	31	80	123	26	18	3	4	1	2	8	
867 Bracknell Forest	62	28	394	44	31	18	93	14	8	0	0	1	0	1	
919 Hertfordshire	0	6	196	59	11	13	83	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	
823 Central Bedfordshire	3	0	123	73	14	8	96	26	6	3	4	0	1	8	
869 West Berkshire	-71	0	201	65	16	10	91	2	3	0	0	1	0	1	
825 Buckinghamshire	21	116	453	46	1	4	51	4	7	3	0	0	0	3	
850 Hampshire	6	10	148	42	13	11	66	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	
936 Surrey	-10	16	309	56	13	29	97	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	-10	23	374	39	11	2	52	0	15	0	0	1	1	2	
895 Cheshire East	68	0	334	23	9	13	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
931 Oxfordshire	-3	5	200	27	12	5	43	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	
873 Cambridgeshire	2	41	345	42	1	80	123	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	

## Unrestricted

	Col 30	Col 31	Col 32	Col 33	Col 34	Col 35	Col 36	Col 37	Col 38	Col 39	Col 40	Col 41	Col 42	Col 43	Col 44
	1.6.1 Insurance	1.6.2 Museum and Library Services	1.6.3 School admission	1.6.4 Licences/ subscription	1.6.5 Misc (not more than 0.1% total of net SB)	1.6.6 Servicing of schools forums	1.6.7 Staff costs supply cover (not sickness)	1.6.8 Supply cover long term sickness	1.6.9 Termination of employment costs	Schools Budget Central Admin £ / pupil (Sum of lines 1.6.1 to 1.6.9)	1.6.10 Purchase of carbon reduction commitment allowances	1.7.1 Other Specific Grants	1.8.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Schools)	1.8.2 Prudential borrowing costs	1.9.1 TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	5	1	10	3	3	1	12	0	6	40	3	2	21	3	5,042
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	0	0	9	1	2	1	6	0	2	38	0	0	4	0	5,050
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-23	0	-8	2,676
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	43	10	42	21	47	14	49	4	60	148	13	46	140	65	7,920
<b>Average (median)</b>	0	0	10	3	2	0	5	0	0	21	4	0	7	0	4,937
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	2,896
<b>Maximum</b>	0	0	23	11	5	8	20	0	5	47	6	1	108	20	5,217
867 Bracknell Forest	0	0	9	11	2	1	20	0	3	47	5	0	0	0	4,923
919 Hertfordshire	0	0	13	4	3	0	18	0	2	40	6	0	43	0	5,017
823 Central Bedfordshire	0	0	10	0	4	0	4	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	4,781
869 West Berkshire	0	0	10	0	5	8	20	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	5,217
825 Buckinghamshire	0	0	23	2	2	0	4	0	5	35	5	0	56	0	5,007
850 Hampshire	0	0	8	2	3	0	5	0	2	21	0	0	108	1	4,762
936 Surrey	0	0	13	4	1	0	2	0	0	21	5	0	3	0	4,944
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	0	0	12	9	1	1	8	0	0	32	4	1	7	0	5,024
895 Cheshire East	0	0	7	5	0	0	3	0	5	20	0	0	0	20	4,937
931 Oxfordshire	0	0	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	71	16	4,822
873 Cambridgeshire	0	0	6	3	5	0	6	0	0	19	6	0	20	0	2,896

