

Notice of Meeting

Schools Forum

Martin Gocke (Pupil Referral Unit Representative (Governor))
(Chair)
Stuart Matthews, Academy School Representative (Headteacher)
(Vice-Chairman)
Jennifer Baker, Special School Representative
Sue Butler, Early Years PVI Provider
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Karen Davis, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Keith Grainger, Secondary School Representative (Headteacher)
Jo Lagares, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Roger Prew, Primary School Representative (Governor)
Elizabeth Savage, Academy School Representative (Headteacher)
Phil Sherwood, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Debbie Smith, Secondary School Representative (Headteacher)
Richard Stok, Primary School Representative (Governor)
Grant Strudley, Academy School Representative
Greg Wilton, Teacher Union Representative



Also Invited:

Councillor Dr Gareth Barnard, Executive Member for Children,
Young People & Learning

Thursday 13 January 2022, 4.30 - 6.30 pm
Zoom Meeting

Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1.	Apologies for Absence/Substitute Members	
	To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute members. Reporting:	
2.	Declarations of Interest	
	Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary or affected interests 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. Any Member with an affected Interest in a matter must disclose the interest to the meeting. There is no requirement to withdraw from the meeting when the interest is only an affected interest, but the Monitoring Officer should be notified of the interest, if not previously notified of it, within 28 days of the meeting. Reporting:	

EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

3.	Minutes and Matters Arising	3 - 10
	To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of 9 December 2021. Reporting: ALL	
4.	2022-23 Proposals for the Early Years Block Element of the Schools Budget	11 - 22
	To seek agreement from the Forum to proposals for the 2022-23 Early Years budgets, including the values to be attributed to the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Funding Formula. Reporting: Paul Clark	
5.	2022-23 Proposals for the Schools Block and Central School Services Block Elements of the Schools Budget	23 - 44
	To present final proposals from the Council for the 2022-23 Schools Block and Central Schools Services Block elements of the Schools Budget. Reporting: Paul Clark	
6.	2022-23 Proposals for the Local Authority Budget	45 - 68
	To present for comment the draft proposals for the Council's 2022/23 budget. Reporting: Paul Clark	
7.	Dates of Future Meetings	
	The next meeting of the Forum will be held at 4.30pm on Thursday 10 March 2022. Meetings have also been scheduled at 4.30pm on the following dates in the 2022/23 municipal year: 23 June, 15 September, 17 November, 8 December 2022, 12 January and 9 March 2023. Reporting: Joanna Gibbons	

Sound recording, photographing, filming and use of social media is permitted. Please contact Derek Morgan, 01344 352044, derek.morgan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk, so that any special arrangements can be made.

Published: 4 January 2022

EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS

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



**SCHOOLS FORUM
9 DECEMBER 2021
4.30 - 5.40 PM**

Present:

Martin Gocke, Pupil Referral Unit Representative (Governor) (Chair)
Stuart Matthews, Academy School Representative (Headteacher) (Vice-Chairman)
Jennifer Baker, Special School Representative
Liz Cole, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Karen Davis, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Keith Grainger, Secondary School Representative (Headteacher)
Jo Lagares, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Roger Prew, Primary School Representative (Governor)
Elizabeth Savage, Academy School Representative (Headteacher)
Phil Sherwood, Primary School Representative (Headteacher)
Debbie Smith, Secondary School Representative (Headteacher)
Richard Stok, Primary School Representative (Governor)
Greg Wilton, Teacher Union Representative

Observer:

Councillor Dr Gareth Barnard, Executive Member for Children, Young People & Learning
(Observer)

Apologies for absence were received from:

Sue Butler, Early Years PVI Provider
Grant Strudley, Academy School Representative

209. Apologies for Absence/Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

210. Declarations of Interest

Richard Stok declared an affected interest regarding Item 4 (Education Capital Strategy) as a member of the "Save Jealott's Hill" campaign.

Councillor Barnard declared an affected interest as a governor of Warfield Primary School regarding Item 6 (2022-23 Budget Proposals for the Schools Budget: Schools and Central School Services Block Elements) in relation to recommendation 3.1 (3) for an additional £0.050m funding for Warfield Primary.

211. Minutes and Matters Arising

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Forum on 18 November 2021 be approved as a correct record.

Arising from minute 203, Cherry Hall would report on the proposed funding formula under Item 5 (Initial proposals for the 2022-23 Early Years Block Budget and Funding Formula).

Arising from minute 204, Paul Clark would report on the de-delegation model under Item 6 (2022-23 Budget Proposals for the Schools Budget: Schools and Central School Services Block Elements).

