



NOTICE OF MEETING

Schools Forum

Thursday 19 July 2012, 4.30 pm

Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell

To: The Schools Forum

Schools Members:

Maureen Beadsley, Secondary School Governor
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative
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

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
Published: 10 July 2012

Schools Forum
Thursday 19 July 2012, 4.30 pm
Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Easthampstead House, Bracknell

AGENDA

Page No

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

To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute members.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

Members are asked to declare any personal interest and the nature of that interest, in respect of any matter to be considered at this meeting. Any Member with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter should withdraw from the meeting when the matter is under consideration and should notify the Democratic Services Officer in attendance that they are withdrawing as they have such an interest. If the Disclosable Pecuniary Interest is not entered on the register of Members interests the Monitoring Officer must be notified of the interest within 28 days.

3. **Minutes and Matters Arising**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of 26 April 2012.

1 - 4

4. **Membership of the Schools Forum**

To advise the Forum of a change to its membership.

5 - 6

5. **School Meals Service**

To advise the Schools Forum on the decision and outcome of awarding the school meals contract to ISS Education.

7 - 12

6. **Update on progress towards meeting the requirements of DfE School Funding Reform**

To receive a report which updates the Schools Forum on progress made by the School Funding Review Group on reviewing the changes required from the Department for Education (DfE) proposals for school funding reform that are expected to be implemented from April 2013.

13 - 34

7. **2011-12 Provisional Outturn on the Schools Budget and other relevant matters**

To receive a report which informs members of the Schools Forum on the provisional outturn on the 2011-12 Schools Budget and to confirm the level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to be received in 2012-13.

35 - 44

8. **2011-12 School Balances and other related matters**

To receive a report which updates members of the Schools Forum on the level of balances held by schools as at 31 March 2012 and how these compare to the previous financial year.

45 - 52

9. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the Schools Forum is scheduled for Thursday 13 September 2012 at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House.

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS FORUM
26 APRIL 2012
4.30 - 5.05 PM

Present:

Schools Members

Maureen Beadsley, Secondary School Governor
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative
Trisha Donkin, Primary School Representative
Brian Fries, Secondary School Governor
Gill Harbut, 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
Anne Shillcock, Special Education Representative
John Throssell, Primary School Governor (Vice-Chairman)
Kathy Winrow, Secondary School Representative

Non-Schools Members:

George Clement, Union Representative (Chairman)

Also Present:

Paul Clark, Bracknell Forest Council
Amanda Roden, Bracknell Forest Council
David Watkins, Bracknell Forest Council
Bob Welch, Bracknell Forest Council

Apologies for absence were received from:

Andrew Fletcher, Secondary School Representative
Ed Glasson, Primary School Governor
Louise Lovegrove, Primary School Representative

40. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

41. Minutes and Matters Arising

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2012 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

42. Financial Support to Schools in Categories

The Forum received a report which requested that the Schools Forum agree a set of principles to be applied by the Director of Children, Young People and Learning in relation to the allocation of funds to schools in, or in danger of entering an Ofsted

category from the retained budget for schools in financial difficulty without having to first obtain agreement of the Forum.

School Funding Regulations allowed for additional funds outside the normal operation of the Funding Formula to be provided to schools considered to be in financial difficulty. In agreement with the Schools Forum, funding of £304,000 had been set aside in the School's Budget for this purpose.

In order to allow funds to be allocated within an appropriate time scale and to provide certainty of funding to qualifying schools, it was recommended that a set of principles be agreed by the Schools Forum which allowed the Director of Children, Young People and Learning discretion to allocate funds up to but not exceeding a set level dependent on the Ofsted category of the school.

The new Ofsted inspection framework was challenging and proposed changing the category of 'satisfactory' to 'in need of improvement' which would make this a category of concern. Early intervention and available funding was needed to avoid further expenditure.

RESOLVED that the Schools Forum:

- i. **AGREED** the set of principles and arrangements as contained in the report related to the allocation of funds to schools in, or in danger of entering an Ofsted category as at paragraphs 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 of the report.

43. **DfE School Funding Reform - Next Steps**

The Forum received a report which updated members of the Schools Forum on the latest consultation from the Department for Education (DfE) on proposals for school funding reform that were expected to be implemented from April 2013 together with their anticipated impact.

The DfE issued a third and final consultation on a small number of outstanding issues at the end of March 2012 which confirmed that there were two timescales for funding reform: to make local changes for April 2013 and to seek to introduce a national funding formula between 2014-2017 and beyond.

The immediate task for local authorities and Schools Forums was a need to simplify the local authority funding formula for primary and secondary schools as new restrictions would apply from April 2013. This would require the Council to review the basis of charging schools for traded services as the number of available factors in the funding formula would be significantly reduced. There was also a need to delegate a range of budgets which could currently be retained centrally by local authorities which were estimated to total around £2 million.

Once the reforms were fully implemented, there was likely to be a significant redistribution of funding between schools and local authorities. For schools, there would be at least two years of funding stability with the Minimum Funding Guarantee set at a maximum reduction of 1.5%. However, continuation of this protection was subject to review in the next spending review.

It was proposed that a School Funding Review Group (SFRG) be established with Schools Forum representation with the aim to completing review work by the end of the summer term. Consultation with all schools on the proposed changes would be between 9 July 2012 and 28 September 2012, with governor and headteacher briefings to be held week commencing 9 September. The Schools Forum would need

to agree the changes at its meeting on 18 October 2012 as there was a requirement to inform the DfE of the new funding formula by 31 October 2012.

The draft proposals for the SFRG at Annex E of the report were amended to also include an SEN Governor, and one primary and one secondary bursar. Representatives could send substitutes to meetings from their sector but they would also need knowledge of the budgetary matters of the school. It would be raised at the next Secondary Schools Headteachers' meeting of the need for one secondary headteacher representative and one secondary headteacher substitute as there would only be one secondary headteacher representative on the SFRG.

Meetings of the SFRG would be held on the 10 May, 31 May, 14 June and 28 June 2012 at Seymour House, 10.30am – 12.00noon.

The Schools Forum would agree 2.3 of the report in relation to a response to the DfE consultation at a later date as this had not been completed yet. When the consultation was completed it would be circulated to the Schools Forum for a response by the deadline of the end of May 2012.

RESOLVED that the Schools Forum:

- i. **NOTED** the proposed DfE school funding reforms and their potential impact.
- ii. **AGREED** the programme and other related matters of the School Funding Review Group, and members from the Schools Forum as at Annex E of the report.

44. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The Forum noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 14 June 2012 at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber at Easthampstead House but meetings would be cancelled if there was no business to discuss.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM 19 July 2012

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM Director of Corporate Services

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 To advise the Forum of a change to its membership.

2 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 Nominations were recently sought to fill two vacancies for primary school governor representatives and one vacancy for a secondary school governor representative on the Forum following the end of the terms of office for Kelvin Menon, John Throssell and Mrs Maureen Beadsley. Three application forms have been received; from John Throssell, who continues to be a governor at Crown Wood Primary School; Edward Essery, who is a governor at Wildmoor Heath Primary School, and Margaret Saner, who is a governor at Garth Hill College.
- 2.2 With only three applications, there is no need to hold an election and in accordance with the procedures for appointment to the Forum, Mr Throssell, Mr Essery and Ms Saner have been duly appointed to fill the vacancies. It is proposed to appoint Mr Throssell, Mr Essery and Ms Saner for a period of one year until 31 August 2013.

3 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 There are no issues.

4 STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 4.1 There are no issues.

Background Papers

None

Contact for further information

Amanda Roden, Democratic Services: 01344 352253
amanda.roden@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Doc. Ref

Membership of the Schools Forum

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 19 JULY 2012

SCHOOL MEALS SERVICE
(Director of Children, Young People & Learning)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise Schools Forum on the decision and outcome of awarding the school meals contract to ISS Education.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That the Schools Forum notes the outcome of the re-tendering of the school meals contract which has been awarded to ISS Education with improved financial and other benefits is NOTED.**
- 2.2 **That following consultation, schools wish to continue to charge the current price per meal of £2.00 is NOTED.**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 **It is appropriate for the Forum to be aware of, and where relevant, comment on these contractual matters on behalf of schools.**

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 These are set out in the supporting information.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 5.1 The current Council-managed contract for school meals was tendered in 2006 and expires in July 2012. A total of 28 Primary/Infant/Junior, 1 secondary and 1 Special School participate in the current contract which is with ISS Education. The remaining 5 Secondary and 3 Primary/Infant/Junior in the borough make their own arrangements for school meals by a combination of individually tendered contracts and in-house delivery.

Procurement

- 5.2 The Procurement Plan for the school meals service was endorsed by the Executive Member for Education in October 2011, and in December 2011 Schools Forum gave feedback on the draft specification.
- 5.3 The contract was jointly procured with West Berkshire Council to make it more attractive in the marketplace and to achieve economies of scale. Officers from both Councils collaborated to produce a joint specification and Invitation to tender. There will however be separate contracts for each authority to ensure each can effectively manage the service on behalf of its own schools.

Unrestricted

- 5.4 School meals is considered to be a Part B service, and not subject to the Public Contract Regulations (2009) requiring advertisement via the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU). The contract was therefore procured using a two-stage restricted procedure, with advertisement on the South East Business Portal, which attracted expressions of interest from 12 suppliers.
- 5.5 From this a tender list was drawn up with 5 contractors, all of whom demonstrated that they had appropriate resources and experience of working in schools. Tenders were let in January 2012 and responses were received from all 5. Schools Forum will recall that in 2006 when the contract was last tendered the market was such that no tenders were received. The 2006 contract had to be negotiated at a cost plus profit basis, and the subsequent subsidy payable by schools, though reduced, has continued to be an ongoing burden.
- 5.6 Tenders were evaluated against the pre-defined criteria by a joint Bracknell Forest/West Berkshire team including school representatives, based on a 40/60 Price/Quality ratio. All 5 tenders were of a high standard, and all 5 contractors were interviewed.
- 5.7 ISS Education scored highest on quality whilst also offering the lowest cost option for Bracknell Forest schools. ISS is our current provider, which also avoids the disruption of mobilising a new contractor.
- 5.8 In February 2012 the Executive agreed to delegate the decision to award the contract to the Director of Children Young People & Learning in consultation with the Executive Member for Education to allow more time for consultation with schools, and the award decision was taken in April 2012.

The New Service

- 5.9 This procurement has been successful in that it has also resulted in a number of significant improvements and benefits for Bracknell Forest schools, including:
- The contractor has provided a signed compliance statement that all of the features of the specification will be met, and this will form part of the contract documentation.
 - The new contract can be delivered at a zero subsidy by schools, which amounts to an overall saving of £90k per annum when compared to the current contract.
 - Moreover the primary meal cost payable by schools from September 2012 will be £1.91, which is £0.09 below the current meal price charged to parents. Schools were consulted about how this surplus should be managed. 30 schools responded to the question with only two schools wishing to charge a lower price than the current £2.00 per meal price, the majority of schools opting to retain the surplus. Based on latest take-up figures, the aggregate surplus would amount to £32k per annum.
 - There is also an additional 1% rebate back to schools as part of the contract. Based on latest take-up figures, the aggregate rebate payable to schools would amount to £7k per annum.
 - The service from July 2012 will be to the higher Food for Life Silver Standard.
 - ISS will provide and manage an on line pre-payment facility for parents
 - Parents will also be able to pre-order on-line on behalf of their children

Unrestricted

- Pupils will also pre-order their meals each morning via the interactive whiteboard
- There will be a new and more efficient financial management system
- ISS will work with schools to market the service to parents to increase meal take-up
- ISS will continue to be responsible for providing light equipment
- Heavy kitchen equipment continues to be a school responsibility but the Council will continue to offer a management service for repairs/replacements through the SLA.

5.10 The new service will be open to all Bracknell Forest schools to buy into through a Service Level Agreement (SLA). The enhanced benefits available on the new contract has resulted in two schools that previously contracted out of the service now buying back.