006

	Col 45	Col 46	Col 47	Col 48	Col 49	Col 50	Col 51	Col 52	Col 53	Col 54	Col 55	Col 56	Col 57	Col 58	Col 59	Col 60
	2.0.1 Educational psychology service	2.0.2 SEN admin, assessment and coordination	2.0.3 Therapies and other health related services	2.0.4 Parent partnership, guidance and information	2.0.5 Monitoring of SEN provision	2.0.6 Total Special Education	2.1.1 Excluded pupils	2.1.2 Pupil support	2.1.3 Home to school transport: SEN transport expenditure	2.1.4 Home to school transport: other home to school transport expenditure	2.1.5 Home to post16 provision transport: SEN/ LLDD transport expenditure (aged 16-18)	2.1.6 Home to post 16 provision transport: SEN/ LLDD transport expenditure (aged 19-25)	2.1.7 Home to post16 provision transport: other home to post 16 transport expenditure	2.1.8 Education welfare service	2.1.9 School improvement	2.1.10 Total Learner Support
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	16	10	2	3	2	33	1	1	70	51	4	1	4	13	38	184
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	16	10	0	2	1	34	0	0	68	16	1	0	0	13	36	159
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	55	44	26	26	15	109	13	27	202	195	22	17	24	65	175	375
<b>Average (median)</b>	19	12	1	1	0	39	1	0	81	79	5	1	2	11	46	205
<b>Minimum</b>	10	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	56	20	0	0	0	5	9	169
<b>Maximum</b>	27	41	21	4	3	59	5	1	122	112	15	17	18	20	89	315
867 Bracknell Forest	21	12	8	1	3	46	1	0	89	20	8	0	0	17	60	194
919 Hertfordshire	24	12	1	2	0	39	1	1	56	55	15	7	4	11	51	201
823 Central Bedfordshire	13	41	1	4	0	59	0	0	93	103	5	4	9	12	89	315
869 West Berkshire	20	17	12	2	1	52	1	0	74	79	1	4	1	20	26	205
825 Buckinghamshire	18	10	0	1	0	30	0	0	81	108	0	0	3	8	49	248
850 Hampshire	19	11	0	1	2	33	2	1	92	54	6	1	1	14	30	202
936 Surrey	20	24	0	3	0	46	0	0	122	68	5	0	7	15	36	252
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	27	8	21	0	0	56	4	0	63	30	9	0	1	11	52	169
895 Cheshire East	11	1	1	1	0	14	0	0	82	86	0	17	0	7	9	202
931 Oxfordshire	10	13	10	1	2	36	5	0	66	101	11	1	2	5	46	236
873 Cambridgeshire	16	6	0	2	0	24	0	1	73	112	0	0	18	11	41	256

## Unrestricted

	Col 61	Col 62	Col 63	Col 64	Col 65	Col 66	Col 67	Col 68	Col 69	Col 70	Col 71	Col 72
	2.2.1 Asset management education	2.2.2 Supply of school places	2.2.3 Music services	2.2.4 Visual and performing arts (other than music)	2.2.5 Outdoor education including environmental and field studies (not sports)	2.2.6 Total Access	3.0.1 16-18 Provision other than schools and FE	3.0.2 14-19 Reform	3.0.3 Total Young people learning and development	3.1.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Young people learning and development)	4.0.1 Adult and Community learning	4.0.2 - Total Adult and Community Learning
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	13	4	3	1	1	22	1	4	6	0	9	9
