

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 8 DECEMBER 2011

PREPARATIONS FOR THE 2012-13 SCHOOLS BUDGET
(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 progress towards setting the 2012-13 Schools Budget, and in particular:
- i. seeking agreement to a budget strategy to enable effective budget planning;
 - ii. reviewing the questions posed and responses received to the financial consultations with schools;
 - iii. the current evaluation of the financial outlook for the 2012-13 budget;
 - iv. the current position regarding the Council's Job Evaluation exercise.
- 1.2 As in previous years, detailed budget proposals will be brought to the Schools Forum for consideration in the new year. At this point in time, issues are being highlighted with no final decisions being taken in respect of the 2012-13 budget.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Schools Forum:

- 2.1 **AGREES the Budget Strategy at Annex 1 as the guiding document in developing the 2012-13 Schools Budget (paragraph 5.2);**
- 2.2 **AGREES that the key outcomes from the financial consultations with schools should be incorporated into the initial proposals for the 2012-13 Schools Budget that will be presented to the Schools Forum in February (paragraphs 5.15 and 5.16);**
- 2.3 **NOTES that the latest information in respect of the budget for 2012-13 indicates a potential shortfall in funding of £1.844m (paragraph 5.23);**
- 2.4 **AGREES that the Director of Children, Young People and Learning authorises the issuing of indicative 2012-13 budgets to schools, based on the proposals set out in this report (paragraph 5.26);**
- 2.5 **NOTES the latest position on the Council's Job Evaluation exercise (paragraphs 5.27 to 5.29).**

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 Where relevant, these are set out in the supporting information.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

- 5.1 The processes involved in setting the Schools Budget are well established and include the following key activities:
1. two financial consultations are undertaken with head teachers and governors to gather views on the relative importance of budget pressures and developments and other relevant budget matters;
 2. to aid financial planning, indicative budgets are sent to schools before the end of the autumn term, based on the October census data, up to the level of estimated resources;
 3. the Schools Forum considers initial budget proposal each February to agree that all relevant budget matters have been considered and that any new resources are being targeted to the correct areas;
 4. the Schools Forum agrees final proposals for the Schools Budget in March that the Executive Member for Education is recommended to approve;
 5. schools receive their actual budget for 2012-13 in advance of the statutory deadline of 31 March.
- 5.2 In order to ensure that officers prepare budget proposals that meet the needs of the Schools Forum, the Budget Strategy at Annex 1 is recommended to be agreed. This is unchanged from the strategy agreed by the Forum for setting the 2011-12 Schools Budget, with the exception of targeting appropriate resources to schools through deprivation measures, as this objective is now being met through the Pupil Premium.

Outcomes from the initial financial consultation

- 5.3 The initial consultation document was sent to schools on 7 October for reply by 21 October. This sought views from schools on proposals to classify certain pressures as unavoidable, which would then help to prioritise items for new funding. In addition, views were also sought on whether any desirable budget developments, other than the ones identified by the Council should also be considered for new funding.
- 5.4 Half of all schools (19) made a reply to the first consultation. All schools that responded agreed that the list of items proposed as unavoidable should be treated as the highest priority developments. In addition, one school proposed that school redundancy costs be added to the list. For information, the items considered unavoidable are set out again in Annex 2.
- 5.5 With regard to identifying desirable budget developments for next year, schools identified the following additional items that were added to those

presented by the LA for inclusion on the prioritisation exercise to be considered through the second consultation:

- a) Development of additional special educational needs resource units.
- b) Funding allocated for statemented pupils should be reviewed to ensure that it covers the cost of making the required provision.

- 5.6 In addition, a number of schools identified increased utility costs as a budget pressure, but these were not separately itemised on the second consultation as they will be taken into account in the general inflation pressure which schools have agreed should be treated as an unavoidable pressure, and therefore be expected to be considered as one of the highest priorities for additional funding.
- 5.7 Two schools also suggested that alternative education provision, possibly through a Pupil Referral Unit, should be considered for primary aged pupils. Such expenditure would need to be classed as centrally managed by the LA, and work will need to be undertaken to determine whether this proposal would be beneficial. The findings of this work will be presented to the Schools Forum in the new year for consideration with all other budget matters.