Arising from minute 206, Jenny Baker updated that the High Needs Block (HNB) subgroup had been working on two main projects. The first was around banding descriptors and this work started in Spring / Summer 2021. This was supported by a consultant who presented the subgroup with four models. The subgroup chose to pilot two of those models after refining some of the descriptors. The pilot involved Garth Hill College, The Rise at Garth Hill College, Owlsmoor Primary School, Jennett's Park CE Primary School, Kennel Lane School, and Whitegrove Primary School. After the consultant left, the subgroup took ownership of the project from September and subsequent work identified the Windsor & Maidenhead model as the preferred option. It was felt that this gave a better clarity and understanding of the descriptors of the needs of the children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) within the Borough, what provision might entail for a child with those needs, and the type of placement that the child may need. This was presented by KLS staff to Nichola Jones and other members of the SEN Service last month, discussing how the points could transfer to the different scales within that model. This was due to come back to the subgroup for further discussion but was postponed due to the Ofsted SEND inspection. The subgroup decided from an early stage that the descriptors should not have any monetary value attached to them as it should be about the needs of the child. The second piece of work was to review the Service Level Agreements (SLAs), and Jenny Baker believed that those were all agreed and completed, and discussions were now taking place with the individual schools. Jenny Baker added that, at the start of the academic year, the terms of reference were updated to ensure it was clear that the key aim of the subgroup was to save money and reduce the deficit of the HNB.

212. **Education Capital Strategy**

The Forum considered a report which presented the proposed capital strategy for Education & Learning. The Forum was encouraged to provide feedback on the proposals.

Chris Hilliard advised that the duty to provide sufficient school places was for all age ranges in both maintained and academy schools. Whilst the government had not defined what "sufficient" meant, the Department for Education (DfE) recognised that an excess of 5% surplus places would need to be addressed. Likewise, a deficit of places in excess of 5% would also need to be addressed.

There were no current issues regarding Early Years childcare capacity across the Borough. However, for mainstream primary schools in the Borough, forecasts indicated a surplus of places significantly exceeding the 5% target over the next five years. There was no immediate concern for the secondary sector, and it was broadly manageable but needed to be kept under review. Regarding Post-16 education, whilst there was no statutory duty to ensure sufficiency, the Council had identified a need to look at the balance of Post-16 provision and the courses available.

There was currently a deficit of SEND places within the Borough, meaning that a third of children with complex needs were being educated outside of the Borough. Therefore, the Council had proposed to consult with Headteachers, Governors and Trustees whether any surplus mainstream accommodation could be used for SEND. The intention was to consult on both of those issues (surplus mainstream places and

the deficit of SEND places) and then bring any proposals back to feature as part of the Council's capital programme.

Chris Hilliard, Chris Taylor and Nichola Jones had met with the three geographical clusters within the Borough (North Bracknell, South Bracknell, and Sandhurst and Crowthorne) and had engaging discussions with those colleagues. They had invited feedback to be made by 10th January 2022. The SEN sufficiency document would also be prepared by that date, which would feed through to the Capital Strategy.

The Forum expressed that some incorrect information had been included in the presentation shared with the Headteachers; slide 11 referred to an older version of the Local Plan. Chris Taylor agreed to review, correct and reissue as necessary.

Action: Chris Taylor

The Forum noted that Kings Academy Binfield had published their intention to increase their Primary phase Planned Admission Numbers (PAN) from 1FE (Forms of Entry) to 2FE. This was felt to disadvantage other local primary schools, and the Forum asked why this was happening now, especially in light of the Council being in a process of gathering information. Chris Taylor replied that Kings Academy Binfield had not increased their PAN yet and the proposal was to increase from September 2022. Chris Taylor acknowledged that this expansion would add to the problem of surplus primary places in North Bracknell, but the agreement to do so was reached between the Council and the academy some time ago. However, following discussions between the Council and Kings Academy Binfield, in acknowledgment of the Council's concerns about surplus places, the academy had made a concession to delay their primary expansion plans to September 2022 (it was originally planned to increase from September 2021). Chris Hilliard added that this was the subject of robust discussion with the North Bracknell cluster. The Forum asked whether there was a requirement for Kings Academy Binfield to do another consultation to increase their PAN. Chris Taylor replied that there was no requirement for consultation to increase their PAN, and admissions arrangements were published and set 18 months ahead of any planned change to the PAN, and because that time had passed, the September 2022 PAN was fixed.

The Forum noted the request for feedback from Headteachers and asked what format that should take. Chris Hilliard replied that there was guidance in the email that was sent out to Headteachers on 12 November 2021 which suggested four areas to feed back on. Chris Taylor added that any format would be welcome.

Chris Taylor confirmed for the secondary school representatives of the Forum that the headteacher cluster meetings referred to above were for primary school colleagues only, and it was just primary school Headteachers who were expected to reply to the consultation. Chris Hilliard added that this was due to the biggest challenges being the surplus places within the primary sector and the pressing demands of SEND, meaning those areas needed to be looked at first. Separate discussions were needed with the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and special schools and that had been planned for next term. Whilst there was less concern with secondary schools about surplus spaces, there was a desire to cover all sectors, so discussions with secondary schools were planned for the autumn term in 2022. The Forum highlighted that SEND discussions were relevant to all schools, including secondary schools.

The Forum asked whether funding was available as part of the SEND capital strategy. Chris Taylor confirmed that the Council was bringing together a funding envelope under the capital umbrella to put together an overall package. There was

some funding available from the DfE via their SEND grants, and some funding available through the Section 106 process (developer contributions from new housing). There was also an appetite within the Council to ensure there were enough facilities for SEND, so the Council may in future consider additional funding from its own resources. Chris Hilliard added that, if there were increasing numbers of children being educated within the borough rather than being educated outside the borough, this would represent financial savings in terms of revenue.