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	10	2	1	0	0	18	0	1	2	0	2	2
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	-76	0	-2	-2	-6	-74	0	0	0	0	-5	-5
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	188	280	21	12	20	293	30	46	46	1	105	105
<b>Average (median)</b>	6	4	3	0	0	13	0	3	5	0	1	1
<b>Minimum</b>	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	-2	-2
<b>Maximum</b>	36	14	7	1	9	39	30	6	33	0	45	45
867 Bracknell Forest	7	2	2	0	0	10	0	6	6	0	0	0
919 Hertfordshire	16	14	4	1	0	36	0	6	6	0	1	1
823 Central Bedfordshire	10	6	4	0	1	21	0	0	0	0	45	45
869 West Berkshire	5	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
825 Buckinghamshire	0	3	3	0	0	6	30	3	33	0	20	20
850 Hampshire	15	5	5	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	7	7
936 Surrey	1	4	7	0	0	13	0	5	5	0	2	2
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	-2	-2
895 Cheshire East	36	1	1	0	0	39	3	3	6	0	13	13
931 Oxfordshire	4	5	7	0	9	25	0	6	6	0	1	1
873 Cambridgeshire	6	4	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Col 73	Col 74	Col 75	Col 76	Col 77	Col 78	Col 79	Col 80	Col 81	Col 82	Col 83
	4.1.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Adult & Community)	5.0.1 Secure accommodati on (youth justice)	5.0.2 Youth Offender Teams	5.0.3 Other Youth Justice Services	5.0.4 Total Youth Justice	6.0.1 Funding paid to early years providers to deliver free early education places for two year olds	6.0.2 Other early years funding	6.0.3 Total Early Years	6.1.1 Funding for individual Sure Start Children Centres	6.1.2 Local authority provided or commissioned areawide services delivered through Sure Start Children Centres	6.1.3 Total Sure Start Children Centres
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	0	1	13	2	16	4	18	21	41	11	52
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	0	0	13	0	16	3	9	14	44	2	63
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	0	-22	0	-1	0	0	-5	-5	0	-50	-2
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	3	9	56	18	69	84	206	222	164	163	193
<b>Average (median)</b>	0	0	10	0	14	3	18	22	35	17	55
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	2
<b>Maximum</b>	0	2	19	11	20	5	49	54	79	35	112
867 Bracknell Forest	0	0	16	0	16	5	49	54	33	9	43
919 Hertfordshire	0	0	16	0	16	4	18	22	53	1	55
823 Central Bedfordshire	0	0	7	11	18	4	24	28	51	20	71
869 West Berkshire	0	2	18	0	20	5	8	13	34	35	68
825 Buckinghamshire	0	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	79	32	112
850 Hampshire	0	1	9	1	11	2	35	37	35	24	59
936 Surrey	0	0	10	4	14	2	41	43	44	5	49
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	0	0	10	0	10	5	20	25	44	17	61
895 Cheshire East	0	0	6	0	6	3	0	3	30	18	48
931 Oxfordshire	0	0	19	0	19	0	0	0	4	0	4
873 Cambridgeshire	0	0	8	0	8	0	10	10	2	0	2