The second consultation

- 5.8 A second financial consultation with schools was undertaken between 4 and 18 November. This incorporated the matters raised by schools in the initial consultation and sought views from schools on the priority order for funding budget developments and comments on proposals to deal with other finance matters. A summary of school responses to the questions posed follows at paragraph 5.15, with more detail at Annex 3. Paragraphs 5.9 to 5.14 below set out more information on the elements of the consultation not connected with the prioritisation of budget developments.

Change proposed to the Funding formula for Schools

- 5.9 There was one change proposed to the Funding Formula relating to the data source to be used to fund schools with Looked After Children (LAC). At the moment, £0.009m is allocated to schools with LAC through reference to data from the national school census held each January at £360 per LAC. However, due to concerns relating to the accuracy of this data, the DfE no longer collect LAC information from the annual school census and instead use the more specific Children Looked After Data Return (SSDA903) which records children continuously looked after for over 6 months as at each March. The SSDA903 is used by the DfE in the distribution of LAC related funding in the Pupil Premium.
- 5.10 It is proposed that the Funding Formula also uses the SSDA903 return from financial year 2012-13 and allocates the same level of resources as in 2011-12. Due to the timing of the publication of this return, which is generally in October, if agreed, schools will in future be funded for LAC numbers from the previous financial year and only for LAC who are the responsibility of BFC.

Pupil Premium for Looked After Children: Proposal to pool income

- 5.11 Part of the Pupil Premium allocates funds to schools to support LAC with each LA funding the LAC they are responsible for and not necessary all of the LAC in the schools they maintain as some will be the responsibility of other LAs. In order to be able to provide the most effective level of support to these children as determined in their Personal Education Plan¹, a proposal was made that a voluntary pooling of funds is agreed with all schools, to be managed by the Looked After Children Education Services (LACES), which when added to existing resources is expected to deliver the most beneficial and cost effective level of support. If agreed, the pooling of funds – just over £0.010m in the current financial year - would commence from April 2012.

Other financial matters

- 5.12 In view of the proposals in the latest DfE consultation on Education Funding that has previously been reported to the Forum, there is a likelihood that responsibility and resources for more services will need to be delegated to schools from April 2013, rather than being centrally managed by LAs. The Council is therefore reviewing budgets to see if there would be any benefits from making further delegations from April 2012.
- 5.13 As part of the Council's budget setting process, a review is underway to confirm that charges currently being made for services traded with schools fully cover their costs and that the Schools Budget appropriately funds relevant services. The outcomes from this review may require some budget changes and it may also be necessary to review the current charging policy whereby in general, schools are charged for services in the same amount as the funding provided through the Funding Formula.
- 5.14 Any proposals arising from these other financial matters will be presented to the Schools Forum next year.

Provisional outcomes from the second consultation

- 5.15 A summary of the outcomes from the second financial consultation is set out below, with the paragraph numbers corresponding to the consultation questions. Overall there was a fair response rate from schools with 16 replies received (42%).

¹ An individual Personal Education Plan (PEP) is created for all children who are in care. This plan ensures that access to services and adequate support are available for the pupil whilst ensuring that stability is maintained and disruption to their schooling is kept to a minimum. Additionally, the plan acts as a record of progress and achievement for pupil with Special Educational Needs and establishes clear goals and development needs.

1. The prioritisation of potential budget developments, where 1 = most important and 5 = least important was as follows:

Ref	Item	Indicative Amount	Rank
A	Additional Inflation	£230,000	1
B	Full cost to support pupils with statements of SEN	£TBD	2
C	Reactive building maintenance	£50,000	3
D	Building maintenance	£100,000	4
E	Pupil Integration Units	£185,000	5

2. All 16 schools (100%) agreed that any new funding should be allocated to schools relative to their increase in costs.
3. All 16 schools (100%) agreed that where there is no obvious factor to use in distributing new funds to schools, that they should be allocated 85% by reference to pupil numbers and 15% as a fixed lump sum to each school.
4. 10 schools (63%) agreed that if savings are anticipated in the medium to long term from the development of more SEN units, then if any additional spend is required in the short term, this should be considered for funding.
5. 10 schools (63%) agreed that to provide maximum flexibility in next years budget, the Forum should consider redistributing any increase in funding from the pupil premium to allow all schools to benefit.
6. 15 schools (94%) agreed that schools should be funded for LAC through the BF Funding Formula through reference to the DfE LAC return SSDA903.
7. 15 schools (94%) agreed that to maintain stability of funding, funding for the former specific grants, now included in delegated budgets, should be on the same cash amount as received in 2011-12 and 2010-11.
8. 11 schools (69%) agreed that the LAC element of the Pupil Premium should be managed centrally by the LA in the Looked After Children's Education Team.