The Forum noted that over time, any trends within the primary sector would translate to the secondary sector. Chris Taylor agreed with this and explained that they make predictions for secondary schools up to seven years ahead.

The Forum expressed surprise in being able to predict declining birth numbers. The Forum also asked whether there were any calculations regarding impact of additional housing around North Bracknell. Chris Taylor replied, regarding estimates of declining birth numbers, figures were obtained from different sources. The ONS published population data, but more focused local data was available from the NHS by postcode, which meant that the Council could see the numbers of children being born in each catchment area. Whilst ONS and NHS figures did not exactly coincide, they both showed the same trend of a decrease in birth numbers. Regarding new housing, this was still prevalent, particularly in the north of the Borough. Since 2005, the Council had been undertaking surveys using consultants to the occupants of new housing in the Borough to undertake research on pupil yields. This was done every two or three years and had revealed that pupil yields had been reducing since 2016. Therefore, even though construction levels had been sustained, this had not seen an equivalent increase in children coming into Bracknell Forest schools from that housing. The figures also showed that, where families moved within the Borough, 85% chose not to move children from their existing schools, so the impact of new housing was not likely to be felt for some years after they had been built.

RESOLVED to NOTE the proposed capital strategy for Education & Learning as set out in the Appendix to the report.

213. **Initial proposals for the 2022-23 Early Years Block Budget and Funding Formula**

The Forum considered a report which sought agreement for changes to the Early Years Funding Formula from April 2022, the principles to be adopted for allocating the announced increases to the Early Years Block Budget, and to consider if appropriate arrangements were in place for administration of the early years' free entitlements.

Cherry Hall explained that the focus was on the formula itself rather than the monetary values which would be presented to the Forum in January 2022 on receipt of indicative figures.

The Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) had key requirements that Local Authorities needed to meet. The Council consulted with providers and the Early Years Forum around the proposed changes to the EYNFF. There were limited responses from the providers, so the proposals had been agreed by the Early Years Forum based on the feedback from the wider provider groups. One procedural correction was required as the deprivation supplements should apply to both the universal and extended entitlements for 3- and 4-year-olds with the current formula relating only to the universal entitlement. Also, the formula factor referencing the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) was subject to annual update,

and providers preferred more stability and predictability to plan ahead for more than one year.

The Chair asked why the recommendations were to the Leader of the Council and not the Executive Member. Paul Clark explained that it was due to the conflict of interest that Councillor Barnard had declared on the Schools Budget, with the Executive Member decision having already been set to consider both of these budget matters at the same time.

RESOLVED

1. to RECOMMEND to the Leader of the Council:
 - i. that taking account of comments from providers to the consultation on the Council's proposed changes to the Early Years Funding Formula from April 2022:
 - a. the deprivation supplement will apply to the universal and extended entitlements for 3- and 4-year-olds;
 - b. funding bands for the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement are reduced from three to two;
 - c. calculation of the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement is changed to a three-year rolling average score;
 - d. the revised process for allocating providers to the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement, as set out in paragraph 5.15 of the report;
 - e. eligibility for the quality supplement will be limited to the setting in which the person with the relevant early years qualification at level 5 or above is based; and
 - f. there are appropriate arrangements in place for administration of the early years free entitlements; and
 - ii. initial proposals for the 2022-23 Early Years Block Budget as set out in the supporting information in paragraphs 5.34 to 5.36 of the report; and
2. to NOTE the final 2022-23 Early Years Block Budget proposals and funding rates to be allocated to the Early Years Funding Formula will be presented to the Forum for comment in January.

Councillor Barnard left the meeting at this point due to needing to attend another meeting.

214. 2022-23 Budget Proposals for the Schools Budget: Schools and Central School Services Block Elements

The Forum considered a report which sought to ensure that final 2022-23 budget decisions could be made at the 13 January Forum meeting in order to meet the 21 January 2022 statutory deadline. Therefore, updated proposals for the Schools Block (SB) and Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) elements of the Schools Budget were presented.

The report presentation reflected the specific membership voting requirements of the required decisions.

Regarding the proposed de-delegation of School Improvement Services, Paul Clark reminded the Forum that they had wanted to hear views from the Headteachers before making a decision. Primary Headteachers were asked to respond to Liz Cole if they did not support the proposal, and 2 replies were received. By default, the vast majority of primary headteachers were content with the proposal. The feedback from secondary Headteachers had not been received in time for sharing in the published report. Therefore, Debbie Smith provided a verbal update that two Headteachers had agreed with the proposal whereas one was not in agreement.

Items for Maintained Primary School representatives only

RESOLVED to AGREE

1. that the per pupil deduction amounts for existing de-delegated services be increased by 2.6%, the average increase in per pupil funding expected to be received by schools (paragraph 6.25 of the report); and
2. the de-delegation of School Improvement Service, to be funded by the remaining School Improvement Monitoring and Brokerage Grant with no deduction from schools (paragraph 6.26 of the report).

Items for Maintained Secondary representatives only

RESOLVED to AGREE

1. that the per pupil deduction amounts for existing de-delegated services be increased by 2.6%, the average increase in per pupil funding expected to be received by schools (paragraph 6.25 of the report); and
2. the de-delegation of School Improvement Service, to be funded by the remaining School Improvement Monitoring and Brokerage Grant with no deduction from schools (paragraph 6.26 of the report).