## Unrestricted

	Col 84	Col 85	Col 86	Col 87	Col 88	Col 89	Col 90	Col 91	Col 92	Col 93	Col 94	Col 95	Col 96	Col 97	Col 98
	6.2.1 Residential care	6.2.2 Fostering services	6.2.3 Other children looked after services	6.2.4 Secure accommodation (welfare)	6.2.5 Short breaks (respite) for looked after children	6.2.6 Children placed with family and friends	6.2.7 Advocacy services for children looked after	6.2.8 Education of looked after children	6.2.9 Leaving care support services	6.2.10 Asylum seeker services children	6.2.11 Total Children Looked After	6.3.1 Child death review processes	6.3.2 LA functions in relation to child protection	6.3.3 Local safeguarding childrens board	6.3.4 Total Children and Young People Safety
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	79	111	12	2	7	4	1	3	19	1	240	2	13	2	17
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	73	112	8	0	3	2	1	2	19	0	235	0	12	2	14
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	17	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-257	66	0	0	0	1
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	275	302	115	59	38	68	52	24	240	51	704	260	91	20	295
<b>Average (median)</b>	58	59	14	0	10	5	1	2	9	2	169	0	10	1	11
<b>Minimum</b>	30	24	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	146	0	3	0	3
<b>Maximum</b>	139	101	24	59	24	12	2	7	32	23	252	0	65	3	66
867 Bracknell Forest	59	54	14	0	10	0	1	1	18	0	155	0	15	3	18
919 Hertfordshire	71	84	24	0	3	5	1	7	9	3	207	0	6	1	8
823 Central Bedfordshire	30	93	0	59	24	0	0	0	0	3	209	0	9	2	11
869 West Berkshire	58	59	15	0	4	5	1	3	8	6	159	0	17	0	17
825 Buckinghamshire	45	51	16	3	17	6	2	0	7	1	146	0	20	1	21
850 Hampshire	56	72	2	0	11	11	0	3	6	0	162	0	3	1	3
936 Surrey	56	58	16	1	9	3	1	4	17	4	169	0	10	1	11
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	77	63	9	0	4	10	1	0	4	2	170	0	9	1	10
895 Cheshire East	139	24	20	0	11	3	0	2	25	0	224	0	65	0	66
931 Oxfordshire	45	57	12	2	3	12	0	0	9	23	164	0	10	1	11
873 Cambridgeshire	82	101	12	0	15	1	2	5	32	0	252	0	13	0	14
	Col 99	Col 100	Col 101	Col 102	Col 103	Col 104	Col 105	Col 106	Col 107	Col 108	Col 109	Col 110	Col 111	Col 112	Col 113
	6.4.1 Direct payments	6.4.2 Short breaks (respite) for disabled children	6.4.3 Home care services	6.4.4 Equipment and adaptations	6.4.5 Other family support services	6.4.6 Contribution to health care of individual children	6.4.7 Intensive family Interventions	6.4.8 Total Family Support Services	6.5.1 Adoption services	6.5.2 Special guardianship support	6.5.3 Other children and families services	6.5.4 Total Other Children and Families Services	6.6.1 Partnership costs	6.6.2 Central commissioning function	6.6.3 Total Children Services Strategy
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	5	13	4	1	32	3	5	63	20	4	7	31	2	11	13
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	4	13	1	0	31	0	1	65	21	3	3	31	0	6	8
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	0	-2	0	0	0	-28	0	0	0	0	0	0	-38	0	-38
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	37	68	29	30	145	35	87	213	76	29	128	170	46	85	101
<b>Average (median)</b>	4	18	1	1	35	0	4	67	14	3	2	20	0	4	4
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	36	8	0	0	12	0	0	0
<b>Maximum</b>	13	40	6	2	55	8	15	90	76	7	22	76	11	85	86
867 Bracknell Forest	4	29	1	1	35	0	13	84	8	2	3	12	0	2	2
919 Hertfordshire	9	18	6	2	44	8	4	90	15	3	22	41	0	4	4
823 Central Bedfordshire	0	40	0	0	15	0	12	67	8	4	2	14	0	13	13
869 West Berkshire	1	20	1	0	31	5	15	73	16	7	1	24	11	10	22
825 Buckinghamshire	1	0	0	2	36	0	2	42	13	1	3	17	2	16	18
850 Hampshire	3	0	3	1	41	0	4	53	14	2	11	27	0	0	0
936 Surrey	0	29	1	1	23	0	13	67	17	3	0	20	1	4	4
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	7	23	1	0	36	0	0	68	8	7	2	17	0	2	2
895 Cheshire East	13	0	0	2	55	2	0	72	76	0	0	76	0	8	8
931 Oxfordshire	4	10	2	0	11	0	9	36	11	5	0	16	0	0	1
873 Cambridgeshire	5	2	5	2	26	0	1	40	22	1	0	23	1	85	86



## Unrestricted

	Col 114	Col 115	Col 116	Col 117	Col 118	Col 119	Col 120	Col 121	Col 122
	6.7.1 Commissioning and social work	6.8.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue ((CERA) (Children and young people)	6.9.1 Universal services for young peole	6.9.2 Targeted services for young people (including youth work, positive activities and (A/C))	6.9.3 Substance misuse services (Drugs, Alcohol and Volatile substances)	6.9.4 Teenage pregnancy services	6.9.5 Discretionary Awards	6.9.6 Student Support	6.9.7 Total Services for young people
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-60</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-38</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>Average (median)</b>	101	0	23	23	1	1	0	0	45
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	30
<b>Maximum</b>	132	0	68	43	6	3	1	2	77
867 Bracknell Forest	101	0	68	6	1	3	0	0	77
919 Hertfordshire	114	0	28	43	2	1	1	2	76
823 Central Bedfordshire	116	0	12	23	0	0	0	0	36
869 West Berkshire	106	0	50	9	6	0	0	0	65
825 Buckinghamshire	0	0	21	10	0	1	0	0	32
850 Hampshire	68	0	33	8	2	1	0	0	45
936 Surrey	132	0	17	38	1	2	0	0	58
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	102	0	23	27	0	2	0	0	53
895 Cheshire East	19	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	40
931 Oxfordshire	91	0	14	27	2	0	0	0	43
873 Cambridgeshire	79	0	3	27	0	0	0	0	30