5.11 For secondary schools ISS is offering a cafeteria style menu tailored to the needs of the individual school. ISS are keen to expand their market and increase the number of secondary schools in the contract, so this should be seen as an opportunity to any secondary schools that are currently reviewing their catering arrangements.

5.12 The new contract will be awarded for an initial period of 5 years from July 2012 with the option to extend by up to a further 4 years at 2 yearly intervals thereafter. A break clause has been included within the contract which gives schools the right to terminate the Agreement by giving 6 months written notice expiring on each anniversary of the Agreement.

New School Meals Kitchen

5.13 On a related matter Schools Forum will wish to note that the new school meals kitchen at Cranbourne Primary school provided through the Education Capital Programme opened in January 2012. The new kitchen provides a full on site fresh cook service. This removes the need to transport school meals from another school site, with a consequential increased the quality of the meals provided to the children.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 No legal issues arise from the recommendation made by this report.

Borough Treasurer

6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information. The application of the £0.09m saving on payments to the contractor and the other new income streams to relevant schools will need to be considered as part of the 2013-14 budget setting process.

Impact Assessment

6.3 Not required.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

6.4

Issue	Comment
The financial risk of the contractor going bankrupt is assessed as LOW, because independent financial checks have been obtained by the Chief Technical Accountant.	The contractor is also required to have a minimum level of insurance cover and renewal certificates will be obtained through the duration of the contract.
The risk of poor performance is assessed as LOW, because ISS are our current provider and schools are aware of and are satisfied with their past performance.	ISS's allocation of resources and competence have been assessed as adequate to ensure delivery to the specified standard. The Council will continue to provide a contract monitoring and management service through the SLA.
The risk of insufficient number of schools participating, making the contract unviable is assessed as LOW.	The majority of schools have expressed an interest in the new contract.
The risk of school meals take up not increasing is assessed as MEDIUM.	The meal price charged will be a significant factor in take up in the current economic climate. This will need to be carefully balanced to incentivise/maximise meal take up.

7 CONSULTATIONPrincipal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 In June 2010 Schools and Schools Forum were consulted and agreed that the Council should re-tender the service on behalf of schools.
- 7.2 Schools and Schools Forum were again consulted over the draft specification in the 2011 Autumn term. A written questionnaire was sent to all schools about the features they would like to see in the specification.
- 7.3 The Headteachers and Governing Bodies at the participating schools have all been consulted to seek their agreement to participate in the tender process.
- 7.4 In 2011 Schools and Schools Forum were again consulted over the draft specification in the 2011 Autumn term.
- 7.5 Overview and Scrutiny Panel were also consulted on the draft specification during the 2011 Autumn Term as part of an independent review of school meals.
- 7.6 In June 2010 Schools and Schools Forum were consulted and agreed that the Council should re-tender the service on behalf of schools.
- 7.7 The Tender Evaluation Team was drawn from both Bracknell Forest Council & West Berkshire Councils and included school representatives.

Method of Consultation

- 7.8 A combination of letters, meetings with interested parties, presentations, formal questionnaires and reports.

Representations Received

- 7.9 Feedback from the various groups above was applied to make up the written specification for the service prior to the letting of tenders. The consultation post-tender has been to seek final agreement from individual schools on their participation in the new contract. As at mid June 2012, 32 schools had indicated that they will participate, an increase of two schools compared to the current contract.

Background Papers

Previous reports to Schools Forum and the Executive.

Specification and tender documents.

School consultation results on participation in the contract and meal price from September 2012.

Contact for further information

David Watkins (01344 354061)	Chief Officer: Performance and Resources David.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
Chris Taylor (01344 354062)	Head of Property & Admissions Chris.taylor@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
David Eagle (01344 354004)	Contract Monitoring Officer David.Eagle@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE 19 JULY 2012

**UPDATE ON PROGRESS TOWARDS MEETING THE
REQUIREMENTS OF DFE SCHOOL FUNDING REFORM
(Director of Children, Young People and Learning)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Schools Forum on progress made by the School Funding Review Group on reviewing the changes required from the Department for Education (DfE) proposals for school funding reform that are expected to be implemented from April 2013.
- 1.2 At this stage, changes are focused on local funding arrangements, with the national funding framework expected to be updated during the next Spending Review period (2015-2018).

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That progress towards meeting the requirements of the funding reforms is NOTED.**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 To ensure the Schools Forum is aware of progress being made towards meeting the requirements of the new funding framework.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 These were considered by the Working Group with various options recorded in the minutes of the relevant meetings.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

- 5.1 Reports on school funding reform have previously been presented to the Schools Forum. These have confirmed that there will be no changes to the national funding system before the start of the next Spending Review Period (2015), but that for April 2013, there would be an impact on local arrangements for schools from the following key changes:
1. The simplification and standardisation of the way that resources are distributed to schools through the Funding Formula, with each LA required to inform the DfE of its new Formula no later than 31 October, 2012.
 2. Creating a national benchmark for funding schools in their general budgets to

support pupils with special educational needs;

3. Delegation of additional resources to schools for services currently managed centrally by the Council.

- 5.2 To help guide the process, the Schools Forum established a School Funding Review Group, with membership from head teachers, governors, school bursars and LA officers to work through the new requirements. This Group has now met 4 times and agreed a set of recommendations for change that have been used to frame the content of the consultation document that was circulated to all schools on 12 July.
- 5.3 The final meeting of the Group was held on the day that the DfE published decisions for the new funding arrangements. As expected, there were a number of outcomes that had not been anticipated, and a note on the changes was sent to Group members setting out how they were proposed to be dealt with. There were no adverse responses to the proposed actions. Annex 1 sets out the late changes.

Overview of work of the Review Group

- 5.4 The work of the Group in constructing a consultation document for all schools to consider is now complete, with one further meeting scheduled on 4 October to review responses from schools in advance of the 18 October Schools Forum meeting that must agree changes to the Funding Formula, so the DfE deadline of 31 October to supply relevant information is met. The final meeting of the group will also consider any late developments that may emerge following publication of the consultation.

A presentation on the recommendations made by the Group and other relevant matters will be made at the meeting which will cover the issues set out below.

Funding Formula for Schools

- 5.5 This has resulted in proposed amendments to some factors to meet the new criteria set by the DfE and the deletion of others that will no longer be allowed. For each factor of the proposed Formula, the Group have agreed an approach to be recommended to all schools. The one exception to this being deprivation, which in future can only use pupil eligibility to a free school meal, or the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index¹. The Group considered that neither measure was clearly better than the other, and a recommendation will not be made on the consultation document for how schools should be funded for deprivation. The options modelled on this factor result in large movements of funds between schools.

High Needs Pupils / SEN funding

- 5.6 SEN funding is the most complex part of the DfE consultation and these proposals represent the first major review of SEN funding since the early 1990's. The key changes now being proposed are:
 - Introducing equivalence of funding, irrespective of provider type;
 - Increasing choice and quality;

¹ . An IDACI score is the measure of probability that a child living in a defined area will be from a low income family. For example, a child with an IDACI score of 0.2 has a 20% chance of coming from a deprived background. IDACI can measure degrees of deprivation whereas FSM eligibility is binary and therefore has no scale of severity

Unrestricted

- A greater focus on “commissioner” (i.e. LAs) and “provider” (i.e. schools) arrangements;
- Defining high needs as those above £10,000;
- Requiring the placing LA to pay for top-up funding above the £10,000 threshold and not the LA the school resides in.

5.7 The new funding arrangements would follow a “place-plus” approach that would comprise three elements:

- **Element 1, or “core education funding”**: the mainstream unit of per-pupil or per-student education funding. In the school sector for pre-16 pupils, this is part of the age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU), while for post-16 provision in schools and in the FE sector this is the mainstream per-student funding as calculated by the national 16-19 funding system.
- **Element 2, or “additional support funding”**: a clearly identified budget for providers to provide additional support for high needs pupils or students with additional needs up to an agreed level. *This has traditionally been termed the ‘notional SEN budget’ with the relevant amount for each school confirmed each year with their budget plan.*
- **Element 3, or “top-up funding”**: funding above elements 1 and 2 to meet the total cost of the education provision required by an individual high needs pupil or student, as based on the pupil’s or student’s assessed needs. *This has traditionally been the funding top-up paid to schools for statemented pupils.*

5.8 Under the place-plus approach, mainstream providers would receive elements 1 (core education funding) and 2 (additional support funding) as part of their standard funding. The DfE strongly recommend that element 2 equates to £6,000 per relevant pupil and in many LAs would require a funding transfer from centrally managed SEN budgets through the new restricted range of Formula Factors. In BF, there is currently £1,900 included in general school funding for notional SEN costs, sufficient to purchase the first 5 hours of additional support required by SEN pupils, so this would need to increase by £4,100, sufficient to fund the first 16 hours of additional support. This will require a funding transfer from the statemented budget, and will need to be distributed through one of the restricted number of factors, and no longer on an individual named pupil basis.

5.9 The DfE recognises that a formulaic approach to allocating funding for SEN may not adequately resource all schools, particularly those that are popular with SEN pupils. In such a situation, a contingency fund can be held and additional funding allocated where schools meet locally defined criteria. Initial modelling indicates that up to £0.190m should be held for this purpose.

5.10 For KLS, elements 1 and 2 would be funded by BFC at £10,000 for the agreed number of places, with additional funding for element 3 based on assessed need, to be paid for by the commissioner, who will not always be BFC. There are a significant number of out of borough pupils in KLS that will require element 3 top ups from other LAs, estimated at nearly £0.3m which KLS would need to ensure were paid.

5.11 To focus on the specific issues facing KLS, a sub group has been established which has identified a number of key issues that need to be reviewed, including setting the correct funding baseline, agreeing the number of places to be funded (subject to

Education Funding Agency (EFA) ² approval), and establishing the appropriate level of top-up to charge for pupils for element 3. The outcomes from this sub group would be reported to the Schools Forum in due course.

- 5.12 The new funding framework for resource units will operate in a similar way to that set out for KLS. Therefore, the work of the KLS sub group would form the basis for making recommendations for arrangements for resourced units, and that these would also be reported to the Schools Forum in due course. In addition to the work of the KLS sub group, officers from the SEN Team plan to visit all 3 schools with units to explain the changes and gather information and issues.
- 5.13 There are also different arrangements for College Hall PRU, and a further sub group had been created to consider relevant matters which will also be reported to the Schools Forum in due course.
- 5.14 The College Hall sub group have identified a number of key actions for the LA to complete to make College Hall Pupil Referral Unit compliant with the new arrangements. This includes establishing the level of delegated budget, the number of places to fund (subject to EFA approval) and the criteria for pupil admittance. Pupil Referral Units are expected to receive core funding for elements 1 and 2 at £8,000 per agreed place, but the DfE has yet to confirm this amount.
- 5.15 Changes required to KLS, SEN Resource Units and College Hall do not need to be confirmed to the DfE for 31 October, so there is more time to complete these reviews.
- 5.16 There are a small number of other important matters relating to SEN as follows:
- Work is currently underway to define the local offer relevant to BF schools as envisaged in the Government's SEN and disability Green Paper. A consultation with interested parties is expected to take place in the autumn term.
 - For reasons of value for money and a consistent approach to commissioning SEN services, the council intends to work closely with neighbouring LA's in the procurement of SEN services from schools that require top up payments (element 3). This will be developed over the autumn term
 - There is likely to be a reduction in the number of formal statements issued as the threshold to receive funding will increase from £1,900 to £6,000 although existing statements are expected to remain in place.
 - Schools would need to ensure element 3 top up income for individual pupil support costs above £6,000 placed by commissioners other than BFC was duly received.

Additional delegation

- 5.17 As well as the simplification of local Funding Formulas, the new funding arrangements also require all LAs to delegate funding for the same services and functions, with a presumption of additional delegation.

