

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
15 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**SCHOOLS PLANNED WORKS PROGRAMME
Director of Children Young People & Learning**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consult Schools' Forum on the proposed approach to the prioritisation of funding for the Schools Planned Works Programme.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That the Schools Forum AGREES to the proposed approach to the prioritisation of LA funding for the Maintained Schools Planned Works Programme as set out in the body of the report.**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 **The LA has a duty to consult the Schools Forum on school funding matters.**

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The options for schools are set out in the body of the report.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 5.1 The Planned Works Programme is LA capital investment in maintained schools over £2,000 that can be foreseen and planned for, such as planned maintenance, disabled access, fire safety etc. These works are essential to ensure safe and continuous operation of school buildings.
- 5.2 The LA's Planned Works programme has assumed a greater importance for maintained schools since the new coalition government reduced the allocation of Devolved Formula Capital funding to schools, and increased capital grant funding to LAs for schools capital maintenance. Maintained schools are therefore more reliant on the LA to make wise investment decisions that will support them in their safe and continuous operation.
- 5.3 Schools Forum took a report in March 2011 suggesting an approach to prioritisation from April 2011, following a consultation with schools during the 2011 Spring Term. The Forum raised concerns that the length of time allowed for the consultation was insufficient to allow for a fully considered response, and so a further 12 week written consultation with schools was undertaken between May and July 2011. This report feeds back on the results of this consultation.

The Approach to Planned Works in Maintained Schools

- 5.4 This report relates to Maintained schools only, and VA schools and Academies are subject of their own separate funding arrangements for Planned Works.
- 5.5 Projects will be raised in maintained schools under the planned works programme subject to the availability of funding. Statutory compliance items e.g. Fire Safety, DDA and Legionella will be given the highest priority for available funding, with Planned Maintenance and suitability items below this in the order of ranking. Within this the LA will adopt the following approach to Planned Works in Maintained Schools from April 2011 which will also be included in the 2011 CYPL Asset Management Plan:

PRIORITISATION OF THE COUNCIL'S CAPITAL FUNDING FOR PLANNED WORKS AT MAINTAINED SCHOOLS
N.B. The extent to which works will be undertaken is subject to available funding in each year.
1. Fire Safety/Risk Assessment works <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will be drawn from: School Fire Risk Assessments• Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Compliance items with fire alarms, emergency lights and fire compartmentation.
2. DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) works <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will be drawn from: The needs of Individuals and School Access Audits• Proposed Method of Prioritisation: In accordance with the Asset Management Plan (AMP), which allows schools to refer the physical access needs of individual statemented pupils or registered disabled staff to the Council. Any funding remaining will be allocated to Priority 1 items from schools Access Audits.
3. Legionella works <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will be drawn from: School Schemes for Prevention or Control of Legionella under the Service Inspection Contracts SLA to schools managed by Building Group.• Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Compliance items involving replacement of water systems.
4. Planned Maintenance works <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will be drawn from: School Condition Surveys.• Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Works are prioritised in accordance with the AMP to Priority 1 (urgent) items. Where funding is insufficient to address all P1 items, works will be selected focussing the Priority 1d items which are the most urgent, and within this giving priority to those items that carry Health & Safety risk, or may result in significant disruption or school closures, or where there is potential for significant damage to buildings if they are not addressed.

5. Suitability (Fitness for Purpose) Works:

- Will be drawn from: School Suitability Surveys.
- Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Any works to be prioritised in accordance with the AMP to Priority 1 items.

6. School Contributions to Planned Maintenance Works

- Schools should make a contribution to the cost from the devolved budget where the LA undertakes planned maintenance works in a school.
- The contribution should be 10% of the estimated cost of the works on the condition survey, up to a maximum ceiling of 75% of the schools annual Devolved Formula Capital allocation.
- Where the final cost of the works exceeds the estimated cost of the works on the condition survey the Council will pay the additional cost and the school's contribution will be fixed at the original agreed figure.
- Where the final cost of the works is below the estimated cost of the works on the condition survey the Schools contribution will be reduced on a pro-rata basis.
- Schools contributions to be subject to abatement where a school has previously agreed with the Council for the allocation of its devolved Formula Capital to an alternative capital project.
- The school contribution to be taken up on completion of the works
- The above approach to be applied consistently to all schools

7. School Condition Surveys

- To be provided in accordance with DFE guidelines.
- Need to be kept updated on an annual basis.
- Site surveys to be undertaken by arrangement in advance and in consultation with school site management staff.
- There should be no ambiguous items in the surveys like "investigate further", and the cost of any investigations to determine the scope and extent of works should be included in the programme.
- The Council will seek to undertake future condition surveys using hand held devices that download immediately into the online Asset Management database.