Paul Clark updated on the rest of the budget and highlighted the executive summary of the report. The DfE had released provisional data from the October 2021 school census update, but this needed to be verified by the DfE. From the data available, pupil numbers had increased by 0.8%. Therefore, there was an increase in funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and an increase in the growth fund. Paul Clark reminded the Forum about the extra costs of the Warfield split site and the request for an additional £0.050m funding allocation; the DfE had given their consent for that, and a proposal to agree this was included in the report.

Regarding the £0.050m funding cut on the Central School Services Block, Paul Clark explained that the budget proposals which the Council had published confirmed the intention for the Council to finance the shortfall.

Taking account of the new data, it was expected that there would be a funding gap of £0.346m. The report set out three options to manage the shortfall, which were the same three options that the Council considered every year. The Forum were asked for their views.

The Forum asked whether the issue of the falling numbers of children on roll was included in this report. Paul Clark explained that schools received funding based on actual numbers of children on roll. If those numbers were falling, then funding would be based on a lower number than the previous year, and the Council would ordinarily try to manage that by working with the school. Falling rolls and the financial difficulty this may cause in some schools was highlighted as a Strategic Risk in paragraph 7.4 of the report. The Forum noted that this would be an increased burden on Paul Clark and his team. Paul Clark added that he was grateful for the way that schools promptly highlighted issues of this nature.

RESOLVED to AGREE

1. that subject to any late changes proposed to the Forum in January, the 2022-23 budget is set in accordance with the supporting information, as summarised in Table 1, and in particular:
 - i. that no changes are made to the Start-up and diseconomy funding policy for new and expanding schools (paragraph 6.17 of the report);

- ii. that the Growth Fund, including appropriate elements is set at the amount reported in Annex 1 of the report;
 - iii. that the split site funding allocation to Warfield Primary school is increased by £0.050m to £0.125m (paragraph 6.23 of the report); and
 - iv. that the elements of the CSSB and relevant budget amounts are as detailed in Annex 2 of the report; and
- the preferred approach to be taken in balancing any remaining shortfall on the SB (paragraph 6.38 of the report).

215. Dates of Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Forum would be held at 4.30pm on Thursday 13 January 2022.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

**TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
13 JANUARY 2022**

2022-23 PROPOSALS FOR THE EARLY YEARS BLOCK ELEMENT OF THE SCHOOLS BUDGET

Executive Director: People

1 PURPOSE OF DECISION

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from Schools Forum to proposals for the 2022-23 Early Years budgets, including the values to be attributed to the Bracknell Forest Council Early Years Funding Formula (EYFF).

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Forum considers the Early Years Budget proposal from the council and AGREES:

- 2.1 **That for the 2022-23 financial year the LEADER OF THE COUNCIL sets**
- 1. The Early Years Dedicated Schools Grant income budget at £7.98m (Table 4)**
 - 2. The funding rates in the Early Years Funding Formula are as set out in Table 5**
 - 3. The proposed budgets as set out in Annex 1**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The proposals have taken account of local priorities and estimated levels of available resources.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 None. The proposals reflect the approach agreed by Schools Forum on 9 December 2021 and the overall affordability within the financial settlement allocated by the Government.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 5.1 This report presents proposals on the Early Years Block (EYB) element of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) that the Department for Education (DfE) allocates to Local Authorities (LAs) to fund provisions and support for children up to the age of 5. It covers:
1. the 15 hours free entitlement to education and childcare for disadvantaged 2-year-olds
 2. the universal 15 hours free entitlement to education and childcare for all 3- and 4-year-olds
 3. the extended 15 hours free entitlement to education and childcare for eligible working parents of 3- and 4-year-olds
 4. the early years pupil premium (EYPP)
 5. the disability access fund (DAF)

6. the Special Educational Needs Inclusion Fund (SENIF)
7. other specialist and general support services

National Funding Framework

- 5.2 The DfE uses an Early Years National Funding Formula (EYNFF) to distribute DSG income to LAs. This funding framework sets out key requirements on LAs in setting their EYB budgets for **3- and 4-year-olds**. These are:
1. To develop and maintain a local EYFF in accordance with parameters set by the DfE, undertaking consultation with providers and the Schools Forum when any changes are proposed, where the EYFF:
 - i) should include a single funding rate (including the same base rate and supplements) for both entitlements (that is, both the universal 15 hours, and the additional 15 hours for working parents)
 - ii) must plan to pass on at least 95% of funding directly to providers – the “pass through rate”
 - iii) must use a universal base rate, paid at the same value to all providers
 - iv) must use a deprivation supplement to target additional funds to the providers admitting the most disadvantaged children
 - v) can include other discretionary supplements, which the DfE restricts to rurality / sparsity, flexibility of provision, English as an additional language (EAL) or quality of provision
 - vi) supplements selected by an LA can generally use any measure of eligibility, provided it is applied equally to all providers in a transparent and fair way
 - vii) must not allocate more than 10% of funding through supplements
 2. That a Special Educational Needs Inclusion Fund (SENIF) must be created to support children with lower level or emerging SEN
 3. Required to pass on the EYPP to providers to support eligible disadvantaged children
 4. Required to pass on DAF funding to providers to support disabled children’s access to the entitlements

- 5.3 Requirements on funding providers for **the most disadvantaged 2-year-olds** is more straightforward than for 3- and 4-year-olds, with no “pass through rate” or payment of additional funding supplements with the DfE encouraging LAs to pay a single flat rate amount. Neither is there a requirement for the SENIF to apply to 2-year-olds, although this is permitted and included in arrangements in the BF SENIF.