A number of comments were received from schools and these are also set out in Annex 3 after the numerical analysis of responses.

- 5.16 Based on the majority of school replies agreeing with the proposals set out in the consultation, the Forum is recommended to agree that all of the proposals are implemented with the exception of:
 - a) Question 5, which proposed redistributing any increase in funding from the pupil premium to allow all schools to benefit from additional resources rather than just those with the highest levels of pupil eligibility to free school meals. The DfE has recently indicated that schools are likely to be held separately accountable for how they spend funding from the Pupil Premium and it is not therefore appropriate to consider any redistribution, and

- b) Question 8, the pooling of the LAC element of the Pupil Premium for central management by the LA. Whilst the majority of respondents supported this proposal, a number of specific comments from schools need to be followed up before a firm recommendation is made on this matter.

Financial outlook

- 5.17 Taking account of the change of government, the state of the economy and the headline financial information provided by the DfE for the current Spending Review period – which was issued in October 2010 and could therefore be subject to some change - a very tight financial settlement for 2012-13 is to be expected. Whilst the full picture is unlikely to emerge before the end of the year, it remains important that financial planning is taking place now in order for the Council and schools to be in the best position to finalise budgets when funding levels are confirmed.
- 5.18 The key announcements from last year's Spending Review were as follows:
- a) There will be annual real terms growth for 5-16 year olds of 0.1%;
 - b) That there is an assumed £1 billion of savings to be made by schools in back office functions and procurement;
 - c) That there will be a 60% reduction in capital spend;
 - d) That funding for the Pupil Premium, to be targeted at disadvantaged pupils, will reach £2.5 billion by 2014-15.
- 5.19 The 0.1% real terms increase in funding each year is after adding the £2.5 billion pupil premium which is targeted towards pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, mainly through eligibility to a free school meal. This means a large amount of money, equivalent to approximately 10% of the total funding delegated to schools in 2010-11, will be allocated to areas of high deprivation.
- 5.20 Taking account of the information currently available to the Council, the following funding assumptions are being used in the initial preparations of next year's budget:
- a) There will be annual real terms growth of 0.1% in national funding for statutory aged pupils (as announced in the Spending Review 2010 and detailed above)
 - b) Funding allocated through the Pupil Premium to double, which when taken into account with the assumed £1bn savings in back office functions and procurement, will absorb the 0.1% real terms growth.
 - c) Per pupil funding from the DfE through the Dedicated Schools Grant will therefore remain at the same amount as that received in 2011-12 i.e. a cash standstill for the second consecutive year, meaning no increase has been made to reflect rising inflation.
 - d) The Minimum Funding Guarantee to remain unchanged at a maximum decrease in per pupil funding of 1.5%. This means the maximum reduction in per pupil funding that a school can receive next year compared to now is 1.5%.

Preliminary position in Bracknell Forest

- 5.21 Within this context, there have already been a number of significant cost pressures identified which are set out in Annex 4. An increase in funding of 4.2% is required to cover all identified items. Table 1 below summarises the current position.

Table 1: Summary net pressures on 2012-13 Schools Budget – at November 2011

Item	Net Pressure	
	£m	%
Current DSG budget	74.524	
Pressure on items delegated to schools	2.648	
Pressure on items managed by LA	0.445	
Total net pressure	3.093	4.2%

- 5.22 There are three potential positives on the areas of school funding managed by the Council and Schools Forum:

1. Firstly, a carry forward surplus can be managed from the 2011-12 Schools Budget which is currently forecast to under spend by £1.3m. A separate paper on this agenda proposes that £0.9m of this is invested in 2011-12 with £0.4m carried forward into 2012-13. £0.4m is the maximum level of spending that is recommended be funded from balances as once the funding is spent it resources available in the next year by the same value. As the current budget includes funding of £0.23m from the 2010-11 under spend, using £0.4m next year increases available income by £0.17m.
2. Secondly, the base budget assumed a level of Dedicated Schools Grant at £0.476m below the actual receipt. Allowing £0.086m as the maximum estimated top-slice to fund Ranelagh for centrally managed services through the Local Authority Central Services Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) leaves £0.39m of on-going unallocated income.
3. A net financial gain accrues to the Schools Budget at times of increasing pupil numbers, with the converse applying when pupil numbers fall. This is because DSG per pupil funding amounts to £4,861 and the average per pupil allocation to schools through the Funding Formula is around £2,950 resulting in surplus income of approximately £1,900 per new pupil compared to the baseline from the previous year. Initial calculations from the October schools census – which would provide a good guide for likely numbers on roll at January 2012 – shows an increase in pupil numbers of 141, equivalent to additional income of £0.689m.

- 5.23 Taking account of the income assumptions set out above, around £1.249m could be available to fund new pressures, which have been provisionally estimated at £3.093m in Table 1 above. This indicates a provisional funding gap of £1.844m, which is a similar position to that faced at the same stage last year at the initial review of the 2011-12 budget position.

Options available to manage next year's budget pressures

- 5.24 Current information indicates that for a second year running, difficult decisions will need to be taken in setting the budget, as it is anticipated that insufficient funds will be available to meet all unavoidable budget pressures. As a result, it is possible that a number of schools will receive real terms reductions in per pupil funding. It is therefore appropriate to consider options on how the budget could be set if a poor settlement is received. Final budget decisions will need to be made in the new year, but it is important for the Forum to be aware of the actions that may need to be taken.

- Cash limit some budget allocations to 2011-12 amounts. This will relate to areas such as FSM allocations, support for looked after children, ethnic minority pupils. The current budget would be divided by the new, anticipated increased numbers resulting in schools receiving less funds per relevant pupil than in the current year.
- "Top slice" current per pupil funding values (Age Weighted Pupil Units – AWPU) by an agreed amount. This money would then be directed to only those schools facing new unavoidable budget pressures.
- Do not fund some or all of the desirable budget developments.
- Phase in funding for some items, for example, the cost of full time admission of 4 year olds could be introduced over a number of years.

- 5.25 A range of options have therefore been identified that may need to be considered when the financial settlement is known. Other factors will also need to be taken into account, such as the MFG, which reduce the financial impact from some of the available options. There will also need to be careful consideration of the impact on any statutory requirements, such as education provision for pupils with special educational needs, where the growth pressure may need to be fully funded.

Indicative school budgets for 2012-13

- 5.26 Now that an initial calculation has been made for the 2012-13 budget, it is proposed that this is used to assist schools with their financial planning through the production of indicative budgets which are ordinarily sent to schools before the end of the autumn term. These are a guide to potential income, and not a guarantee. Work is progressing on completing more detailed calculations against each of the pressures set out in Annex 4, and the Schools Forum is requested to agree that the Director of Children, Young People and Learning issues indicative budgets based on the budget proposals set out in this report, up to the level of estimated resources. Final pressures to be funded in school budgets will be subject to decisions of the Schools Forum in the new year and may therefore be different to those included in the indicative budgets.

Update on Job Evaluation Project

- 5.27 The Forum has asked to be kept up to date on the Council's Job Evaluation Project. This is still under review with all jobs within the Council, including school support staff roles, having been ranked under the revised job evaluation scheme. This has then led to financial modelling to assess the affordability and fairness of the scheme. This will then be taken forward for further discussion with the trade unions.
- 5.28 It is important to note that throughout this project there has been extremely positive engagement with the support staff trade unions. This includes their involvement with the project board. The current stage of the project is to discuss the financial models with the trade unions and consider options for the introduction of the scheme. These discussions are still at a preliminary stage and, as with the rest of this project, are being undertaken in a constructive manner. There is no current date set for when these new arrangements may be introduced. The Forum will be advised once a proposed date for implementation has been identified.
- 5.29 Once implementation is confirmed a complete set of template job profiles will be available for all school based support staff roles. These will be available for schools to adopt. The HR Team will then work with headteachers to identify which of the job profiles match the actual roles being undertaken at the school. These will then be sent to the staff concerned who will be given the opportunity to agree to the match or, where appropriate, challenge the decision made. This will be done via an appeals process. This will provide schools with an opportunity to review their support staff structures.