² The EFA is a new executive agency of the DfE that from April 2012 will be responsible for capital and revenue funding for education and training for 3-19 year olds. It will fund academies, free schools and LAs. It will also be responsible for the distribution of capital funding and advice on capital projects

Unrestricted

- 5.18 For the newly delegated items, where relevant representatives on the Schools Forum agree that the whole budget for their phase e.g. primary/secondary, should be returned to the Council for central management, this will generally be allowed. This recognises that there are reasons of cost effectiveness, ease of organisation and management or risk sharing that this approach can bring. Academy schools will receive the funding in their budgets and it cannot be returned to an LA, although where offered, they would be able to purchase relevant services from LAs. The exceptions to de-delegation are 14-16 practical learning options and School Meals / Milk which the DfE are requiring to be fully delegated. However, like other services, SLAs can be agreed with schools for continued provision by LAs, to be paid for by schools from their delegated budgets.
- 5.19 The possibility of returning funding of newly delegated items for Council management for Kennel Lane Special school will not be permitted as the new commissioning arrangements that all specialist education providers will operate under, on a consistent funding basis with PVI providers, does not lend itself to such an adjustment. Like academy schools, special schools will be able to purchase relevant services where they are made available by LAs.
- 5.20 Overall, around £1.6m of funding is involved across the services, as set out in Table 1 below. These services have been divided between those that are considered strategic, with a collective responsibility for their on-going provision for all schools, those that could be retained by the LA, but are considered suitable for trading, and those that can no longer be retained by the LA:

Table 1: Services subject to delegation at April 2013

Ref	Item	£k
<u>Strategic Services</u>		
1	School contingencies	44
2	Support to schools in financial difficulties	280
3	English as an Additional Language	125
4	SIMS and other licences	88
5	Staff supply cover for official absences *	346
<u>Services suitable to trading</u>		
6	Local CMCD Programme	32
7	Behaviour and Education Support Team	342
8	Anti-bullying co-ordinator	25
9	Social & Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)	71
<u>Services that must be delegated</u>		
10	14-16 flexible learning funds	200
11	Free Milk	3
Total		1,556

* includes maternity leave, trades union, magistrates and jury duties, council membership and staff suspensions.

- 5.21 Whilst the Council accepts that schools should have a choice over whether services should be delegated or not, with the option to de-delegate if supported by relevant representatives on the Schools Forum, there are a number of services that are

considered strategic or where there is a collective responsibility to support all schools, sometimes on services that are used infrequently, but often when they are required, significant costs are involved.

- 5.22 In particular, funding to support schools in financial difficulty and school contingencies are not considered suitable for delegation to individual schools. This is because these funding streams are targeted to specific schools facing real cost increases, which are generally substantial amounts, and it is not therefore appropriate to be included in the general funding of all schools.
- 5.23 Funding for schools in financial difficulties is primarily allocated where a school is in, or at risk of entering an Ofsted category, which ordinarily then requires financial support to put in place changes that will aid a rapid improvement and removal from the category.
- 5.24 Moving these funds directly into individual school budgets would take away the ability of the Council, in consultation with the Schools Forum to provide financial support to schools that face the most challenging financial circumstances. It would place the onus on individual schools to retain sufficient balances to finance the additional costs which generally arise on an unpredictable basis. There would not be a facility to request funding from centrally managed School Budgets.
- 5.25 In respect of the behaviour related services, the Council agrees that these should be offered to schools on a traded basis. However, in order to allow sufficient time to review and where necessary re-structure these services so that they fully reflect the needs of schools, the Council proposes that for 2013-14 only, these funds are de-delegated and returned for Council management, but from 2014-15, they remain within delegated school budgets, with the Council making available a service for schools to buy-back through an SLA, where required

Charging schools for bought back services

- 5.26 The funding reforms will also require the Council to reconsider the basis adopted to charge schools for buy-back services. In future, it is unlikely that the Council will be able to maintain the position of charging for each service at the amount allocated to individual schools through the Funding Formula - the "in and out" basis. This is because the removal of factors currently used will likely result in the future allocation of budget for some traded services being unrepresentative of the cost of delivery. If the Council were to continue on the "in and out" basis, there is the probability that for a number of schools, charges would not be competitive with an external supplier. Maintaining the current approach would increase the risk of schools purchasing elsewhere which would result in a loss of income to the Council. More work on this will be undertaken during the autumn.

Impact from the changes

- 5.27 As a consequence of the revisions proposed to the Funding Formula and SEN funding, there are some significant changes in funding between schools. As previously reported, in the first two years of the new arrangements the MFG will protect schools to a maximum per pupil loss of 1.5% in each year. The extent that funding protection will be available after this period has yet to be confirmed, so it is important that the decisions taken now are the right ones as there are likely to be significant medium to long term implications.

Unrestricted

- 5.28 The attached Annex 2 shows the anticipated financial effect from each change to the Funding Formula recommended by the Review Group, at an individual school level. It also shows the aggregate impact of all changes. Note, the exemplifications show the impact arising from October 2011 census data that will be updated to use October 2012 information for the 2013-14 budget so some figures could significantly change. It also needs to be noted that the financial implications shown are before applying the MFG to cap losses at no more than 1.5% per pupil. Table 2 below sets out the extreme anticipated changes in funding.

Table 2: Summary of most significant funding changes

School	Amount £	Amount %
Primary school maximum increase	£52,635	7.70%
Primary school maximum reduction	-£90,250	-10.02%
Secondary school maximum increase	£210,535	4.08%
Secondary school maximum reduction	-£143,219	-3.30%

- 5.29 There is no obvious pattern to the changes at an individual school level as they arise from a number of changes, so will be difficult to explain to individual schools, especially those losing the most.
- 5.30 Assuming all of the changes proposed by the Review Group are agreed, Table 3 below shows the average amount of funding to be allocated to schools through each factor of the new Funding Formula

Table 3: Potential funding distributed by each factor of the Funding Formula

Factor	Primary average	Secondary average
Basic per pupil funding	72.98%	83.47%
Deprivation	2.12%	4.05%
LAC pupils	0.01%	0.02%
Low prior Attainment	2.67%	4.24%
EAL pupils	0.18%	0.05%
Lump sum amount	15.89%	3.48%
Rates	1.42%	2.77%
EYSFF	3.56%	0.00%
High needs pupil top up	1.07%	1.25%
High needs pupil contingency	0.09%	0.67%
Total	100.00%	100.00%

Managing the impact of the MFG

- 5.31 Changes from the national review are likely to result in a significant re-distribution of funds between schools across a number of LAs. This in turn would increase the cost of funding the MFG protection, which in a period on flat funding settlements, would create financial difficulties for LAs in setting their Schools Budget. Therefore, the DfE intend to amend the school funding regulations so that a cap can be applied to those schools receiving funding increases to limit gains to an amount that would fund the cost of MFG payable to those facing reductions.
- 5.32 The DfE has indicated that the capping process will be applied against each school's budget relative to the MFG, after reflecting all budget changes. It is not just looking at the impact from the simplification of the Funding Formula, but all changes that impact on a school's budget, e.g. that arising for a higher or lower deprivation level from one year to the next, a change in the overall number on roll etc. Outcomes not connected to this review will also be taken into account in the top-up / capping calculations.
- 5.33 Therefore, the cost of funding amounts to be added to school budgets below the MFG will be met from deductions to schools above the MFG, where relevant schools also experience an increase in per pupil funding into 2013-14.
- 5.34 Annex 3 shows a summary by school of the net impact from the simplification of the Funding Formula compared to each school's budget position relative to the MFG. This shows that total losses by schools amount to £0.787m, but due to the effect of the MFG, schools will need to absorb the first £0.231m of reductions, and then receive funding top ups to the level of MFG in the value of £0.556m.
- 5.35 Until such time as the cost of MFG in 2013-14 is known, and the financial settlement is also confirmed, it will not be clear whether the amount, currently estimated at £0.556m can be financed from an overall increase in DSG income, or whether it will need to be funded from a top slice to relevant gaining schools. If a top-slice is to be applied, it will need to work in one of the following two ways:
- a. The schools above the MFG, which are due to receive increases in per pupil funding into 2013-14 and have the lowest pupil funding increase retain all their gain, those above the threshold, only retain a percentage of their gain to the level that fully funds the losers. The modelling proposes schools with increases of up to 3% keep all of the gain, those with greater than 3% increases keep 40% of their whole gain. In this option, the schools receiving the greatest financial gain contribute a larger proportion of their funding increase.
 - b. The schools above the MFG, which are due to receive increases in per pupil funding into 2013-14 have their per pupil funding reduced by a fixed percentage, which would be set at the rate required to fund the MFG. For example, all relevant schools only get to keep 50% of their per pupil increase. All schools contribute at the same proportionate rate on this option.
- 5.36 The review Group are recommending option a, and Table 4 below sets out the impact this would have on the funding changes summarised above in Table 2, based on current data.

Table 4: Summary of most significant funding changes after applying the MFG

School	Amount £		Amount %	
	Pre MFG	Post MFG	Pre MFG	Post MFG
Primary maximum increase	£52,635	£28,214	7.70%	2.63%
Primary maximum reduction	-£90,250	-30,442	-10.02%	-1.23%
Secondary maximum increase	£210,535	£34,895	4.08%	0.80%
Secondary maximum reduction	-£143,219	-£61,156	-3.30%	-1.41%

- 5.37 Table 4 clearly shows the moderating effect of the MFG in respect of funding transfers between schools. Whilst the post MFG changes indicate relatively small movements of funds, the protection is only guaranteed for 2 years, after which there may be different arrangements in place. Therefore, the decisions taken now could have a bigger impact in the medium to long term, which makes it important that they are right.

Proposals for the schools contingency

- 5.38 Three clarifications have been made by the DfE in their 28 June documentation that have implications on the way that school contingencies are funded, all of which must be agreed by the Schools Forum and then managed centrally by the LA to agreed criteria. All of these issues came to light after the last meeting of the Review Group.
- 5.39 The first relates to funding schools that experience significant in-year growth in pupil numbers. The DfE originally stated the intention that relevant funding would need to be added to school budgets but could then be de-delegated if agreed by relevant school representatives on the Schools Forum. The DfE now recognises that such an approach could hinder efficient planning of school places so LAs will now be able to retain a central fund for significant pupil growth, subject to agreement of the Schools Forum along with qualifying criteria and a basis to calculate allocations. Academy schools would need to be treated the same as maintained schools.
- 5.40 The second area relates to the option of holding a central contingency for allocation in year to schools facing additional costs to meet the infant class size regulations that require classes at Key Stage 1 to have no more than 30 pupils per teacher. In some instances, schools are required to employ an additional teacher when Key Stage 1 pupil numbers total one more than the nearest multiple of 30.
- 5.41 The current BF Funding Formula allocates a fixed lump sum amount of £17,063 to schools with infant classes to add to per pupil funding to help manage additional costs that may arise. With the requirement to move to a uniform fixed lump sum payment to all schools, the additional funding source currently being used to support schools in meeting the cost of the infant class size regulations is lost. To help relevant schools manage what can be unpredictable and high costs, it is proposed to create a specific fund in the school contingency.
- 5.42 To fund this new element of the contingency, it is proposed to transfer 50% of the relevant budget currently being allocated to schools with infant classes through the small schools factor through an amount per 'missing pupil', which is a factor that will no longer be allowed. There is £229k allocated through this factor to primary schools, with £224k received by 16 schools with infant classes. Therefore £112k of this

Unrestricted

funding is proposed to be allocated to schools 80% by headcount, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment, with the remaining £112k moved to a Key Stage 1 class size contingency, to be allocated in-year against criteria to be agreed by the Schools Forum.

- 5.43 No change is proposed to the £16k allocated to small secondary schools, which will be recommended to in future be distributed 80% by headcount, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment.
- 5.44 The third area for consideration in respect of the school contingency relates to allocating additional funding to new, reorganising or closing schools, as in such circumstances significant costs can be incurred that the Funding Formula is not able to compensate. For example, some new schools are expected to be required in Bracknell Forest to meet the demand for pupil places from the growing population. There will often be a large increase in pupil numbers during the year, requiring additional classes to be staffed, increasing costs. The normal formula budget will not reflect the increase in pupils as it will be based on the previous October census data. Schools facing these circumstances, where there are real, identifiable costs should have access to additional funds. The amount required, if any, would be agreed by the Schools Forum each year as part of the normal budget setting process. Jennett's Park Primary School would likely need to be funded through this mechanism as it continues to grow to a 2 form entry school.
- 5.45 Depending on responses received from schools to the consultation, and the views of the Review Group, the Schools Forum may be asked to agreed funding adjustments for some or all of the above contingency items when the 2013-14 budget is set.