	Col 123	Col 124	Col 125	Col 126	Col 127	Col 128	Col 129	Col 130	Col 131
	6.10.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Services for young people)	7.0.1 Statutory/Regulatory Duties	7.0.2 Premature retirement costs/Redundancy costs (new provisions)	7.0.3 Existing early retirement costs	7.0.4 Residual pension liability (eg FE, Careers Service, etc)	7.0.5 Joint use arrangements	7.0.6 Insurance	7.0.7 Monitoring national curriculum assessment	7.0.8 Total Local Authority Education Functions
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>Average (median)</b>	0	29	2	14	1	0	0	0	43
<b>Minimum</b>	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
<b>Maximum</b>	1	109	10	25	5	5	3	1	140
867 Bracknell Forest	0	54	0	10	0	0	0	1	64
919 Hertfordshire	0	14	0	16	2	0	0	0	32
823 Central Bedfordshire	0	44	4	12	4	0	0	0	64
869 West Berkshire	0	28	1	9	0	0	3	0	41
825 Buckinghamshire	0	17	0	25	1	0	0	0	43
850 Hampshire	1	41	1	9	2	0	3	1	58
936 Surrey	0	24	2	14	1	0	1	0	43
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	0	29	7	0	1	0	0	0	38
895 Cheshire East	0	109	10	21	0	0	0	0	140
931 Oxfordshire	0	42	2	21	5	0	0	0	71
873 Cambridgeshire	0	13	3	14	1	5	2	0	38

Unrestricted

	Col 132	Col 133	Col 134	Col 135	Col 136	Col 137
	7.1.1 Other Specific Grant	7.2.1 Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (LA Education Functions)	8.1.1 Total Schools Budget, Special Education, Learner Support, Access, Young People's Learning and Development, Services for Young People and Adult and Community Budget (Including CERA) (Lines 1.9.1+ 2.0.6 + 2.1.10 + 2.2.6 + 3.0.3 + 3.1.1 + 4.0.1 + 4.1	8.1.2 - Total Youth Justice, Children and Young People Services Budget (including CERA)(lines 5.0.4 + 6.0.3 + 6.1.3 + 6.2.11 + 6.3.4 +6.4.8 + 6.5.4 + 6.6.3 + 6.7.1 + 6.8.1 + 6.9.7 + 6.10.1)	8.1.3 Total LA Education Functions Budget (Including CERA) plus (Lines 7.0.8 + 7.1.1 + 7.2.1)	9 Total Education, Young People's Learning and Development, Services for Young People and Adult and Community Budget, Youth Justice, Children and Young People Services and Local Authority Education Functions Budget (lines 8.1.1+ 8.1.2+ 8.1.3)
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	-1	1	5,296	641	70	6,007
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	0	0	5,285	631	73	5,975
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	-154	0	2,834	281	-68	3,379
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	15	38	8,173	1,833	189	9,948
<b>Average (median)</b>	0	0	5,220	561	52	5,824
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	3,186	384	32	3,775
<b>Maximum</b>	14	8	5,480	632	140	6,100
867 Bracknell Forest	0	0	5,179	563	64	5,806
919 Hertfordshire	0	0	5,299	632	32	5,963
823 Central Bedfordshire	0	0	5,220	584	64	5,867
869 West Berkshire	12	0	5,480	567	52	6,100
825 Buckinghamshire	0	0	5,344	394	43	5,781
850 Hampshire	0	0	5,028	466	58	5,552
936 Surrey	0	0	5,262	568	43	5,873
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	14	0	5,254	518	52	5,824
895 Cheshire East	0	0	5,209	561	140	5,910
931 Oxfordshire	0	0	5,126	384	71	5,581
873 Cambridgeshire	0	8	3,186	543	46	3,775