8. Arrangements for ongoing Consultation on Schools Planned Works

The LA will include Planned Works on the agenda of the schools Reactive Maintenance Working Group. This group includes schools representatives. The Group will meet termly and there will be an annual review during the Spring Term meeting each year.

Any future changes to this approach to prioritisation of Planned Works at Maintained Schools will be subject of consultation with Schools and Schools Forum.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

6.1 Not sought.

Borough Treasurer

6.2 The Borough Treasurer is satisfied that no significant financial implications arise from this report. Funding for capital works will be determined through the Council's budget setting process.

Equalities Impact Assessment

6.3 Not required

Strategic Risk Management Issues

6.4 The risk of not addressing urgent planned maintenance items is assessed as HIGH, for the LA and for Schools. A co-ordinated approach to target limited resources is essential to mitigate this risk.

6.5 The staffing capacity risk of the 2011/12 LA budget not being spent is assessed as MEDIUM, and arrangements have been made to ensure that adequate resources are in place.

6.6 The risk of inaccurate or out of date condition survey data for 2011 is assessed as LOW because new condition surveys have been commissioned from external consultants.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 School Bursars and Head Teachers

Method of Consultation

7.2 A written consultation questionnaire was sent under a covering letter on 04/05/11. The consultation ran for 12 weeks until the end of the 2011 summer term.

Consultation Responses

- 7.3 Only five maintained schools (16%) responded to the consultation; three primary and two secondary. Reminders were sent to schools before the end of the consultation period and this was also raised at the Summer Term Bursars and Headteachers meetings to remind schools to respond. The low response rate was disappointing, and fewer schools responded to this consultation than did to the first one, perhaps reflecting that this is not a significant issue for the majority of schools.
- 7.4 The consultation questionnaire, schools answers/comments and the LA's response are attached as APPENDIX A.

Background Papers

Appendix A Consultation Results

Contacts for further information

David Watkins 01344 354061	Chief Officer: Performance & Resources david.watkins@bracknell-forest.gov.uk
Chris Taylor 01344 354062	Head of Property & Admissions chris.taylor@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

BRACKNELL FOREST COUNCIL

CONSULTATION WITH MAINTAINED SCHOOLS

CAPITAL PLANNED WORKS PROGRAMME FROM APRIL 2011

PROPOSED METHOD ON HOW THE COUNCIL'S CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS SHOULD BE PRIORITISED AND SHARED ACROSS MAINTAINED SCHOOLS

N.B. The extent to which works will be undertaken is subject to available funding in each year.

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
<p>1. Fire Safety/Risk Assessment works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be drawn from: School Fire Risk Assessments • Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Compliance items with fire alarms, emergency lights and fire compartmentation. 	<p>5/0</p> <p>4/1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire risk assessments are of a good quality, but items should be prioritised by risk 	<p>We will review this suggestion for the next round of fire risk assessment updates</p>

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
<p>9. DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be drawn from: The needs of Individuals and School Access Audits • Proposed Method of Prioritisation: In accordance with the Asset Management Plan (AMP), which allows schools to refer the physical access needs of individual statemented pupils or registered disabled staff to the Council. Any funding remaining will be allocated to Priority 1 items from schools Access Audits. 	<p>5/0</p> <p>5/0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contingency needs to be sufficient to allow for unexpected in-year individual pupil need 	<p>Agreed, we do not commit the whole of this budget until well into the financial year.</p>
<p>10. Legionella works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be drawn from: School Schemes for Prevention or Control of Legionella under the Service Inspection Contracts SLA to schools managed by Building Group. • Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Compliance items 	<p>5/0</p> <p>4/1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items should be prioritised and the most critical dealt with first versus a policy of dealing with 	<p>Replacement of water systems, or parts of water systems, is required where other measures such as chlorination fail to achieve the</p>