Support to governors and other interested parties

- 5.46 A range of measures to support governors have also been arranged including 2 evening briefings in July to explain the proposals from the DfE, with a further 2 question and answer sessions on the BF consultation proposals set for September. A page has also been added to the schools area of the Council's website to hold all relevant DfE and Council information on school funding reform, including all the papers from the Review Group. This can be viewed at:

<http://schools.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/schoolfundingreform.htm>

- 5.47 It was originally intended to report the minutes from the Review Group to the Schools Forum, but for reasons of cost efficiency, these have not been attached to this paper, but can be viewed at the above link.
- 5.48 Copies of the consultation document and supporting annexes (circa 40 pages each) will be available at the meeting should any members require one.

Next steps

- 5.49 Changes to the BF Funding Formula need to be agreed by the Schools Forum and confirmed to the DfE by 31 October 2012. The Schools Forum will consider this on 18 October. To provide sufficient time for schools to consider what are substantial and complex changes, the consultation period will run from 12 July to 28 September.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 The Borough Solicitor has nothing to add to the report.

Borough Treasurer

6.2 No financial implications arise at this stage. Any proposals for change arising from the Consultation will need to be reported to the Schools Forum and considered as part of the overall financial arrangements to be put in place from April 2013.

Impact Assessment

6.2 DfE has undertaken a full impact assessment and considers the proposed changes have the potential to reduce the barriers and inequalities that currently exist. The document can be found at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/School%20funding%20Reform%20-%20Equality%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf>

Strategic Risk Management Issues

6.3 The most significant issues are expected to be:

1. The redistribution of funding between schools may result in a number of schools receiving real terms reduction to their funding for a number of years. This could have an adverse impact on pupil attainment. The budget to support schools in financial difficulties would be available to support relevant schools, provided it is returned for central management.
2. Additional delegation of services to schools could result in them ceasing to be provided. If there is low interest from schools, trading may prove uneconomic which could result in the withdrawal of support services which would then be more difficult and costly to provide if a need occurred at a later date. The consultation encourages replies that support de-delegation.
3. The review of charging schools for traded services may have an impact on future take up of services by schools. Lower take up may require services to be restructured or withdrawn, with either scenario likely to result in additional one-off costs.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 The views of the Review Group have been incorporated into the consultation document.

Background Papers

Various DfE guidance notes on School Funding

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI

(01344 354061)

david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance

(01344 354054)

paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

G:\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\57) 190712\School Funding Reforms - July 2012.doc

**Summary of changes from DfE March 2012 consultation on school funding reforms and
final decisions as announced on 28 June 2012**

Ref.	Item of change / decision / new issue / update	DfE doc ref	Proposed action
<u>Simplification of local funding arrangements</u>			
25 1.	Funding schools for significant pupil growth. This is through the school contingency and DfE originally stated the intention to require this to be added to school budgets but could then be de-delegated if agreed by relevant school representatives on the Schools Forum. There is now a recognition by the DfE that this could hinder efficient planning of school places so LAs will be able to retain a central fund for significant pupil growth, subject to agreement of the Schools Forum along with qualifying criteria and a basis to calculate allocations. Academy schools would need to be treated the same as maintained schools.	School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14 Paras 19-22	Review current criteria for funding significant pupil growth i.e. funding allocated where there is an increase of at least 20 statutory aged pupils between January and September census dates, to then receive top up funding equivalent to Teachers Main Scale point 6, for September to March – approx £23,000. Seek agreement from Schools Forum in October to hold funding back for this purpose, with amount to be retained determined by the Schools Forum through the budget setting process. This is generally the current procedure.
2.	DfE has confirmed that funding schools for additional classes needed to meet the infant class size regulation is allowed and can be funded in the same way as significant pupil growth at line 1. This approach has not been taken by BFC before but merits consideration.	Operational guidance Paras 37	Add a new question to the consultation to gather views from PRIMARY schools only about whether retaining a fund to support infant class size regulations would be supported. The current BF Funding Formula allocates a fixed lump sum amount of £17,063 to schools with infant classes to add to per pupil funding to help manage additional costs that may arise. Moving to a uniform fixed lump sum payment to all schools removes the funding source currently being used to support schools in meeting the cost of the infant class size regulations. The assumption for the purposes of the consultation would be that primary schools would support this approach as there are real, identifiable costs arising from this, and the consultation will therefore propose that it is funded from the money currently set aside to fund small schools through

Unrestricted

Ref.	Item of change / decision / new issue / update	DfE doc ref	Proposed action
			<p>an amount per 'missing pupil' which will no longer be allowed. There is £229k allocated through this factor to primary schools, with £223k received by 16 schools with infant classes. The consultation document recommends that these funds be distributed 80% by headcount, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment, so would be amended to assume these funds are used to create an infant class size fund. The financial exemplification in the consultation document will now assume funding is held centrally and allocated in-year against criteria to be agreed by the Forum.</p> <p>No change is proposed to the £16k allocated to small secondary schools, which will be recommended to in future be distributed 80% by headcount, 10% by deprivation and 10% by low prior attainment.</p>
26 3.	<p>Ability to use differential per pupil funding in secondary schools at KS3 and KS4 now confirmed as allowable. Primary aged per pupil funding must be at one uniform rate, irrespective of age.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Paras 25-26</p>	<p>Review Group already agreed preference for differential funding at KS3/4. Consultation document to be updated to make clear DfE will allow differential funding.</p>
4.	<p>DfE proposal to set a minimum percentage of funding to be allocated via the basic per pupil entitlement or pupil-led factors will not be implemented in 2013-14. To be reviewed for 2014-15 after reforms have been implemented to help determine what a target rate should be, from current funding levels.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Paras 27-28</p>	<p>None. But need to be aware of a potential new requirement from 2014-15, which would result in a redistribution of funding between schools if more money had to be allocated via the basic per pupil entitlement or pupil-led factors.</p>
5.	<p>DfE have updated the available IDACI bandings for deprivation funding so that there are 6, rather than 5 available to set different per pupil units of resource. No change to minimum score that can attract funding (stays at 0.2). Change is to the most deprived scores, with the original band 5 operating between 0.5 – 1, now split so that band 5 is 0.5 – 0.6, with band 6 at 0.6 – 1. This helps most deprived areas to include a higher unit of resource for the most deprived children.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Paras 27-28</p>	<p>Add further 0.5 weighting to per pupil unit of resource for new band 6. Not significant to BF. From DfE data supplied in April, only 10 pupils in BF fall into the original band 5, so any additional threshold will not have a material impact. Await DfE data update to determine split of pupils between band 5 and 6, so no change to the consultation document where IDACI used.</p>

Unrestricted

Ref.	Item of change / decision / new issue / update	DfE doc ref	Proposed action
27	<p>6. The threshold that can be used to fund primary schools on low prior attainment data as a proxy to identify low cost, high incidence SEN pupils has been amended. Two options are available from the EYFSP; either fund all pupils scoring below 73 or all pupils scoring below 78 (78 was the original level set by DfE). There is no change for secondary schools with the funding threshold set at pupils who fail to achieve Level 4 or above in both English and mathematics at KS2.</p> <p>A second change is to include all pupils in school who have a valid test result. The original proposal was to use results only from pupils taking the most recent tests, and applying the relevant percentage as a proxy for the whole school.</p> <p>This is now recognised by DfE as potentially not being reflective of the attainment levels across the whole school.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Paras 33-34</p> <p>Operational guidance</p> <p>Para 14b</p>	<p>A new question will be added to the consultation to gather views from PRIMARY schools only as to whether they prefer the below 73 or below 78 score as the funding threshold. Clearly, using a score of 73 would target resources to a set of lower attainers and would allocate the same amount of funds at a higher unit of resource to fewer pupils. Current BF model uses the 78 score, and this represents around 20% of pupils taking the tests. We do not have an equivalent % figure for the below 73 score.</p> <p>We are reliant on DfE to supply relevant test data so are not in a position to accurately model the potential financial effect from using a score of 73. We are also reliant on the DfE in supplying test data from all pupils in schools that sat the tests.</p> <p>Therefore, in terms of financial exemplifications for the consultation document, we can only include the change from the model already shared with the Review Group i.e. using most recent test results as a proxy for the whole school, which we know will not be completely accurate. On balance, propose to include these exemplifications on the consultation document as it is likely to present a fair reflection of the final model.</p> <p>DfE have indicated that they propose to supply LAs with updated data in September. Provided this is received within the consultation period – to allow review and distribution by consultation response deadline of 28 September – an indication of the impact from this revision can be sent for schools for them to take into account before they make their responses.</p> <p>This change will also impact on the MFG figures quoted in the consultation.</p>
7.	<p>To recognise that the cost of supporting EAL pupils that enter secondary schools is likely to be higher than those in primary schools, DfE will now allow differential funding rates between phases, whereas originally one rate for all schools was required.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Para 36</p>	<p>None. BF has traditionally funded all EAL pupils at a flat rate, irrespective of age, and the exemplifications in the draft consultation document used a uniform per pupil rate of funding.</p>

Unrestricted

Ref.	Item of change / decision / new issue / update	DfE doc ref	Proposed action
8.	EAL data baseline will be updated so time spent in Y1 – Y6 for primary will count, not N1 or N2 which DfE previously included in the data set, and was therefore included in BF modelling, and Y7 – Y11 for secondary schools.	Operational guidance Para 14e	None. The exemplifications in the consultation will include N1 and N2 as the LA does not have core DfE data to extract relevant pupils. The significance of this change is unclear. Reference to this will be made in the consultation document.
9.	The cap on lump sum payments has been set at £200k , £50k above the maximum amount anticipated in the consultation. This is to protect smaller schools but the DfE indicate this amount will be reviewed during the year and a different cap may apply in 2014-15, if there is insufficient evidence to support the need for the higher amount.	School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14 Paras 38-43	None. Retain a maximum amount of £150k, as 13 primary schools need an aggregate top up of £174k to achieve the £150k amount. A £200k limit would require a further £50k top up for the 13 already below the £150k proposed amount, plus another 12 schools above £150k but below £200k would require a top up. Overall, a further £1.094m would need to be added to lump sum payments to fund a £200k amount, which is clearly a very significant amount. Propose BF review for 2014-15 in light of DfE decision on the cap.
10.	DfE have determined that a new factor will be added to the allowable list to reflect high pupil mobility to compensate schools for the greater costs incurred. DfE will supply the data – it has not yet been made available – that must be used, which will use October census to identify the start date of each pupil who started in the last three academic years, but did not start in August or September (or January for Year 1). Separate funding rates can be applied to primary and secondary schools.	School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14 Para 46b Operational guidance Para 11	Add a question to the consultation to ask whether schools agree that a mobility factor should be included, and that should the responses support this, the Review Group will make a recommendation to the Forum on how this should be dealt with, which could include a funding cap for this factor at the same amount in the current BF Formula of £18k (all primary related). Information in the guidance documents is not sufficiently clear on how this would operate in practice, but it seems that any school admitting pupils outside normal admission patterns would qualify for funding, if the factor is used. It's not clear if a threshold would need to be crossed to target funding to only schools that had say 10% or above of pupils admitted outside normal patterns, otherwise it is not targeted on a high pupil mobility basis, which is the purpose of the factor.
11.	Two further exceptions have been added to the calculation of the MFG. The Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) – where separate protection arrangements will apply as per Line 14 below – and rates.	School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14 Para 51	The previous calculations of MFG will be updated for the consultation document. This will also have an impact on the amount required to be recovered through the cap to be applied to schools gaining money.