Provisional estimate of Early Years Block DSG income

- 5.4 To reflect potential fluctuation in take-up of the entitlements, and therefore costs, the DfE uses 2 census points to calculate each LAs Early Years Block DSG income. January 2022 part-time equivalent (PTE) actual head count data of eligible children age 2, 3 or 4 for 15 or 30 hours are used to calculate the first 5 months of the financial year from April to August 2022; with the equivalent January 2023 data used to fund the 7 months from September 2022 to March 2023.
- 5.5 The provisional estimate of the 2022-23 Early Years Block DSG income would normally use the January 2021 PTE data as a proxy for the whole year. However, the January 2021 data is not considered an appropriate proxy for the expected level of

uptake in January 2022 due to the impact of COVID-19 on the uptake of the Early Years Free Entitlements.

- 5.6 In December early years providers submitted a forecast funding claim for the Spring term 2022. An estimated PTE was calculated using this forecast funding claim; however, this varies considerably from the actual PTE in previous years. The actual PTE for the spring term 2019, 2020, 2021 and the estimate PTE for spring term 2022 are set out in table 1 below.

Table 1: Comparison of Spring term PTE 2019 to 2022

	Spring 2019 PTE	Spring 2020 PTE	Spring 2021 PTE	Estimated Spring 2022 PTE
2-year-olds	160.6	179.87	143.39	128.4
3- & 4-year-olds Universal	1,764.5	1,745.5	1,644.4	2,196.3
3- & 4-year-olds Extended	711.5	764.5	771.9	682.2
Total	2,636.6	2,689.87	2,559.69	3,006.9

- 5.7 With the continued uncertainty around the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on the uptake of the Early Years Free Entitlements and in particular the impact of the Omicron variant, it is prudent to take a conservative approach to setting the provisional estimate Early Years Block DSG income. Therefore, the proxy PTE is a weighted average of the PTE from spring 2019, 2020 and 2021. The resulting estimated PTE and funded hours are set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Estimate PTE and funded hours for Early Years Free Entitlements 2022-23

	PTE	Funded Hours
2-year-olds	158.4	90,288
3- & 4-year-olds Universal hours	1,698.1	967,917
3- & 4-year-olds Extended hours	759.4	432,858
Total	2,615.9	1,491,063

- 5.8 As previously reported, on 27 October 2021 the Government announced additional funding for the early years entitlements of £160m in 2022-23. This is for Local Authorities to increase hourly rates to childcare providers to “reflect cost pressures, as well as anticipated changes in the number of eligible children”. Details of the increase at an LA level were published on 25 November 2021. Bracknell Forest will receive an increase in funding for 3- and 4-year-olds of £0.17 per hour and for eligible 2-year-olds of £0.21 per hour. In addition, the national funding rate for early years pupil premium (EYPP) will increase by £0.07 per hour and the national funding rate for the disability access fund (DAF) will increase by £185 per year. Table 3 sets out the change in funding rates.

Table 3: Change to Early Years Funding received by BFC

	2021-22 funding rate	2022-23 funding rate	Change
2-year old's	£6.04	£6.25	3.5%
3- & 4-year old's	£5.07	£5.24	3.4%
EYPP	£0.53	£0.60	13.2%
DAF	£615	£800	30.0%

- 5.9 Using the principles set out above, Table 4 below provides a summary of the £7.98m anticipated EY DSG income for 2022-23 and Annex 1 provides a more detailed breakdown of the calculation.

Table 4: Forecast Early Years Block Income 2022-23

Item	Estimated amount
Funding for 3- & 4-year-olds: universal 15 hours	£5,071,940
Funding for 3- & 4-year-olds: extended 30 hours for working	£2,268,090
Sub Total: 3- & 4-year-olds	£7,340,070
Funding for 2-year-olds	£564,300
Funding for Early Years Pupil Premium	£38,540
Funding for Disability Access Fund	£37,600
Total	£7,980,510

Funding decisions previously taken by Schools Forum

- 5.10 The previous Forum meeting agreed several changes to the Early Years Funding formula, these were:
1. the deprivation supplement will apply to the universal and extended entitlements for 3- and 4-year-olds
 2. funding bands for the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement are reduced from three to two
 3. calculation of the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement is changed to a three-year rolling average score
 4. a revised process for allocating providers to the IDACI measure of the deprivation supplement
 5. eligibility for the quality supplement will be limited to the setting in which the person with the relevant early years qualification at level 5 or above is based
- 5.11 In the absence of complete financial information from the DfE for the 2022-23 Early Years Block Budget, the Forum agreed the following approach to setting the budget and associated provider hourly rates:
1. The components of the Early Years Funding Formula as agreed for 2021-22 are retained for 2022-23
 2. The announced increase in early years funding will be applied to the uniform base rate for 3- and 4-year-olds that is paid to all providers. An increase in funding for 2-year-olds will be applied to the hourly rate paid to providers