## Unrestricted

## Annex C

## Year on Year Table

Statistical Neighbours	Schools Budget Items 2010-11 to 2011-12				LA Budget Items 2010-11 to 2011- 12				Pupil Numbers 2010-11 - 2011- 12	
	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10
	SEN provision <sup>(i)</sup>	PRUs <sup>(ii)</sup>	Education out of school <sup>(iii)</sup>	School - specific contingency <sup>(iv)</sup>	Statutory/Regulatory duties <sup>(v)</sup>	Other strategic management <sup>(vi)</sup>	School Improvement <sup>(vii)</sup>	Home to school/college transport <sup>(viii)</sup>	Total 3-19 pupil numbers relevant to Schools budget items	Total 3-19 pupil numbers relevant to LA budget items
ENGLAND - Average size of category in year (median) (£m)	7	2	1	2	2	2	1	4	n/a	n/a
ENGLAND - Average (mean) (%)	5%	10%	-3%	29%	-21%	-8%	-36%	-3%	-1%	0%
ENGLAND - Average (median)	2%	7%	0%	10%	-11%	-1%	-35%	-3%	0%	1%
ENGLAND - Minimum	-37%	-100%	-100%	-100%	-99%	-100%	-100%	-86%	-18%	-1%
ENGLAND - Maximum	148%	188%	263%	2234%	528%	3804%	1637%	573%	5%	6%
Average (median)	1%	5%	-18%	46%	-11%	-2%	-26%	-1%	1%	1%
Minimum	-14%	-21%	-67%	-78%	-76%	-32%	-95%	-11%	-7%	1%
Maximum	101%	94%	32%	290%	123%	11%	101%	4%	3%	3%
867 Bracknell Forest	-2%	3%	9%	46%	-8%	-4%	101%	-7%	3%	3%
919 Hertfordshire	3%	10%	-18%	78%	-51%	4%	-25%	-1%	-1%	1%
823 Central Bedfordshire	0%	62%	-47%	290%	-13%	-3%	47%	-10%	1%	2%
869 West Berkshire	-4%	9%	-3%	-78%	51%	1%	-47%	-6%	1%	1%
825 Buckinghamshire	6%	4%	-26%	-6%	21%	-21%	-36%	-8%	-1%	1%
850 Hampshire	0%	-5%	0%	157%	-11%	-9%	-11%	2%	1%	1%
936 Surrey	7%	5%	13%	36%	-28%	-2%	-38%	0%	2%	2%
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	10%	2%	-66%	-4%	94%	0%	-25%	-1%	3%	3%
895 Cheshire East	-14%	94%	-67%	97%	123%	-2%	-95%	4%	-7%	1%
931 Oxfordshire	1%	30%	-55%	245%	-15%	11%	-31%	-1%	1%	2%
873 Cambridgeshire	101%	-21%	32%	-30%	-76%	-32%	-26%	-11%	0%	1%

\*\* No planned expenditure recorded in 2010-11

Year on year changes may be distorted by the mainstreaming of most grants into the DSG GUF in 2011-12.