Unrestricted

Ref.	Item of change / decision / new issue / update	DfE doc ref	Proposed action
12.	<p>Funding of new, reorganised or closing schools has been clarified. Subject to agreement by the School Members on the Schools Forum, funding for these purposes can be held within contingencies, calculated on a case by case basis.</p> <p>This affects Jennett's Park.</p>	<p>Operational guidance</p> <p>Para 18</p>	<p>A new question will be added to the consultation to gather views from schools as to whether they support retention of funds in such circumstances.</p> <p>If this is supported, the amount to be held will be determined by the Schools Forum through the normal budget setting process and would take account of actual needs.</p>
<u>Improving the way that local areas are funded</u>			
13.	<p>There will now be an uplift to the DSG allocations made by DfE to fund the Schools Budget to reflect deferred entries into reception classes. This will reflect the difference in Reception pupil numbers between the October and January counts of the previous academic year.</p> <p>The funding can be applied to all schools through the per pupil amount i.e. not just those with Reception pupils, or none, but if the per pupil amount is not used, it must be distributed through the Formula and not used to fund centrally retained expenditure.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Para 82</p> <p>Operational guidance</p> <p>Para 14g</p>	<p>New question to be added to the consultation to gather views on whether this funding should be allocated via an amount per pupil, or other basis.</p>
<u>Simplification of the arrangements for the funding of early years provisions</u>			
14.	<p>DfE propose to introduce an early years specific MFG to apply against all providers, including those in PVI settings.</p> <p>The same 1.5% cap on funding reductions would apply, but this would be against the 'base rate' only, amounting to £3.17 for maintained schools and £3.71 for PVI providers i.e. not against deprivation or quality supplements.</p>	<p>School Funding Reform: Arrangements for 2013-14</p> <p>Paras 122-125</p>	<p>The previous calculations of MFG will be updated for the consultation document, as set out above in line 11. There is no intention at this stage to reduce the base rate in the EYSFF, so no impact is anticipated on funding rates for Early Years providers.</p>

Unrestricted

Summary financial implications from the recommended changes to the BF Funding Formula for Schools

Ref	School	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	Low need Contingency allocation	Total Change	Change as a % of budget	MFG (Option A) top up/cap from Annex 3	Net change using 2012-2013 budget data	Change as a % of budget	Ref
		31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	31-May-12	14-Jun-12	14-Jun-12	14-Jun-12	14-Jun-12						
Date of review group meeting																			
1	Ascot Heath Infant	£13,123	£3,926	£2,897	£28,385	£0	£1,406	£0	£0	£1,668	£14,447	£1,082	£0	£30,083	4.48%	£23,098	£6,985	1.04%	1
2	Ascot Heath CE Junior	£12,285	£561	£8,299	£44,096	£0	£573	£0	£0	£632	£3,795	£10,795	£0	£32,467	4.20%	£25,447	£7,020	0.91%	2
3	Binfield CE Aided Primary	£5,559	£4,487	£7,239	£413	£0	£429	£0	£0	£1,405	£3,038	£4,949	£0	£1,924	0.49%	£0	£1,924	0.49%	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	£13,975	£21,932	£8,479	£28,087	£0	£475	£384	£0	£608	£6,782	£6,525	£0	£28,774	-1.65%	£11,518	£17,256	-0.99%	4
5	College Town Infant and Nursery	£34,580	£4,135	£12,973	£29,888	£0	£2,895	£0	£0	£1,125	£17,898	£9,893	£0	£42,126	5.50%	£30,842	£11,283	1.47%	5
6	College Town Junior	£7,195	£5,422	£9,102	£31,984	£0	£2,299	£0	£0	£934	£1,293	£9,488	£0	£29,752	3.41%	£24,496	£5,256	0.60%	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	£5,819	£1,683	£2,380	£12,755	£0	£215	£0	£0	£255	£11,461	£2,615	£0	£2,623	0.68%	£0	£2,623	0.68%	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	£5,320	£27,206	£5,575	£44,064	£0	£337	£0	£0	£3,659	£4,775	£4,775	£0	£90,250	-7.32%	£75,141	£15,109	-1.23%	8
9	Crowthorne CE Primary	£1,415	£2,244	£1,031	£19,490	£0	£577	£0	£0	£87	£5,051	£7,887	£0	£24,675	3.61%	£19,430	£5,244	0.77%	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	£6,017	£35,059	£6,334	£3,827	£0	£168	£253	£0	£4,750	£20,041	£8,834	£0	£84,777	-10.02%	£90,085	£5,308	0.63%	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	£29,581	£25,380	£1,911	£35,393	£0	£468	£425	£0	£697	£10,172	£41,091	£37,000	£28,214	2.57%	£0	£28,214	2.57%	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	£977	£2,446	£6,545	£101,945	£0	£207	£637	£0	£3,118	£11,501	£4,364	£0	£79,410	-3.05%	£48,968	£30,442	-1.17%	12
13	Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	£25,495	£8,914	£3,044	£45,797	£0	£2,083	£0	£0	£548	£13,976	£1,880	£0	£49,869	6.09%	£34,824	£15,045	1.84%	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	£16,163	£14,572	£20,491	£27,857	£0	£4	£0	£0	£426	£893	£18,075	£0	£1,785	0.13%	£3,301	£1,516	-0.11%	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	£7,854	£11,728	£4,185	£47,224	£0	£28	£0	£0	£3,300	£28,653	£7,105	£0	£22,037	3.66%	£17,874	£4,162	0.69%	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	£5,855	£23,287	£16,138	£48,347	£0	£176	£0	£0	£1,891	£12,958	£4,171	£0	£16,146	-0.60%	£0	£16,146	-0.60%	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	£5,955	£374	£643	£29,295	£0	£161	£0	£0	£1,419	£9,905	£8,282	£0	£4,912	0.90%	£0	£4,912	0.90%	17
18	Owismoor Primary	£9,663	£10,784	£9,793	£15,897	£0	£331	£212	£0	£262	£7,649	£8,387	£0	£46,733	-2.58%	£48,207	£1,473	0.08%	18
19	The Pines Primary and Nursery	£7,070	£20,440	£6,346	£25,315	£0	£287	£212	£0	£4,764	£11,478	£6,217	£0	£41,866	-4.66%	£35,950	£5,916	-0.66%	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	£2,805	£8,349	£5,563	£98,848	£0	£622	£192	£0	£5,666	£10,499	£6,117	£0	£65,028	-2.76%	£47,878	£17,150	-0.73%	20
21	St Joseph's Catholic Primary	£5,112	£15,706	£4,909	£12,340	£0	£706	£0	£0	£848	£8,561	£11,807	£0	£28,575	-3.23%	£19,071	£9,505	-1.08%	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	£113	£19,071	£2,786	£7,197	£0	£396	£0	£0	£1,435	£6,808	£4,357	£0	£21,958	3.28%	£18,572	£3,386	0.51%	22
23	St Michael's Easthamstead CE Aided Primary	£3,187	£4,161	£5,063	£22,823	£0	£168	£212	£0	£887	£2,325	£3,011	£0	£19,316	2.63%	£0	£19,316	2.63%	23
24	St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	£3,834	£374	£8,856	£33,696	£0	£244	£0	£0	£927	£4,220	£9,287	£0	£31,433	4.68%	£24,028	£7,404	1.10%	24
25	Uplands Primary	£3,865	£0	£6,415	£12,268	£0	£200	£0	£0	£1,413	£9,876	£9,126	£0	£27,829	-3.38%	£18,913	£8,916	-1.08%	25
26	Warfield CE Primary	£5,941	£748	£2,772	£20,901	£0	£107	£0	£0	£659	£6,861	£6,586	£0	£1,064	0.16%	£0	£1,064	0.16%	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	£14,724	£2,992	£3,896	£15,110	£0	£590	£0	£0	£1,956	£6,343	£2,548	£0	£24,397	-1.33%	£5,262	£19,135	-1.04%	27
28	Wildmoor Heath	£9,239	£4,300	£8,039	£13,023	£0	£945	£233	£0	£1,361	£25,112	£911	£0	£31,907	-4.20%	£24,985	£6,922	-0.91%	28
29	Wildridings Primary	£5,247	£21,162	£30,130	£4,297	£0	£1,430	£404	£0	£762	£2,415	£1,898	£0	£8,798	1.10%	£0	£8,798	1.10%	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	£14,240	£0	£16,748	£35,247	£0	£694	£0	£0	£1,718	£5,116	£17,584	£0	£52,635	7.70%	£36,020	£16,615	2.43%	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	£5,904	£31,857	£6,753	£11,415	£0	£377	£404	£0	£3,301	£10,181	£15,429	£0	£17,616	1.80%	£0	£17,616	1.80%	31
32	The Brakenhale	£11,148	£106,047	£16,524	£36,068	£13,860	£762	£233	£0	£5,027	£9,476	£553	£0	£55,170	-1.21%	£0	£55,170	-1.21%	32
33	Easthamstead Park Community School	£13,225	£39,614	£8,568	£56,687	£11,289	£562	£566	£0	£447	£4,984	£33,578	£0	£156,412	4.08%	£125,527	£30,884	0.80%	33
34	Edgarrow	£16,113	£11,933	£27,374	£2,410	£37,538	£425	£172	£0	£2,025	£4,973	£67,868	£62,000	£37,974	-0.86%	£0	£37,974	-0.86%	34
35	Garth Hill College	£29,948	£31,902	£18,601	£85,770	£19,216	£2,574	£40	£0	£84	£12,607	£15,108	£0	£210,535	3.56%	£175,639	£34,895	0.59%	35
36	Ranelagh CE	£4,548	£16,365	£10,777	£90,890	£11,593	£544	£384	£0	£9,114	£6,158	£99,529	£91,000	£93,870	-2.64%	£44,459	£49,412	-1.39%	36
37	Sandhurst	£52,684	£6,233	£5,542	£90,045	£18,421	£3,022	£20	£0	£6,644	£3,039	£10,559	£0	£143,219	-3.30%	£82,063	£61,156	-1.41%	37
Total Primary		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£7,889	£799	£0	£0	£111,392	£82,401	£37,000	£148,105		£174,645	£26,540		
Total Secondary		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£7,889	£799	£0	£0	£111,392	£107,599	£153,000	£36,714		£174,645	£137,931		
TOTAL Primary and Secondary		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£190,000	£111,391		£0	£111,391		

The £60,980 allocated to schools below MFG in 2012-2013 has yet to be re-allocated in the revised formula allocation.

Summary:

There is no reference to Appendix B Early Years Single Funding Formula or C rates, as there is no funding implication arising from these factors.

The difference of £111,392 in column M is the deduction in budget that is proposed to create a Contingency fund to assist schools where necessary to meet the KS 1 class size requirement of classes up to 30 pupils.
Paragraphs 72-75 of the consultation document sets out this proposal.