3. The total funding allocated to the SENIF and provider contingency will remain unchanged and should each be set at 1.4% of total income
 4. The EYFF should allocate 92.2% of total income with:
 - i) The uniform base rate set at around 94.3%
 - ii) The deprivation supplement set at around 3.7%
 - iii) The quality supplement set at around 2%
 - iv) No supplements to be paid for rurality / sparsity, EAL or provider flexibility
 5. Funding to be managed centrally by the council at 5% of income.
 - a) The DAF and EYPP funding allocation should be allocated to providers at the same funding rate as received from the DfE
- 5.12 The current EYFF and funding rates are set out in Annex 2

Budget Proposals

- 5.13 Reflecting on the detailed calculations required for funding 3 and 4 year olds, to implement the budget approach set out above, if the deprivation and quality supplements are to remain at the current proportions then a share of the £0.17 increase in hourly funding will need to be used to fully fund these supplements. Similarly, funding for the budgets outside the EYFF will also need a small increase. This means the hourly base rate would increase by £0.15. For 2 year olds the hourly base rate would increase by £0.19.
- 5.14 Table 5 sets out the proposed 2022-23 Early Years Funding Formula that incorporates the proposed changes to the Formula, the increase in the Early Years Block income and the agreed approach for setting the budget and associated provider rates.

Table 5: Summary of the proposed 2022-23 Early Years Funding Formula

EYFF Element	Weighting	Proposed hourly funding rate	% total EY funding
Deprivation Supplement	1.6 % of EYFF via IDACI scores Average IDACI score of children attending setting.		
	Band 2	£0.32	
	Band 1	£0.16	
	2.2% of EYFF via child eligibility to EYPP	£1.40	
Quality Supplement	2.8% of EYFF via setting leadership qualification Level 5 and above	£0.14	
Uniform Base Rate	94.2% of EYFF	£4.60	
	Indicative EYFF average provider rate	£4.88	92.2%
	Average SEN funding	£0.07	1.4%
	Average contingency funding	£0.07	1.4%
	Subtotal to providers	£5.03	95%
	Average BFC funding (5%) max	£0.26	5%
	Indicative funding 3 and 4 year olds	£5.29	100%
	Provider funding rate for 2 year olds	£5.81	

Note: The 3 and 4 year olds indicative hourly funding rate for all costs of £5.29 exceeds the £5.24 payment received from the DfE due to use of different census points for the income received and payments made.

5.15 Data on funded hours for the 2021 calendar year was used to compare the impact of the proposed 2022-23 Early Years Funding Formula to the current Early Years Funding formula on forecast provider income with the following highlight changes:

1. 1 (1%) provider will see a reduced income of up to 2%
2. 12 (9%) providers will see increased income of up to 2%
3. 100 (71%) providers will see increased income of up to 4%
4. 16 (11%) providers will see increase income of up to 6%
5. 11 (8%) providers will see an increased income of more than 6%

(this forecast is based on 140 providers funded in the 2021-22 financial year and is provided as an exemplar only).

Schools Supplementary Grant

- 5.16 Members will be aware from the agenda item relating to the proposals for the 2022-23 Schools Block Budget that the DfE confirmed schools will be allocated additional funding to provide support for the costs of the Health and Social Care Levy, including the 1.25% increase in employer National Insurance contributions and wider costs. This includes a £24 per pupil allocation to schools for early years provisions. However, the grant guidance confirms that “The schools supplementary grant will only be payable to public sector employers. This means that ... private and voluntary sector (PVI) early years providers will not be eligible to receive this funding”.
- 5.17 The council has sought an explanation from the DfE to the apparent funding inequality between schools and PVI providers and is awaiting a response.

Next Steps

- 5.18 The EYB budget proposal for 2022-23 will be presented to the Executive member for approval on 18 January 2022.
- 5.19 Providers will be notified of funding rates for 2022-23 by 1 February 2022

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 There are no specific legal issues arising from the recommendations in this report. The legal issues are addressed within the report.

Director of Resources

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

Impact Assessment

- 6.3 No Equalities Impact Assessment is required as the proposed changes implement statutory guidance which includes eligibility criteria.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.4 There is no perceived risk, all proposals are within budget limits and are informed by provider feedback.

Climate Change Implications

- 6.5 The recommendations from this report are not expected to have an impact on emissions of carbon dioxide

BACKGROUND PAPERS

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/718179/Early_education_and_childcare-statutory_guidance.pdf

Early education and childcare statutory guidance for local authorities - June 2018

[Early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers operational guide 2022 to 2023 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/718179/Early_years_entitlements_local_authority_funding_of_providers_operational_guide_2022_to_2023_-_GOV.UK_(www.gov.uk))

Early years entitlements: local authority funding of providers operational guide 2022 to 2023

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Cherry Hall, Head of Early Years

01344 352811

cherry.hall@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

David Allais, Early Years Business and Family Information Manager

01344 354027

david.allais@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Proposed 2022-23 EY Budgets