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
involving replacement of water systems.		replacement of water systems first	required levels of control. Replacement prevents the requirement for ongoing chlorination works which have to be paid for by the school directly.
<p>11. Planned Maintenance works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be drawn from: School Condition Surveys. • Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Works are prioritised in accordance with the AMP to Priority 1 (urgent) items. Where funding is insufficient to address all P1 items, works will be selected focussing the Priority 1d items which are the most urgent, and within this giving priority to those items that carry Health & Safety risk, or may result in significant disruption or school closures, or where there is potential for significant damage to buildings if they are not addressed. 	<p>4/1</p> <p>5/0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have reviewed our current survey and supplied feedback on items that the school has completed, items that the local authority has completed and a large number of items are missing. The current surveys are woefully inadequate and issues raised are not specific. We have concern that if they were brought up to a reasonable standard, this would take a huge length of time and could use up what valuable funding we have • As long as they are accurate and up to date • Only when condition survey is properly up to date 	<p>The LA agrees that having accurate condition surveys is an essential pre-requisite to a planned maintenance programme. Building Group are undertaking all new condition surveys for schools in 2011 using external consultants. These new surveys are expected to be completed during the 2011 Autumn term. They will be of a higher standard than in previous years and the drafts will be circulated to each school for comment/feedback before the programme for 2012/13 is drafted.</p> <p>The cost of school condition surveys is not charged against the budget for planned maintenance works. The survey budget is a corporate council budget and is not passed on to schools.</p>
<p>12. Suitability (Fitness for Purpose) Works:</p>			

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be drawn from: School Suitability Surveys. • Proposed Method of Prioritisation: Any works to be prioritised in accordance with the AMP to Priority 1 items. 	<p>5/0</p> <p>5/0</p>		
<p>13. School Contributions to Planned Maintenance Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools should make a contribution to the cost from the devolved budget where the LA undertakes planned maintenance works in a school. • The contribution should be 10% of the estimated cost of the works on the condition survey, up to a maximum ceiling of 75% of the schools annual Devolved Formula Capital allocation. <p>(If you would like to suggest an alternative contribution formula then please give details)</p>	<p>5/0</p> <p>5/0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within our school, we do not draw down (borrow) from future year's capital because of the risk that we may prioritise items that a year later, may not be our top priority (e.g. to use devolved capital for vital IT infrastructure only to find that we need a new heating system which is even more urgent than the IT work). We believe that if schools are being asked to contribute to the work, then this should be consistent across all schools. 	<p>The proposed approach to contributions will be applied consistently across all schools.</p> <p>It has not been proposed as a flat rate top sliced off all school budgets because the Council may not undertake works at all schools every year. Schools will only be expected to contribute to actual works undertaken at their school.</p> <p>The ceiling of no more than 75% of the DFC allocation is to ensure all schools will have some funding remaining to respond to urgent Health & Safety or ICT needs in any given year.</p>

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be provided in accordance with DFE guidelines. • Need to be kept updated on an annual basis • Site surveys to be undertaken by arrangement in advance and in consultation with school site management staff. • There should be no ambiguous items in the surveys like “investigate further”, and the cost of any investigations to determine the scope and extent of works should be included in the programme. 	<p style="text-align: center;">5/0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5/0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5/0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential • Results of the survey need to be made available within 2 months of the survey being undertaken • Strongly agree! 	<p>The survey process has historically taken up to 6 months before surveys are issued to schools. We are currently exploring with Building Group the possibility of surveys in future years being undertaken using hand held devices which download immediately into the online Asset Management database. This would incur an additional cost but would enable surveys to be updated in realtime.</p>
<p>15. Arrangements for ongoing Consultation on Schools Planned Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A: No further ongoing consultation is required • Option B: An annual consultation 	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would agree with both B&C. With option C this could be done every 6 months. • Ongoing consultation with schools planned works would be preferable on a tri-annual basis in line with SLAs • Review/Evaluated annually over the next 3 years 	<p>The LA will include Planned Works on the agenda of the schools Reactive Maintenance Working Group. This group includes schools representatives. The Group will meet termly and there will be an annual review during the Spring Term meeting each year.</p>

Item	No of School that Agree/ Disagree	Schools' Comments	LA Response
<p>with schools (like this one) is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option C: A regular Working Group with School Representatives is required 	4		
<p>16. This space is to allow schools to make further comments and suggestions on how the Council's capital allocations should be prioritised and shared across maintained schools:</p>		No comments were made	