Pry Max increase.	£52,635	7.70%	£28,214	2.63%
Pry Max reduction.	£90,250	-10.02%	£30,442	-1.23%
Sec Max increase.	£210,535	4.08%	£34,895	0.80%
Sec Max reduction.	£143,219	-3.30%	£61,156	-1.41%

This page is intentionally left blank

Impact of the Minimum Funding Guarantee and capping options for schools gaining through the Funding reforms

Ref	School	Total increases as a result of New Formula (As per Annex 2)	Total reductions as a result of New Formula (As per Annex 2)	Schools above MFG 2013 - 2014	Top up to be paid to schools below MFG 2013 - 2014	Per pupil share 2012 - 2013	Per pupil share 2013 - 2014	Schools to contribute to capping			Ref
								Per pupil increase from 2012-2013 for schools above MFG	% Initial change in per pupil share from 2012-2013 for schools above MFG	Gainers over 3% scaled to retain 40% of the gain. Gainers up to 3% keep all of the gain.	
1	Ascot Heath Infant	£30,083	£38,380	£0	£2,711	£2,859	£147	5.44%	£23,098	£19,424	1
2	Ascot Heath CE Junior	£32,467	£42,282	£0	£2,715	£2,850	£135	4.96%	£25,447	£21,399	2
3	Binfield CE Aided Primary	£1,924	£19,509	£0	£2,818	£2,823	£5	0.16%	£0	£9,873	3
4	Birch Hill Primary	-£28,774	£0	-£11,518	£2,996	£2,921	£194	6.93%	£30,842	£25,936	4
5	College Town Infant and Nursery	£42,126	£51,247	£0	£2,802	£2,996	£104	4.08%	£24,496	£20,600	5
6	College Town Junior	£29,752	£40,703	£0	£2,562	£2,666	£14	0.47%	£0	£5,549	6
7	Cranbourne Primary	£2,623	£10,964	£0	£2,881	£2,895	£118	4.86%	£19,430	£16,340	7
8	Crown Wood Primary	-£90,250	£0	-£75,141	£3,473	£3,162	£93	2.71%	£0	£22,177	8
9	Crowthorne CE Primary	£24,675	£32,285	£0	£2,428	£2,546	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	9
10	Fox Hill Primary	-£84,777	£0	-£90,085	£3,785	£3,219	£167	4.31%	£17,874	£15,031	10
11	Great Hollands Primary	£28,214	£43,820	£0	£3,445	£3,538	£240	9.36%	£34,824	£29,285	11
12	Harmans Water Primary	-£79,410	£0	-£48,968	£3,295	£3,166	£240	9.36%	£34,824	£29,285	12
13	Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	£49,869	£57,863	£0	£2,562	£2,802	£167	4.31%	£17,874	£15,031	13
14	Holly Spring Junior	-£1,785	£0	-£3,301	£2,608	£2,554	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	14
15	Jennetts Park Primary	£22,037	£29,700	£0	£3,870	£4,037	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	15
16	Meadow Vale Primary	£4,912	£4,657	£0	£3,015	£2,980	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	16
17	New Scotland Hill Primary	£4,912	£13,547	£0	£2,822	£2,846	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	17
18	Owlsmoor Primary	-£46,733	£0	-£48,207	£2,999	£2,848	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	18
19	The Pines Primary and Nursery	-£41,866	£0	-£35,950	£3,395	£3,153	£24	0.85%	£0	£6,856	19
20	Sandy Lane Primary	-£65,028	£0	-£47,878	£3,187	£3,055	£107	3.70%	£18,572	£15,617	20
21	St Joseph's Catholic Primary	-£28,575	£0	-£19,071	£3,061	£2,923	£80	2.83%	£0	£14,951	21
22	St Margaret Clitherow Catholic Primary	£21,958	£30,858	£0	£2,894	£3,002	£146	5.55%	£24,028	£20,206	22
23	St Michael's Easthampstead CE Aided Primary	£19,316	£29,541	£0	£2,817	£2,897	£28	0.80%	£0	£12,808	23
24	St Michael's CE Aided Primary (Sandhurst)	£31,433	£39,925	£0	£2,621	£2,767	£261	10.94%	£36,020	£30,290	24
25	Uplands Primary	-£27,829	£0	-£18,913	£2,899	£2,764	£55	1.84%	£0	£16,194	25
26	Warfield CE Primary	-£1,064	£7,702	£0	£2,851	£2,846	£28	0.80%	£0	£12,808	26
27	Whitegrove Primary	-£24,397	£0	-£5,262	£2,873	£2,818	£261	10.94%	£36,020	£30,290	27
28	Wildmoor Heath	-£31,907	£0	-£24,985	£2,831	£2,635	£55	1.84%	£0	£16,194	28
29	Wildridings Primary	£8,798	£25,307	£0	£3,472	£3,500	£28	0.80%	£0	£12,808	29
30	Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	£52,635	£59,850	£0	£2,381	£2,642	£261	10.94%	£36,020	£30,290	30
31	Wooden Hill Primary and Nursery	£17,616	£31,998	£0	£3,006	£3,061	£55	1.84%	£0	£16,194	31
32	The Brakenhale	-£55,170	£8,807	£0	£4,682	£4,621	£211	4.50%	£125,527	£105,560	32
33	Easthampstead Park Community School	£156,412	£208,574	£0	£4,687	£4,897	£167	3.88%	£175,639	£147,701	33
34	Edgbarrow	-£37,974	£23,584	£0	£4,166	£4,128	£167	3.88%	£175,639	£147,701	34
35	Garth Hill College	£210,535	£291,839	£0	£4,292	£4,458	£167	3.88%	£175,639	£147,701	35
36	Ranelagh CE	-£93,870	£0	-£44,459	£4,323	£4,200	£0		£0	£0	36
37	Sandhurst	-£143,219	£0	-£82,063	£4,398	£4,244	£0		£0	£0	37
Total Primary		£420,437	£610,139	-£429,278					£254,633	£302,538	
Total Secondary		£366,946	£532,804	-£126,522					£301,167	£253,261	
TOTAL Primary and Secondary		£787,383	£1,142,943	-£555,799					£555,799	£555,799	
		-£111,391									

Summary:

Option A

Option B

The difference of £111,391 is the deduction in budget that is proposed to create a Contingency fund to assist schools where necessary to meet the KS 1 class size requirement of classes up to 30 pupils. Paragraphs 72-75 of the consultation document sets out this proposal.

Sec Max contribution. £36,020
 Sec Min contribution. £17,874

Number of schools contributing to MFG

Primary 10
 Secondary 2

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 19 JULY 2012

**2011-12 PROVISIONAL OUTTURN ON THE SCHOOLS BUDGET
AND OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS
(Director of Children, Young People and Learning)**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform members of the Schools Forum on the provisional outturn on the 2011-12 Schools Budget and to confirm the level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) to be received in 2012-13.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Forum NOTES:

- 2.1 That the outturn expenditure for 2011-12, subject to audit, shows spend of £75.476m which is £2.366m less than the approved budget (paragraph 5.3);
- 2.2 The current balances on specific earmarked reserves within the Schools Budget amount to £5.98m (Table 1, paragraph 5.7);
- 2.3 That the DSG for 2012-13 has now been confirmed at £76.487m, £0.387m above the amount included in the budget and £0.058m more than that originally anticipated (paragraph 5.10).

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The recommendations are intended to inform the Schools Forum of financial performance against budget in the 2011-12 financial year and confirmed DSG income for 2012-13.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 Not appropriate.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

2011-12 Schools Budget Revenue Expenditure

- 5.1 In March 2011, the Schools Forum approved a draft Schools Budget for 2011-12 of £74.675m. This was to be funded from the estimated amount of DSG income that would be received from the DfE (£74.445m) and the accumulated surplus balance on the Schools Budget (£0.230m).

- 5.2 Subsequent to this decision, and using the latest available information for the DSG calculation, the Executive Member approved expenditure of £74.754m. This figure was further updated to £77.842m by adding £5.248m to reflect sixth form grant income from the Young Peoples Learning Agency (YPLA), with a £2.160m deduction in respect of the conversion of Ranelagh to an academy school, with funding thereafter paid directly to Ranelagh by the YPLA and not through the council's accounts.

Provisional Outturn Position

- 5.3 The provisional final accounts include net expenditure in the Schools Budget of £75.476m, an under spend by £2.366m. This comprises over spendings of £1.041m against approved budget allocations and under spendings of £3.407m. These figures remain subject to change, pending external audit, although no significant movement is anticipated.
- 5.4 An explanation of the main changes from the approved budget plan are as follows:
- i. **Delegated School Budgets - £1.756m under spend.** This is the change in balances during the year that are directly under the control of schools and funded through the Council's Funding Formula for Schools. They are earmarked to individual schools for use in subsequent years.
Note: whilst the transfer to school reserves is £1.756m, the real level of in-year increase is £0.784m as £0.972m of under spendings were financed from the Standards Fund Grant, which has subsequently been mainstreamed into the DSG and is no longer paid as a separate grant. Mainstreaming the Standards Fund into delegated budgets creates a one-off transfer to school reserves. More information on school balances is provided on a separate report on this agenda.
 - ii. **SEN provisions and support services - £0.065m over spend.** The most significant element of over spending relates to the cost of external placements for pupils with SEN where spend was £0.141m above budget. This reflects a small increase in the number of pupils placed compared to those anticipated when the budget was set. This was partially offset by savings of £0.060m saving on the Teaching and Support Service, mainly as a result of holding posts vacant during a restructure in the Team, together with reduced premises costs. Other minor variances occurred across the range of support services.
 - iii. **Education out of school - £0.066m over spend.** There are two main variances; additional costs were incurred to meet the new statutory requirements around supporting pupils out of school, which amounted to £0.030m; and a £0.036m over spend on the costs of home tuition.
 - iv. **Pupil behaviour - £0.045m under spend.** There was a £0.028m under spend at the Behaviour Support Team, mainly on staffing, as a result of the Head of Service retiring and the post temporarily held vacant. Other minor variances occurred across the range of other support services.
 - v. **School staff absence and other items - £0.009m under spend.** A number of variances occurred across a range of services that support schools, of which the most significant comprised £0.035m under spending on the school contingency, mainly from less in-year allocations to Kennel Lane than anticipated; an £0.018m under

spending on official school staff absences; a £0.037m over spending on school rates, following revaluations as a result of the school building programme; and £0.031m over spend on implementing the new broadband and internet service for schools during the transition from one provider to another.

- vi. **Combined Service Budgets - £0.052m under spend.** These budgets support the every child matters agenda and when combined with budgets for similar services that are funded by the Council can result in a greater overall impact and educational benefit. Support to looked after children under spent by £0.035m, mainly from reduced school transport costs, with £0.17m under spending at the Margaret Wells Furby Children's Resource Centre as a result of a requiring a lower level of service delivery than allowed for in the budget.
- vii. **Early Years provisions and support services - £0.253m under spend.** £0.184m of the under spending relates to a Standards Fund grant to support early years provisions which when the budget was set, was expected to be repaid to the DfE and not be available to carry forward into 2011-12. The remaining under spend results from a lower level of take up of the free entitlement to education and child care than provided for in the budget.
- viii. **Support to schools in financial difficulty – £0.154m under spend.** As previously reported to the Forum, only one school qualified for support from the financial difficulties budget, resulting in a £0.154m under spend.
- ix. **DSG – change from original estimate - £0.328m additional income.** The DfE confirmed a final DSG allocation of £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.
- x. **Under spend brought forward - £0.230m over spend.** With centrally managed budgets under spending, there was no requirement to transfer the planned contribution from balances.

Annex A sets out the full Schools Budget at a summary level, with the above notes referencing to the appropriate lines with budget variances.

Balances and reserves

- 5.5 As part of the financial planning process, the Council considers the establishment and maintenance of reserves and balances. Earmarked Reserves are sums of money which have been set aside for specific purposes and a number of Schools Budget reserves have been created, following requests from the Schools Forum. Each year these reserves can have funds added or deducted depending on financial performance and the purposes for which they were created.

5.6 In February 2012, when it became clear that the Schools Budget would significantly under spend, the Forum agreed to allocate £0.9m of the forecast under spend to new earmarked reserves. These related to:

1. £0.500m 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 to help finance any additional costs falling on schools from the Job Evaluation exercise

5.7 New reserves have therefore been created, although as a result of completing some early preparatory works, the SEN resource unit initiative spent £0.009m, and the Turnaround project spent £0.012m, the total now available in these reserves has reduced to £0.491m and £0.088m respectively

Table 1 below provides a summary of movements and current balances on the earmarked reserves.