Next steps

- 5.30 The financial implications arising from the October school census and other data used for budget setting purposes will continue to be reviewed so that the most up to date cost data is available for the Forum to consider in February. It is also anticipated that sufficient information will have been received from the DfE regarding likely income for next year to provide an accurate overall budget assessment.
- 5.31 In light of this updated information, the Forum will be asked to agree that the initial budget proposals being made in February reflect the key areas and wishes of schools, which will then allow final budget calculations to be completed before the actual budget setting meeting of the Forum in March where final decisions will need to be taken.
- 5.32 As set out above, at this stage it seems unlikely that sufficient funds will exist to meet all unavoidable costs, and consequently schools may face a real terms reduction in funding.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal provisions have been considered within the main body of the report.

Borough Treasurer

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

Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.3 There are no specific impacts arising from this report. The need for equalities impact assessments will be kept under consideration as the budget process develops.

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

Budget reports to the Schools Forum and Executive Member

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

Doc. Ref

\\FS_ELS\VOL1\USERS\ALL\EDUCATE\New Alluse\Executive\Schools Forum\53) 081211\2012-13 Schools Budget Preparations - December.doc

Budget Strategy Proposed for 2012-13

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

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

Note, the following objective to target resources to areas of high deprivation has been removed as this objective is now met by the Pupil Premium, and is the only change proposed to the strategy agreed for 2011-12

Maintain current level of deprivation funding in schools at 90% of proportion included in Dedicated Schools Grant (DfE targeting LAs below 80%) through implementation of the key recommendations from the review of funding schools for deprivation which was to introduce new funding factors based on number of Looked After Children and those with English as an Additional Language. If after these changes, deprivation funding remains below the 90% target level, then the outstanding requirement would be met by allocating 75% of the balance based on low prior attainment and 25% on pupil eligibility to a free school meal.

Budget items classified as statutory / unavoidable

Ref	Item	Delegated to schools item	LA managed item
<u>Items previously agreed as unavoidable</u>			
1	Inflation	✓	✓
2	Change in number of statutory aged pupils	✓	X
3	Change in number of pre-statutory aged pupils	✓	X
4	Full time admissions for 4 year olds	✓	X
5	New primary school for Jennetts Park	✓	X
6	Special School pupil numbers / needs	✓	✓
7	Mainstream school SEN statements	✓	X
8	Non-pupil data changes	✓	X
9	Employer contribution to national insurance	✓	✓
10	Employer contribution to pension schemes	✓	✓
11	Maternity leave cover	X	✓
<u>New items to be added</u>			
12	Redundancy costs	X	✓
13	Alternative education provisions	X	✓

Responses to the second financial consultation

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION- NOVEMBER 2011					
QUESTION	TOTALS				%
	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL	OVERALL	
Number of responses	10	5	1	16	
Maximum number of responses	31	6	1	38	
Response rate	32.26%	83.33%	100.00%	42.11%	
1 Budget pressure prioritisation (1 = most important 5 = least important)					
A Additional Inflation	1	1	1	1	
B Pupil Integration Units in Secondary Schools	5	5	5	5	
C Building Maintenance	4	3	4	4	
D Planned Maintenance	3	4	2	3	
E Pupils with Statements of Special Educational Needs	2	2	3	2	
2 In allocating any new funding for budget developments to schools, do you agree that where possible, resources should be distributed to schools through the methodology that most closely matches to the costs each school is likely to incur (point 3 from the budget strategy at Annex 2)?					
Yes	10	5	1	16	100%
No	0	0	0	0	0%
3 Where there is no obvious factor to use in distributing new funds to schools, do you agree that they should be allocated 85% by reference to pupil numbers and 15% as a fixed lump sum to each school (point 7 from the budget strategy at Annex 2)?					
Yes	10	5	1	16	100%
No	0	0	0	0	0%
4 Do you agree that if it can be demonstrated that in the medium to long term, there will be significant improvements to the education and wellbeing of relevant children and overall cost savings through the development of more SEN Resource Units in the borough, that new funding should be considered to meet any short term increase in costs as the new Units are developed?					
Yes	5	5	0	10	63%
No	5	0	0	5	31%
No response / undecided	0	0	1	1	6%