<u>2022-23 EY Budget</u>	3 and 4 year olds						2 year olds			
	Hourly funding rate	Funded hours per week	Funded weeks per year	Total funded hours	Total Funding	%	Hourly funding rate	Total funded hours	Total Funding	%
<u>Forecast DSG funding from the DfE:</u>										
15 hours free entitlement funding forecast	£5.24	15	38	967,928	£5,071,940		£6.25	90,299	£564,370	
30 hours free entitlement funding forecast	£5.24	15	38	432,841	£2,268,090		-	-	-	
Total BFC estimate of EY DSG funding	£5.24			1,400,769	£7,340,030		£6.25	90,299	£564,370	
2021-22 rate	£5.07						£6.04			
Change	£0.17	3.4%					£0.21	3.5%		
<u>For allocation through the EY Funding Formula (notional split by supplement):</u>										
Basic rate	£4.60	94.2%	of allocated funds		£6,375,970		£5.81	90,299	£524,640	
Deprivation supplement (average)	£0.18	3.8%	of allocated funds		£258,920		-	-	-	
Quality (average)	£0.09	2.0%	of allocated funds		£132,620		-	-	-	
Total BFC estimate of EY Funding Formula allocati	£4.88	(average)			£6,767,510	92.2%	£5.81	90,299	£524,640	93.0%
2021-22 rate	£4.72						£5.62			
Change	£0.16	3.3%					£0.19	3.4%		
<u>Funding to be managed by the Council</u>										
<i>Outside the 5% cap of EY Funding Formula:</i>										
SEN Inclusion Fund	£0.07	1.4%	of total available funds		£102,760				£11,511	
Provider Contingency	£0.07	1.4%	of total available funds		£102,760					
					£205,520	2.8%			£11,511	2.0%
Total within the 95% allocation to providers - the "Pass through rate"					£6,973,030	95.0%			£536,151	95.0%

Proposed 2022-23 EY Budgets

<u>2022-23 EY Budget</u>	3 and 4 year olds						2 year olds			
	Hourly funding rate	Funded hours per week	Funded weeks per year	Total funded hours	Total Funding	%	Hourly funding rate	Total funded hours	Total Funding	%
<i>Inside the 5% cap of EY Funding Formula:</i>										
BFC Services	£0.26		5.0% of total available funds							
Outreach to parents				£47,209				£26,029		
Professional support to providers				£143,890				£0		
Business support to providers				£66,571				£0		
S&L Therapist assistant				£13,200				£0		
Free milk				£11,210				£0		
Free entitlement systems and software				£37,171				£2,190		
Management of the EY Funding Formula				£47,750				£0		
2 Total BFC estimate of funding to be managed by the Council				£367,000		5.0%			£28,219	5.0%
Total BFC estimate of EY funding				£7,340,030		100.00%			£564,370	100.0%
<u>Other Income</u>										
Early Years Pupil Premium	£0.60	15	38	64,239	£38,540					
Ring fenced Disability Access Fund		£800	per child	47	£37,600					
Total anticipated income - DSG and other				£7,980,540						

Summary of the 2021-22 BF Early Years Funding Formula

EYFF Element	Weighting	Proposed hourly funding rate	% total EY funding
Deprivation Supplement	1.9% of EYFF via IDACI scores Average IDACI score of children attending setting. Top 20% - Band 3 Next 10% - Band 2 Next 10% - Band 1	£0.13, £0.26 & £0.39	
	2.4% of EYFF via child eligibility to EYPP	£1.54	
Quality Supplement	2.1% of EYFF via setting leadership qualification Level 5 and above	£0.14	
Uniform Base Rate	93.6% of EYFF	£4.45	
	Indicative EYFF average provider rate	£4.65	91.7%
	Average SEN funding	£0.10	2%
	Average contingency funding	£0.08	1.5%
	Subtotal to providers	£4.83	95.2%
	Average BFC funding (5%) max	£0.24	4.8%
	Indicative funding from DfE to BFC	£5.07	100%

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE: 13 JANUARY 2022

**2022-23 PROPOSALS FOR THE SCHOOLS BLOCK AND
CENTRAL SCHOOL SERVICES BLOCK ELEMENTS OF THE SCHOOLS BUDGET**
Executive Director: People