i: using lines 1.2.1:1.2.4 + 1.2.7 in both years

ii: using line 1.3.1 in both years

iii: using line 1.3.3 in both years

iv: using line 1.1.2 in both years

v: using line 7.0.1 in both years

vi: using lines 7.0.2:7.0.7 in both years

vii: using line 2.1.9 in both years

viii: using lines 2.1.3:2.1.7 in both years

Section 251 data as at 9th September 2011

England figures do not include data for City of London or Isles of Scilly

Unrestricted

Annex D

Additional Information Table

Statistical Neighbours	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11	Col 12	Col 13
	2011-12 DSG Guaranteed Unit of Funding £ / pupil	Planned expenditure in addition to DSG (£'000) in 2011-12	Increase in nursery ISB per pupil from 2010-11 to 2011-12	Increase in primary ISB per pupil from 2010-11 to 2011-12	Increase in secondary ISB per pupil from 2010-11 to 2011-12	Increase in special ISB per pupil from 2010-11 to 2011-12	Planned expenditure devolved to schools (%)	Primary / secondary ratio of planned expenditure per pupil (Total Schools budget) for 2011-12	Percentage of nursery schools receiving Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2011-12	Percentage of primary schools receiving Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2011-12	Percentage of secondary schools receiving Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2011-12	Percentage of special schools receiving Minimum Funding Guarantee for 2011-12	Central Expenditure from the Schools Budget as a proportion of allowed limit for 2011-12 <sup>1</sup>
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	4,398	73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	91%	80%	17%	21%	14%	17%	#N/A
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	5,000	-	900	485	739	1,493	91%	79%	0%	15%	10%	0%	116%
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	4,429	-	5,350	377	336	69,054	78%	53%	0%	0%	0%	0%	73%
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	8,052	3,399	495,938	94,572	43,940	107,062	97%	111%	100%	99%	100%	100%	361%
<b>Average (median)</b>	4,787	-	1,059	451	551	1,430	90%	77%	0%	14%	8%	0%	107%
<b>Minimum</b>	4,644	-	2,337	316	420	69,054	82%	69%	0%	2%	0%	0%	95%
<b>Maximum</b>	4,967	3,399	3,299	611	1,226	5,494	94%	83%	13%	49%	29%	25%	229%
<b>N</b> 867 Bracknell Forest	4,861	-	^^	316	430	1,430	88%	76%	0%	42%	17%	0%	100%
919 Hertfordshire	4,787	-	^^	346	543	1,293	92%	70%	13%	16%	8%	16%	104%
823 Central Bedfordshire	4,658	-	3,146	564	1,226	852	94%	81%	0%	9%	3%	20%	143%
869 West Berkshire	4,891	-	2,337	522	506	1,474	93%	69%	0%	23%	0%	0%	100%
825 Buckinghamshire	4,814	-	814	366	420	69,054	87%	82%	0%	49%	29%	0%	129%
850 Hampshire	4,648	-	^^	503	710	1,671	92%	80%	0%	36%	13%	19%	102%
936 Surrey	4,804	3,399	3,299	451	564	1,045	90%	77%	0%	10%	10%	4%	114%
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	4,967	-	900	559	577	5,494	90%	82%	0%	14%	23%	0%	107%
895 Cheshire East	4,695	-	^^	611	792	2,983	90%	77%	0%	2%	0%	25%	95%
931 Oxfordshire	4,758	1,158	1,219	443	501	2,213	92%	83%	0%	4%	0%	0%	123%
873 Cambridgeshire	4,644	-	^^	405	551	1,040	82%	75%	0%	5%	4%	0%	229%

^ denotes zero pupils/ population in this category

\* denotes pupil/population figures are not available

.. Pupil numbers in this category are zero in either or both years

^^ No ISB recorded in either or both years

Figures are rounded so may not sum

England figures do not include data for City of London and the Isles of Scilly

1. assumes that all mainstreamed grants in 2010-11 were delegated

2. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 at NMSS, Independents and Hospital on 2011 AP census

3. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 from 2011 PRU census, but excludes dual subsidiary registrations

4. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 not in school from 2011 AP census

5. divisor includes stated pupils as at January 2011

6. divisor includes looked after children using SSDA 903 return (as at 31st March 2010)

7. divisor includes children and young people who are subject to a child protection plan (as at 31st March 2010)