Table 1: Earmarked reserves related to the Schools Budget

Reserve	Balance B/Forward 1-Apr-2011 £ 000	Movement in year £ 000	Balance 31-Mar-2012 £ 000
<u>School Balances:</u>			
Primary	-1,238	-1,415	-2,652
Secondary	-1,353	-298	-1,651
Special	-185	-43	-228
	<u>-2,776</u>	<u>-1,756</u>	<u>-4,531</u>
<u>Family Tree Reserve</u>			
Family Tree Nursery Reserve (closed)	-110	20	-90
	<u>-110</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>-90</u>
<u>Discretionary Schools Budget Carry Forwards</u>			
Crownwood LAL (closed)	-11	11	0
College Hall PRU	-122	26	-96
	<u>-133</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>-96</u>
<u>Unused Schools Budget Balance</u>			
Unallocated Schools Budget	-595	197	-398
	<u>-595</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>-398</u>
<u>New Reserves for 2011-12</u>			
SEN Resource Units Reserve	0	-491	-491
Turnaround Project Reserve	0	-88	-88
Schools Job Evaluation Reserve	0	-285	-285
	<u>0</u>	<u>-864</u>	<u>-864</u>
Total earmarked reserves	-3,614	-2,366	-5,980

- 5.8 The movement in year column from Table 1 reconciles to the net variance for the year at Annex A at £2.366m. The £1.756m under spending on delegated and devolved funding has been transferred into the earmarked school balances reserve.
- 5.9 Table 1 above shows that the accumulated unused balance on the Schools Budget totals £0.398m. This funding can only be used to support expenditure in the Schools Budget. In setting the 2012-13 Schools Budget, it was agreed that £0.230m of balances could be spent. Therefore, £0.168m of balance on the unallocated Schools Budget balance remains uncommitted.

Confirmed DSG allocation for 2012-13

- 5.10 DfE have now confirmed the amount of DSG for 2012-13 at £76.487m which is £0.387m higher than the budget. In setting the budget £0.243m was set aside as a contingency for in-year cost pressures. Furthermore, £0.086m was set aside for the LACSEG deduction for academy schools. The remaining £0.058m variance is accounted for by slight differences between DfE census numbers and BFC calculated equivalents. These are now subject to checking.
- 5.11 Proposals for the use of the additional DSG and unallocated Schools Budget balance will be brought to the Schools Forum in September with the first budget monitoring report for the year.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

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

Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The financial implications arising from this report are set out in the supporting information. The budget variances were reviewed during the year and where appropriate, have been built into the 2012-13 budget.

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 Not applicable.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

2011-12 provisional final accounts

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI

(01344 354061)

David.Watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance

(01344 354054)

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

Doc. Ref

G:\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\57) 190712\2011-12 Schools Budget outturn.doc

2011-12 PROVISIONAL OUTTURN STATEMENT FOR THE SCHOOLS BUDGET

	Approved Budget			Estimated Variance			Note
	Expenditure	Income	Net	Under spending	Over spending	Net variance	
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	
<u>Delegated and devolved funding</u>							
Delegated School Budgets	65,481	0	65,481	-1,784	29	-1,756	i
Other School Grants	0	-5,248	-5,248	0	0	0	
	65,481	-5,248	60,233	-1,784	29	-1,756	
<u>LEA managed items</u>							
SEN provisions and support services	6,813	-985	5,828	-153	218	65	ii
Education out of school	1,069	-4	1,065	-19	85	66	iii
Pupil behaviour	534	-7	527	-56	11	-45	iv
School staff absence and other items	1,125	-20	1,105	-209	200	-9	v
Combined Service Budgets	591	0	591	-73	21	-52	vi
Early Years provisions and support services	3,102	-12	3,090	-500	247	-253	vii
Support to schools in financial difficulty	155	0	155	-154	0	-154	viii
Standards Fund LEA Managed	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	13,389	-1,028	12,361	-1,164	782	-382	
Dedicated Schools Grant	0	-72,364	-72,364	-459	0	-459	ix
Underspend brought forward	0	-230	-230	0	230	230	x
TOTAL - Schools Budget	78,870	-78,870	0	-3,407	1,041	-2,366	

1. Total income of £77.842m is from grants and unspent balances only.

See paragraph 5.4 for an explanation to the notes to variances.

Earmarked reserves relating to the Schools Budget

Reserve	Purpose	Policy	Value
School Balances	These funds are used to support future expenditure within the Schools Budget relating to individual school balances.	Balances are permitted to be retained by Schools under the Schools Standards & Framework Act 1998. Policies are set and the reserves are managed by schools and the LA has no practical control over the level of balances.	March 09 £1.899m March 10 £1.617m March 11 £2.776m March 12 £4.531m
Family Tree Nursery	A reserve was created following the agreement to set up a self funding Nursery. It holds fee income from ongoing trading.	Although the Nursery has now been closed there may still be some one-off costs to be met in 2012/13, including the potential requirement to repay DfE start-up grant.	March 09 £0.112m March 10 £0.110m March 11 £0.110m March 12 £0.090m
Discretionary Schools Budget Carry Forwards	The statutory requirement to carry forward school balances has been extended to cover those held for the Language & Literacy Unit and College Hall Pupil Referral Unit.	Budget Carry Forwards are permitted in accordance with the scheme set out in BF financial regulations. The Language and Literacy Unit has now closed.	March 09 £0.172m March 10 £0.198m March 11 £0.133m March 12 £0.096m
SEN Resource Units	To set aside in a reserve for building adaptations to allow for the creation of SEN resource units on school sites.	To finance capital expenditure to assist with the development of local, cost effective provisions to support pupils with SEN	March 12 £0.491m

Reserve	Purpose	Policy	Value
Turnaround Project	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.	To consider the effectiveness of a new approach to maintaining children in schools that are at risk of exclusion.	March 12 £0.088m
Job Evaluation	To set aside an earmarked reserve for the Job Evaluation exercise	To help finance costs arising from the implementation of the Job Evaluation Review.	March 12 £0.285m
Unallocated Schools Budget Balance	The Schools Budget is a ring fenced account, fully funded by external grants, the most significant of which is the Dedicated Schools Grant. Any under or overspending remaining at the end of the financial year must be carried forward to the next year's Schools Budget.	This reserve is held for specific accounting reasons. The funds in this reserve are ring fenced and cannot be used for any other purpose than a future years' Schools Budget.	March 09 £0.360m March 10 £0.139m March 11 £0.595m March 12 £0.398m

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
Date 19 JULY 2012

2011-12 SCHOOL BALANCES AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS (Director of Children, Young People and Learning)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update members of the Schools Forum on the level of balances held by schools as at 31 March 2012 and how these compare to the previous financial year.
- 1.2 The Forum is also requested to agree an extension of one year to the licensed deficit agreement at Cranbourne Primary, which would then become fully repaid by 31 March, 2014.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Forum NOTES:

- 2.1 **The level of aggregate surplus revenue balances as at 31 March 2012 totalled £4.531m, an increase of £0.784m (21.0%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.3 (1));**
- 2.2 **That at 6.7% of annual income, average surplus balances are in excess of the amount required for working balances and that more funds could have been spent by schools on their key priorities (paragraph 5.3 (3));**
- 2.3 **That significant surplus revenue balances totalled £1.1m, an increase of £0.385m (54%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.7);**
- 2.4 **That £0.827m of Devolved Formula Capital grant remained unspent at 31 March 2012, a decrease of £0.707m (53.8%) from the previous year (paragraph 5.11 (1));**
- 2.5 **That £0.211m of Devolved Formula Capital grant must be spent by schools by 31 August 2012, or returned to the DfE (paragraph 5.11 (3)).**

That the Schools Forum AGREES:

- 2.6 **That the repayment term for the £0.050m licensed deficit previously agreed for Cranbourne Primary School be extended by one year, for full repayment to be made by 31 March 2014 (paragraph 5.3 (6)).**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 **It is appropriate for the Schools Forum to be aware of, and where relevant, comment on these financial matters.**

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 Not applicable.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Calculating Statutory School Balances

5.1 The School Standards and Framework Act 1998 provides a statutory requirement for the balance of expenditure made by each school compared to its budget share to be carried forward for use by individual governing bodies in the next financial year. This applies to both surplus and deficit balances and relates to all revenue funds held by schools in local authority accounts.

5.2 Attached at Annex A is a list of individual school balances as at 31 March 2012. For comparison, the annex also shows the change from the 2010-11 year end position. Annex B provides a summary profile of deficit and surplus balances.

5.3 Some comments on the analysis are as follows:

1. Aggregate surplus balances have increased by £0.784m, from £3.747m to £4.531m. This is an increase of 21%.
2. There has been a net increase in surplus balances in the primary sector of £0.811m (+44.1%). Aggregate surpluses in the secondary and special sectors have decreased by £0.027m (-1.4%).
3. On average, at 6.7% of total budget, overall reserves are considered to be at a more than adequate level required for working balances to cover unforeseen circumstances and therefore more money could have been spent by schools on their key objectives.
4. The aggregate surplus balance of £4.531m comprises £4.560m from surpluses (was £3.822m) and £0.029m in deficits (was £0.076m). Surplus balances are increasing with deficits reducing.
5. The largest surplus balance as a percentage of budget is 19.1% (was 15.1%) and the greatest deficit is 4.4% (was 8.7%). There are limited circumstances where a surplus balance of 19.1% of annual income can be warranted.
6. Cranbourne Primary was the only school in deficit at the end of the 2011-12 financial year, which is a reduction of three schools compared to the previous year. The school is in deficit by £0.029m and has an agreed £0.050m licensed deficit. Whilst this has reduced by £0.023m during the course of the year, the governing body has requested that the repayment schedule be extended by a further year to 31 March 2014. A medium term budget plan is in place that governors are committed to deliver to which shows a return to surplus by 31 March 2014. The Forum is therefore asked to approve the requested extension. If agreed Cranbourne will have been in deficit for 5 years, which is the maximum allowed under the Scheme for Financing Schools.

Reasons for the increase in balances

- 5.4 For the second consecutive year, this level of increase in school balances was not expected but it is significant and therefore explanations have been requested from schools. There is no proposal to claw-back any money, but a better understanding of the reasons for the increase will help with the construction of next year's budget. Primary schools that have increased their surplus by £15,000 or more during the year and secondaries with increases of more than £50,000 were asked to give reasons for their increase. This covers 17 primary and 2 secondary / special schools and £1.046m.
- 5.5 A summary of responses is as follows, with some schools having more than one reason for the increase in surplus:
- 15 schools had lower than expected spend on teachers, totalling £0.411m.
 - 9 schools incurred lower than expected spend on non-teaching staff, totalling £0.058m.
 - 8 schools received additional grant and other income in excess of original expectations, totalling £0.061m.
 - 7 schools set aside funds for 2012-13 to contribute to large scale projects, totalling £0.124m.
 - 3 schools set aside money for anticipated future budget reductions or saved money to recover from a deficit, totalling £0.236m.
 - 10 schools gave a range of reasons, including savings on training, general supplies and services, totalling £0.134m.

It seems from the responses received from schools that a large number of schools have held posts vacant in order to be better placed to deal with the difficult financial environment that they will face in the coming years.

Significant surplus balances

- 5.6 Whilst the statutory requirement to consider claw-back of significant surplus balances has been removed, the Forum recently agreed that a claw-back scheme should be applied from 2012-13 accounts, where significant balances are not being held for a valid purpose. To help inform schools of their position relative to the claw-back scheme, the relevant calculations have been made on 2011-12 balances and circulated. Members of the Forum will recall that balances in excess of 5% for secondary schools or 8% for primary or special schools have been defined as significant.
- 5.7 Fifteen schools are assessed to have a significant surplus, which compares to nine at the end of 2010-11, of which eight continue with a significant surplus for the fourth consecutive year. The aggregate level of significant surplus balances stands at £1.1m, an increase of £0.385m (54%).
- 5.8 It is important that schools carefully plan their budgets and balance the need to hold funding as a contingency for the future whilst at the same time ensuring the maximum investment is made in the school each year to help achieve improvement targets. A prudent approach to spending is recommended in the current economic climate, but it should not in itself lead to continued increases in balances and should be balanced against needs of current pupils in schools.

Capital Funding

- 5.9 Schools receive direct funding for capital projects through the DfE Devolved Formula Capital Grant (DFC). DFC is allocated through a national formula in response to the continuing need for additional resources to be spent on improving the condition and suitability of school accommodation as well as ICT hardware. Individual projects need to be at least £2,000 to qualify as capital related expenditure and need to be approved by the Council before they can proceed. Schools can pool their funding amongst each other or add it as a contribution to projects undertaken by the Council. Funding must be spent on eligible expenditure within 3 years and one term of receipt or be returned to the DfE.
- 5.10 As voluntary aided (VA) schools own and are responsible for the maintenance of their buildings, different arrangements are in place, outside local authority accounts, and therefore, information on the 5 VA schools in Bracknell Forest are not available for inclusion in this report.