FINANCIAL CONSULTATION – NOVEMBER 2011

QUESTION	TOTALS			OVERALL	%
	PRIMARY	SECONDARY	SPECIAL		
<p>5 Do you agree that to provide maximum flexibility on prioritising any additional funding available in 2012-13, and to allow for as large a number of schools as possible to receive a financial gain, that the Schools Forum should consider redistributing the additional funding to be received through the Pupil Premium (point 5 from the budget strategy at Annex 2)?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response / undecided</p>	<p>5</p> <p>5</p> <p>0</p>	<p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>10</p> <p>6</p> <p>0</p>	<p>63%</p> <p>38%</p> <p>0%</p>
<p>6 Do you agree that from April 2012, the Bracknell Forest Funding Formula for Schools should allocate resources to schools with Looked After Children who are the responsibility of the Council, based on head count data available from the DfE Children Looked After Data Return (SSDA903)?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response / undecided</p>	<p>9</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>5</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>94%</p> <p>6%</p> <p>0%</p>
<p>7 In order to maintain stability of funding for schools, do you agree that the basis of allocating funding to schools from the former specific grants - the Standards Fund, School Standards Grant etc as detailed in Annex 3 - should remain unchanged from the cash amount allocated in 2011-12?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response / undecided</p>	<p>9</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p>	<p>5</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>15</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p>	<p>94%</p> <p>0%</p> <p>6%</p>
<p>8 Do you agree that a voluntary agreement should be created whereby all maintained schools return the element of the Pupil Premium allocated for Looked After Children who are the responsibility of the Council to be centrally managed in the Looked After Children's Education Service for the most effective delivery of support as determined in Personal Education Plans?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No response / undecided</p>	<p>6</p> <p>4</p> <p>0</p>	<p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>11</p> <p>5</p> <p>0</p>	<p>69%</p> <p>31%</p> <p>0%</p>

School	Comment
<u>Development of SEN Units as a high priority development</u>	
Birch Hill Primary	We'd need to know a lot more about the proposals before being able to consider this.
Kennel Lane	Yes and No ! We have serious reservations about the development of primary and secondary autism units. Previous experience with this type of resource in Bracknell Forest indicates that they bring with them a range of unintended consequences and unfortunately are unable to satisfy the demand for places that exists. Our preferred strategy would be a further enhancement of the ASSC Service. We do however recognise the benefits of developing a secondary speech and language resource for those pupils who require progression from Meadow Vale School for the reasons outlined in the consultation document.
Ascot Heath Infants	We are greatly concerned on the short term impact on budgets as we are a school with cross border pupils and are not sure that there would be a benefit in long term for us
<u>Financial outlook</u>	
Meadow Vale Primary School	But this strategy must <u>not</u> be detrimental to those schools which have high levels of deprivation. If this was the case then we would say No.
Sandy Lane Primary School	The children that are due the pupil premium funding should be allocated the money and not be spread around the Borough. The schools in areas of low deprivation should be given additional funding.
Wooden Hill Primary School	We strongly object to this question. It has been clearly highlighted by the government on a number of occasions about the allocation of the pupil premium to those pupils identified via FSM, services children or LAC children. Therefore this funding should be allocated to these pupils and for those schools to decide how best to use this funding to support the individual needs of these children. We are certain that it won't be long before there are requirements to report on how the allocations of the pupil premium have been spent on these specific children. (and in fact this exact question was raised at our last finance committee meeting (14/11/11) – whereby a governor did ask how we are using the pupil premium funding to support these pupils)
Birch Hill Primary	Our difficulties with this proposal are: The pupils for whom this money is intended might be losing their entitlement. Schools would be held accountable by Govt/Ofsted for expenditure over which they had lost responsibility.
St Michaels Easthampstead	Although, this would mean that schools with low fsm numbers in more affluent areas would miss out. Also if we do have to justify to parents how the pupil premium has been spent, this may cut down on flexibility of how the additional funding is spent