## Unrestricted

Statistical Neighbours	Col 14	Col 15	Col 16	Col 17	Col 18	Col 19	Col 20	Col 21	Col 22	Col 23	Col 24	Col 25	Col 26
	Further gross per capita breakdown (Selected lines from Table 1 divided by relevant pupils/ population)						Further net per capita breakdown (Selected lines from Table 1 divided by relevant pupils/ population)						
	Pupils at independent special schools & abroad (line 1.2.4) and fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN (line 1.2.6) (£)2	Pupil referral units (line 1.3.1) (£)3	Education out of school (line 1.3.3) (£)4	Home to school transport: SEN transport expenditure (line 2.1.3) + SEN transport (line 1.2.5) (£)5	Total children looked after (line 6.2.11) (£)6	Total children and young people's safety (line 6.3.4) (£)7	Pupils at independent special schools & abroad (line 1.2.4) and fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN (line 1.2.6) (£)2	Pupil referral units (line 1.3.1) (£)3	Education out of school (line 1.3.3) (£)4	Home to school transport: SEN transport expenditure (line 2.1.3) + SEN transport (line 1.2.5) (£)5	Total children looked after (line 6.2.11) (£)6	Total children and young people's safety (line 6.3.4) (£)7	Hourly Spend on Early Years Free Entitlement (aggregated from School Table) (£)
<b>ENGLAND - Average (mean)</b>	47,775	30,514	25,903	2,461	47,010	7,172	46,607	29,269	24,420	2,405	43,327	6,458	3.55
<b>ENGLAND - Average (median)</b>	53,978	30,068	32,279	2,433	44,559	4,697	52,185	29,511	30,728	2,309	42,793	4,076	3.56
<b>ENGLAND - Minimum</b>	35	3,825	-	38	22,789	294	35	3,825	-	38	5,315	247	1.05
<b>ENGLAND - Maximum</b>	162,435	447,099	2,566,965	7,405	112,402	72,499	162,435	447,099	2,566,965	4,954	108,108	69,024	1,917.14
<b>Average (median)</b>	60,115	45,428	45,156	2,470	50,517	5,472	57,311	45,428	42,259	2,470	48,730	4,991	3.78
<b>Minimum</b>	7,794	20,470	9,966	1,910	39,130	1,745	7,794	20,085	8,310	1,901	39,130	1,510	3.25
<b>Maximum</b>	114,659	361,030	583,560	3,476	90,199	36,448	114,659	320,786	576,520	3,424	72,344	34,709	4.47
867 Bracknell Forest	47,317	20,470	583,560	2,262	46,714	*	47,317	20,085	576,520	2,262	45,306	*	3.54
919 Hertfordshire	81,440	36,837	90,293	2,470	45,187	3,245	81,440	36,837	90,293	2,470	45,187	2,985	4.47
823 Central Bedfordshire	84,759	^	306,877	3,367	90,199	4,794	52,768	^	303,319	3,346	72,344	3,822	3.37
869 West Berkshire	57,715	28,835	17,415	2,435	48,797	9,429	54,623	28,835	17,415	2,434	46,375	9,126	3.78
825 Buckinghamshire	60,115	47,042	9,966	2,134	51,750	9,153	60,115	46,555	8,310	2,128	48,730	8,340	3.82
850 Hampshire	43,771	45,428	48,247	3,348	42,141	1,745	43,771	45,428	48,247	3,348	40,369	1,510	3.78
936 Surrey	57,311	84,949	85,114	3,476	55,565	5,489	57,311	77,065	85,114	3,424	53,662	5,042	3.98
868 Windsor and Maidenhead	67,137	58,556	11,918	1,910	54,572	5,455	67,137	57,033	11,918	1,901	53,838	4,940	3.91
895 Cheshire East	7,794	^	18,658	2,838	39,130	36,448	7,794	^	18,658	2,838	39,130	34,709	3.25
931 Oxfordshire	114,659	24,168	45,156	3,211	50,517	5,877	114,659	24,141	42,259	3,207	49,653	5,536	3.71
873 Cambridgeshire	62,709	361,030	22,644	2,150	67,581	5,437	61,822	320,786	22,600	2,126	66,324	4,857	3.70

^ denotes zero pupils/ population in this category

\* denotes pupil/population figures are not available

... Pupil numbers in this category are zero in either or both years

^^ No ISB recorded in either or both years

Figures are rounded so may not sum

England figures do not include data for City of London and the Isles of Scilly

1. assumes that all mainstreamed grants in 2010-11 were delegated

2. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 at NMSS, Independents and Hospital on 2011 AP census

3. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 from 2011 PRU census, but excludes dual subsidiary registrations

4. divisor includes all pupils aged 3-19 not in school from 2011 AP census

5. divisor includes stated pupils as at January 2011

6. divisor includes looked after children using SDA 903 return (as at 31st March 2010)

7. divisor includes children and young people who are subject to a child protection plan (as at 31st March 2010)

This page is intentionally left blank