Annex C provides a summary of individual school balances of DFC as at 31 March 2012.

- 5.11 Some comments on the analysis are as follows:
1. Aggregate unspent balances have decreased by £0.707m, from £1.534m to £0.827m. This is a decrease of 54% and is mainly accounted for through a number of significant schemes being completed, including joint funded projects at the Council, most notably, New Scotland Hill, Edgbarrow and Kennel Lane.
 2. The level of capital balances are not considered excessive as schools tend to save funds over a number of years before committing to significant projects.
 3. 9 schools are in danger of having to return unspent grant at 31 August 2012, which could in total aggregate to £0.211m. Relevant schools have been informed of this risk and all have indicated that plans are in place to spend the funds.

Conclusions

- 5.12 At 6.7%, the aggregate level of school revenue balances is considered to be higher than required to cover normal in-year variances against the budget and suggests that more money could have been spent in-year on key priorities. Within the overall total, as should be expected, a small number of schools are running deficits in order to implement financial change over the medium term, in a managed way.
- 5.13 In respect of capital grants, the majority of schools continue to secure total funding for a project from DFC before it commences, hence balances are 2.7 times greater than annual funding allocations. With DFC funding having been reduced by approximately 80% from April 2011, schools will be undertaking much lower value projects in the future and will therefore need to carefully consider which are their highest priority projects.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

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

Borough Treasurer

6.2 The financial implications of the report are outlined in the supporting information.

Equalities Impact Assessment

6.3 There are no specific impact assessments arising from this report.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

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

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 Not applicable, applying statutory regulations.

Method of Consultation

7.2 Not applicable.

Representations Received

7.3 Not applicable.

Background Papers

School Balances from BFC final accounts for 2011-12
Scheme for Financing Schools

Contact for further information

David Watkins, Chief Officer: SR&EI
david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

(01344 354061)

Paul Clark, Head of Departmental Finance
<mailto:paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk>

(01344 354054)

Doc. Ref

Doc. Ref \NewAlluse\Executive\Schools Forum\57) 190712\School Balances 2011-12.doc

2011-12 School Revenue Balances

School	2011-12 Budget	Carry forward		Significant Surplus	Change from 2010-11	Percentage of total Budget last year	Change in Percentage of total Budget
		Total Amount	Percentage of total budget				
Ascot Heath Infant	£724,875	-£31,935	-4.41%	£0	£13,514	-6.66%	2.26%
Ascot Heath CE Junior	£866,766	-£62,998	-7.27%	£0	-£14,940	-5.81%	-1.46%
Binfield CE Primary	£1,312,238	-£1,060	-0.08%	£0	£14,127	-1.19%	1.10%
Birch Hill Primary	£1,522,532	-£121,514	-7.98%	£0	-£47,470	-5.28%	-2.70%
College Town Infant & Nursery	£945,444	-£68,291	-7.22%	£0	-£859	-7.95%	0.73%
College Town Junior	£956,340	-£239	-0.02%	£0	-£19,645	2.12%	-2.14%
Cranbourne Primary	£650,653	£28,708	4.41%	£0	-£22,835	8.65%	-4.24%
Crown Wood Primary	£1,174,570	-£105,852	-9.01%	-£11,886	-£29,406	-7.01%	-2.00%
Crowthorne CE Primary	£770,040	-£44,204	-5.74%	£0	£1,867	-6.28%	0.54%
Fox Hill Primary	£777,670	-£37,824	-4.86%	£0	-£22,551	-2.01%	-2.85%
Great Hollands Primary School	£1,547,915	-£79,690	-5.15%	£0	-£41,958	-2.77%	-2.37%
Harmanswater Primary	£2,555,554	-£489,615	-19.16%	-£285,171	-£159,974	-15.05%	-4.11%
Holly Spring Infant	£883,826	-£32,015	-3.62%	£0	£32,858	-8.15%	4.53%
Holly Spring Junior	£951,677	-£129,154	-13.57%	-£53,020	-£4,392	-14.80%	1.22%
Jennets Park Primary School	£529,036	-£35,322	0.00%	£0	-£39,322	0.00%	0.00%
Meadow Vale Primary	£1,856,463	-£124,826	-6.72%	£0	£6,410	-7.52%	0.80%
New Scotland Hill Primary	£793,431	-£25,261	-3.18%	£0	-£18,336	-0.95%	-2.23%
Owlsmoor Primary	£1,691,463	-£152,150	-9.00%	-£16,833	-£80,205	-4.75%	-4.24%
The Pines School	£880,465	-£109,928	-12.49%	-£39,491	-£12,260	-10.86%	-1.63%
Sandy Lane Primary	£2,109,044	-£246,058	-11.67%	-£77,334	-£111,385	-7.23%	-4.43%
St Joseph's Catholic Primary	£855,849	-£67,948	-7.94%	£0	-£13,832	-6.89%	-1.05%
St Margaret Clithrow Primary	£786,644	-£29,537	-3.75%	£0	-£9,719	-2.75%	-1.00%
Winkfield St Mary's CE Primary	£710,711	-£9,519	-1.34%	£0	£5,796	-2.26%	0.92%
St Michaels Easthampstead	£836,218	-£48,086	-5.75%	£0	-£35,210	-1.68%	-4.07%
St Michaels CE, Sandhurst	£779,658	-£92,472	-11.86%	-£30,099	-£14,210	-11.30%	-0.56%
Uplands Primary	£779,296	-£28,121	-3.61%	£0	£13,803	-5.59%	1.98%
Warfield CE Primary	£781,886	-£28,703	-3.67%	£0	-£29,319	0.08%	-3.75%
Whitegrove Primary	£1,495,846	-£82,411	-5.51%	£0	-£27,463	-3.85%	-1.65%
Wildridings Primary	£1,252,225	-£180,850	-14.44%	-£80,672	-£65,407	-10.45%	-3.99%
Broadmoor Primary	£765,619	-£73,717	-9.63%	-£12,467	-£26,138	-6.42%	-3.21%
Woodenhill Primary & Nursery	£1,361,218	-£141,727	-10.41%	-£32,830	-£53,118	-7.24%	-3.17%
The Brakenhale	£4,940,203	-£63,723	-1.29%	£0	£125,368	-4.13%	2.84%
Easthampstead Park	£4,916,354	-£393,362	-8.00%	-£147,544	-£162,571	-4.54%	-3.46%
Edgbarrow	£5,910,204	-£373,425	-6.32%	-£77,915	£5,189	-6.63%	0.32%
The Garth Hill	£7,288,437	-£555,512	-7.62%	-£191,090	£78,103	-9.69%	2.07%
Ranelagh CE	£1,602,840	£0	0.00%	£0	£66,208	-1.51%	1.51%
Sandhurst	£5,184,537	-£265,386	-5.12%	-£6,159	-£54,035	-4.19%	-0.93%
Kennel Lane	£3,790,543	-£227,465	-6.00%	-£37,938	-£30,941	-5.79%	-0.21%
Total	£67,538,290	-£4,531,192	-6.71%	-£1,100,450	-£784,258	-5.72%	-0.99%

Summary profile of deficit and surplus school balances

Sector	2010-11		2011-12		Change in carry forward 2010-2011 to 2011-2012	2011-12 Carry Forward as % of final budget	
	Final Budget	Carry Forward	Final Budget	Carry Forward			
Primary	£30,725,062	£1,840,740	£33,905,172	£2,652,319	£811,579	44.09%	7.82%
Secondary and Special	£34,746,994	£1,906,194	£33,633,118	£1,878,873	-£27,321	-1.43%	5.59%
Total	£65,472,056	£3,746,934	£67,538,290	£4,531,192	£784,258	20.93%	6.71%

Analysis of level of Reserves									Memo Item Surpluses Over £75,000
Deficits		Surpluses					Significant Surpluses		
No.	Largest	No.	Largest	No. 0-5% of budget	No. 5-8% of budget	No. > 8% of budget	No.	Largest	

2010-11

Primary	4	£51,543	27	-£329,641	9	12	6	6	-154,460	9
Secondary and Special	0	£0	7	-£633,615	4	2	1	3	-306,702	6
Total	4	£75,565	34	-£3,822,499	13	14	7	9	-715,247	15

2011-12

Primary	1	£28,708	30	-£489,615	11	9	10	10	-285,171	13
Secondary and Special	0	£0	6	-£555,512	1	4	1	5	-191,090	5
Total	1	£28,708	36	-£4,559,900	12	13	11	15	-1,100,450	18

Change 2010-2011 to 2011-2012

Primary	-3	-£22,835	3	-£159,974	2	-3	4	4	-£130,711	4
Secondary and Special	0	£0	-1	£78,103	-3	2	0	2	£115,612	-1
Total	-3	-£46,857	2	-£737,401	-1	-1	4	6	-£385,202	3

2011-12 School Capital Balances

School	2011/12 new year funding	Carry forward		Change from 2010/11 (-increase / +decrease)	Amount that must be spent by 31 Aug 2012
		Total Amount (-surplus / + deficit)	Percentage of new year funding		
Ascot Heath County Infant	6,363	-65,262	-1,025.65%	£5,873	£41,625
Ascot Heath CE Junior	6,633	-62,591	-943.63%	£8,132	£35,710
Birch Hill Primary	8,472	-73,436	-866.81%	£42,839	£39,538
Wildmoor Heath Primary	6,109	-22,393	-366.55%	£24,066	£0
College Town Infant and Nursery	7,021	-11,486	-163.59%	£16,370	£0
College Town Junior	6,925	-10,557	-152.44%	£977	£0
Cranbourne Primary	5,980	-9,813	-164.09%	-£5,980	£0
Crown Wood Primary	7,302	-62,200	-851.82%	£16,967	£33,132
Crowthorne CE Primary	6,323	-33,577	-531.03%	£39,257	£8,852
Fox Hill Community Primary	5,924	-15,988	-269.89%	£10,945	£0
Great Hollands Primary	7,718	-4,997	-64.74%	£9,570	£0
Harmanswater Primary	11,183	-11,183	-100.00%	-£11,183	£0
Holly Spring Infant and Nursery	6,295	-23,605	-374.97%	£59,100	£0
Holly Spring Junior	6,385	-18,738	-293.47%	£27,708	£0
Meadow Vale Primary	9,102	-26,761	-294.02%	-£9,102	£0
New Scotland Hill Primary	6,492	-6,235	-96.04%	£84,004	£0
Owlsmoor Primary	9,265	-1,762	-19.02%	-£5,915	£0
The Pines	6,261	-56,537	-903.00%	£36,544	£30,639
Sandy Lane Primary	9,985	-4,338	-43.45%	£81,142	£0
St Marys CE Primary (Winkfield)	6,228	-33,431	-536.78%	£19,249	£8,574
Uplands Primary	6,363	-3,613	-56.78%	-£3,613	£0
Warfield CE Primary	6,329	-4,163	-65.78%	-£4,055	£0
Whitegrove Primary	8,731	-45,741	-523.90%	£55,984	£9,335
Wildridings Primary	7,201	-34,113	-473.73%	-£5,334	£3,747
Woodenhill Primary and Nursery	7,741	-30,341	-391.96%	-£4,051	£0
Brakenhale	18,934	-41,321	-218.24%	-£8,244	£0
Easthampstead Park	20,166	-33,749	-167.36%	-£20,166	£0
Edgbarrow	23,626	-9,764	-41.33%	£157,990	£0
Garth Hill	26,309	-33,257	-126.41%	-£26,309	£0
Sandhurst	22,849	-33,572	-146.93%	£12,300	£0
Kennel Lane	9,923	-2,260	-22.77%	£102,375	£0
Total	£304,138	-£826,783	-271.84%	£707,440	£211,153