School	Comment
<u>Funding Formula</u>	
Sandy Lane Primary School	If the LA is going to 'spread' the pupil premium money between all schools then they should do the same with the Looked After Children's budget. As I said above the money should go to whom it is meant for i.e. deprivation or LAC!
Wooden Hill Primary School	What mechanisms are there to ensure that the allocated resources for all LAC children are allocated accordingly? If the data on LAC children is to be collated through the SSDA903 return then presumably this will provide much more accurate data on where LAC children are placed. What will happen to the funding that Bracknell will receive for the LAC children that are not educated in BF schools? Does this mean that the non BF school that has a BF LAC child will not receive any additional resources to support this child?
St Michaels Easthampstead	Qn 7 on maintaining cash protected funding allocations to schools for the former specific grant, answer is a maybe..... There were some schools with large standards grants because of involvement with specific funded projects – which funded supply time etc. These requirements are no longer there, & other schools who were not part of the original projects eg every child a reader/writer etc will still be funding supply etc to catch up , but without funding.
<u>Pooling LAC pupil premium into LACES Team</u>	
Owlsmoor Primary	The schools are still being expected to undertake the Personal Education Plans and should therefore retain the funding. We would consider the LA being given a percentage if they are to assist with the Personal Education Plans.
Wooden Hill Primary School	As with the pupil premium we believe that individual schools should have the scope to decide on how best to allocate this funding for specific pupils. It is the schools who will know in great detail what levels of support and additional need would benefit each of the LAC children to improve their educational outcomes. What would happen to the LAC funding for pupils who are the responsibility of Bracknell Forest and not in a BF school? Would they also be expected to return the pupil premium funding? This could also raise anomalies within schools where there are LAC children from different local authorities with different methods of distributing LAC & pupil premium funding. (To date we have not received any funding for two LAC pupils who are the responsibility of Reading Borough Council)
Birch Hill Primary	The pupils for whom this money is intended might be losing their entitlement. Schools would be held accountable by Govt/Ofsted for expenditure over which they had lost responsibility . However, we feel that we need a lot more information about this proposal before being able to make an informed decision.
St Michaels Easthampstead	Although if the LAC is a free school meal child - this would mean that the school would miss out – as cost of providing FSM could be £390 per child per year (if the child has a school dinner each day), as we no longer get the separate funding for the provision of free school meals
The Pines Primary	LAC funding should be directly allocated to schools.
Garth Hill College	Based on the information we have to date, we have answered no to this question however upon further clarification we may change our views. We would like to receive further details on how it is intended that this fund would be spent and what level of access we would have to the funding.

School	Comment
<u>Other comments</u>	
Meadow Vale primary School	Keep Smiling
Ascot Heath Infants	Funding for 4 year olds – Full funding needs to be received for these children

Areas of budget pressure, saving or development for the 2012-13 School Budget – PROVISIONAL estimates

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><u>Statutory / unavoidable</u></p> <p>1. Inflation Most items have traditionally been increased at level of Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG), the rate of which is set by the government and has previously been based on unavoidable national cost increases, less 1% for school efficiency gains. Exceptions have been applied, where previously agreed, for inescapable costs such as rates and insurance. Due to the public sector spending reductions, including the public sector pay freeze, the current budget assumption is that the national funding settlement will not include a provision for inflation. However, there will be an inflationary pressure on schools on non-pay items, and this is included at 2.5% on the 25% of school costs not linked to pay.</p>	250	120	370
<p>2 Mainstream School pupil numbers (statutory aged) Information is being checked from the October census to provide a provisional figure for 2012-13 which at this stage indicates an extra 277 pupils in schools.</p>	706	0	706
<p>3. Pre-statutory aged pupils (maintained and private, voluntary and independent sector providers) Change in number of placements of 3 and 4 year olds in maintained schools and private and voluntary sector settings. Information is being checked from the October census with a provisional figure for 2012-13 indicating a pressure.</p>	90	0	90

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><u>Statutory / unavoidable (continued)</u></p> <p>4 Full time admissions for 4 year olds With effect from September 2011, schools were required to offer full time admissions for 4 year olds from the September following their fourth birthday, where this is requested by parents, rather than the previous provision for admission from the September following the fifth birthday. Due to the cash freeze in national per pupil funding in 2011-12, it was only possible to fund one third of the extra cost and an unfunded pressure remains. Prior to this statutory change, with the exception of one school, all were operating some form of admissions at September and were funding the impact from their overall budget. The £0.460m pressure would fully fund the remaining two thirds estimated cost.</p>	460	0	460
<p>5 New Primary School for Jennetts Park The new primary school for Jennetts Park opened in September 2011 and is planned to expand from a 1 form of entry to a 2 form of entry at September 2012. During the rapid expansion in pupil numbers, funding will need to be allocated outside the normal Funding Formula as there will be significantly fewer pupils on roll at January 2012, the normal point to determine a school's budget, compared to the start of the 2012-13 academic year which will determine the majority of costs.</p>	200	0	200
<p>6 Special School pupil numbers / needs There is a statutory requirement to meet the needs of pupils set out in statements of special educational needs, with the most complex cases needing support from special schools which can either be maintained by BFC, other LAs or private, voluntary or independent sector providers. There are expected to be cost increases both at KLS and non-maintained schools.</p>	142	50	192
<p>7 Mainstream School SEN statements There is a statutory requirement to meet the needs of pupil set out in statements of special educational needs, with the majority of children having their needs met in BFC schools. During the last 3 years, the average increase in cost of support has totalled £0.045m.</p>	45	0	45

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><u>Statutory / unavoidable (continued)</u></p> <p>8 Non-pupil data changes Besides pupil numbers changes, there are other data changes that can impact on funds allocated to schools. The main cost increase in 2011-12 related to a rise in the number of pupils eligible to a free school meal, and due to the prevailing economic conditions, this trend is expected to continue, although the October census indicates a reduction in the number of eligible pupils. Other data changes that impact on budgets include the number of newly qualified teachers, significant school redevelopments, attainment data, pupil mobility and rating revaluations.</p>	250	0	250
<p>9. Employer contribution to pension schemes The employer contribution to pension schemes is contractually committed and subject to change. An increase is expected to contribute to the Local Government pension scheme deficit.</p>	40	10	50
<p>10 Maternity leave cover Schools are reimbursed for the net cost of classroom staff on maternity leave. This is in accordance with statutory employment conditions, with cost determined by the incidence of maternity leave cases, which has increased in the current year.</p>	0	25	25
<p>11 Alternative education provision In the 2010 schools White Paper, <i>The Importance of Teaching</i>, there was a commitment from the government to ensure that all pupils in alternative education provision should receive suitable full time education. The main impact on BF is that additional support will be required for pupils who are unable to attend school by reason of accident, illness or pregnancy or who are described as 'school-phobic'.</p>	0	60	60
<p>Sub total – statutory / unavoidable items</p>	2,183	265	2,448

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<p><u>New budget developments</u></p> <p>12 Additional 0.5% inflation allowance This is intended to be top up funding to the MFG rate to ensure all schools benefit from any additional resources that may be available. The Schools Forum will need to take a view on funding for inflation when more information is available.</p>	230	30	260
<p>13 Creation of pupil integration units at all secondary schools Pupil Integration Units (also known as Learning Support Units) are funded at four secondary schools to reduce the number of permanent exclusions. This funding has been allocated to the schools facing the most challenging circumstances, and supports the Council's strategy for reducing fixed period and permanent exclusions, thereby aiding the reintegration of pupils. Requests have previously been made to consider extending the funding to all secondary schools.</p>	185	0	185
<p>14 Day to day building maintenance Pressure is being experienced relating to the cost of undertaking day-to-day reactive maintenance of schools buildings. Adequate maintenance of school buildings is important from a health and safety perspective.</p>	50	0	50
<p>15 Planned Maintenance The Planned Works Programme is ordinarily capital investment in maintained schools over £2,000 that can be foreseen and planned for, such as planned maintenance, disabled access, fire safety etc. These works are essential to ensure safe and continuous operation of school buildings. A summary of school condition works from the 2010 Asset Management Plan, which is in the process of being updated, identified £13.7m of condition works across all schools of which £4.2m is Priority 1 (Urgent). Combining funding from the Schools Budget with resources from the Council and government grants (if available), this will allow for better progress in tackling the backlog.</p>	0	100	100

Item	Delegated To schools £'000	Managed by The Council £'000	Total £'000
<u>New budget developments (continued)</u>			
<p>16 Additional speech and language resources This funding would be used to provide for assessments, individual speech and language therapy, small group work and to train teaching and learning support assistants to implement speech and language techniques within their schools. A needs gap analysis undertaken with key stakeholders including schools, health services and parents earlier this year has identified the level of provision as just meeting our statutory requirements at the cost of early intervention and prevention. To enable an ongoing plan of work to be developed to ensure schools have the right skills to implement basic speech and language techniques benefiting the whole school, additional speech and language therapy is proposed.</p>	0	50	50
Sub total – new developments	465	180	645
Grand total – all items for consultation with schools	2,648	445	3,093