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present final proposals from the Council for the 2022-23 Schools Block (SB) and Central Schools Services Block (CSSB) elements of the Schools Budget.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 Building on earlier decisions agreed by the Forum together with the release by the Department for Education (DfE) of the key data that must be used to calculate school budgets, final work on next year's Schools Budget has now been completed. Inevitably, this has led to some changes now being presented, most notably as a result of confirmed additional educational needs (AEN) data which using the DfE the National Funding Formula (NFF) will result in an additional £0.233m being allocated to schools, although with the interaction with the *Start-up and diseconomy funding policy for new and expanding schools*, this reduces to a net pressure of £0.148m.
- 2.2 With Local Authorities (LAs) funded for their schools through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) on lagged 2020 data, there is no change in the overall amount of funds available for next year's SB to finance this additional £0.148m cost.
- 2.3 There are a number of other, less significant changes to the funding and budget calculations that result in a £0.164m increase to the funding gap to achieve the NFF rates which now stands at £0.510m.
- 2.4 The Executive Director: Finance has considered the medium-term financial outlook for school budgets and concluded that there are insufficient Reserves to fully fund the £0.510m shortfall. Therefore, funding at 99.75% of NFF rates is proposed. The DfE considers LAs to be mirroring the NFF when schools are funded at 99% or above NFF rates.
- 2.5 This approach results in a £0.356m draw down from Reserves and school budgets being set at £0.154m below the NFF amount. Therefore funding at reduced NFF values funds the additional costs being incurred as a result of the AEN eligibilities on the 2021 census that LAs need to fund schools on, but for which the DfE does not increase LA income.
- 2.6 Overall, the final proposals being presented result in schools on average receiving an increase in per pupil funding of 2.7%, which compares to 3.8% in 2021-22, 6.3% in 2020-21, 2.8% in 2019-20 and 2.7% in 2018-19.
- 2.7 In addition to this increase in funding through the Bracknell Forest (BF) Funding Formula for Schools, as part of the School Funding settlement, the DfE has confirmed that in the 2022-23 financial year, schools will be allocated additional funding, to provide support for the costs of the Health and Social Care Levy, including the 1.25% increase in employer National Insurance contributions and wider costs. This funding will be allocated through the new Schools Supplementary Grant with the DfE estimating this at £2.420m for BF. On average, this amounts to £146 per pupil, equivalent to a 3.0% increase.

- 2.8 Therefore, on average, schools will receive a 5.7% increase in funding which is expected to be more than sufficient to cover rising costs.
- 2.9 Recommendations agreed from this report will form the basis of proposals to be presented to the Leader of the Council on 18 January, who will be agreeing most aspects of the Schools Budget. However, within the overall budget setting process, there are a number of areas where the Forum holds responsibility, and these are separately presented now for a decision.
- 2.10 With the DfE needing to be informed of the actual Funding Formula for Schools to be used in 2022-23 with associated units of resource and total cost no later than 21 January, final budget decisions must be made at this meeting.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

To AGREE:

- 3.1 **In its role as the representative body of schools and other providers of education and childcare, the Forum REQUESTS that the Leader of the Council AGREES the following for the 2022-23 Schools Budget:**
1. **the changes to budgets as set out in Table 3, in particular:**
 - i. **that the Schools Block DSG be set at £84.434m (line 3);**
 - ii. **that the Central School Services Block be set at £0.867m (line 3);**
 - iii. **the changes to all other budgets that amount to £2.903m (line 18).**
 2. **that the £0.510m resultant funding shortfall will be met from:**
 - i. **Council Reserves, to the value of £0.182m**
 - ii. **Schools Budget DSG Reserves, to the value of £0.174m**
 - iii. **scaled NFF rates, to the value of £0.154m.**
 3. **that the factors used in the BF Funding Formula for Schools are the same as those used by the DfE for BF in the NFF (Annex 4);**
 4. **that the units of resource used in the BF Funding Formula for Schools are set at 99.75% of the values used by the DfE in the NFF;**
 5. **that the cost of the MFG should be financed by all schools above the average increase in per pupil funding;**
 6. **that the resulting DfE pro forma template of the 2022-23 BF Funding Formula for Schools, as set out in Annex 5 be submitted by the 21 January deadline;**
 7. **that other Schools Block related grants, including the new Schools Supplementary Grant, be set to the amounts anticipated in 2022-23.**
- 3.2 **As decision maker:**
1. **that the arrangements in place for the administration of central government grants are appropriate;**
 2. **the financing and budgets for the Growth Fund are as set out in Annex 1.**
 3. **The budgets to be centrally managed by the council on behalf of schools, as set out in Annex 2**

4 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 To ensure that the 2022-23 Schools Budget is developed in accordance with the views of the Schools Forum, the anticipated level of resources and the statutory funding framework, including the requirement to submit summary details of individual 2022-23 school budgets to the DfE by 21 January 2022.

5 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 These have been considered during each stage of the budget process.

6 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background to School and Education Funding

- 6.1 The Forum has been kept up to date with DfE school and education funding reform, most notably through the introduction of a NFF since change was first announced in March 2016.
- 6.2 The Schools Budget is funded by the DSG, a 100% ring fenced government grant. The DSG comprises 4 funding Blocks, each with a separate calculation and funding allocation; the Schools Block (SB); the Central School Services Block (CSSB) the High Needs Block (HNB); and the Early Years Block (EYB). The SB and CSSB directly support mainstream schools and are generally delegated to governors, the HNB and EYB are centrally managed by LAs although the majority of funds are ultimately used to pay schools and other providers for services to children.
- 6.3 The DSG can only be spent on the purposes prescribed by the DfE. Any under or overspending in a year must also be ring-fenced and applied to a future Schools Budget. There is a general ring-fence in place in that SB funding must be spent on school budgets, although where agreed by the local Schools Forum, up to 0.5% of the SB (circa £0.422m) can be transferred to fund costs that fall into other Blocks. Money can be freely transferred from other Blocks into the SB or from the SB to CSSB.
- 6.4 Reflecting on local cost priorities, the Council's Executive previously agreed to support a 4-year funding strategy and will provide £1m from council balances to March 2023 to help finance the diseconomy funding required for the new schools.
- 6.5 Whilst the council retains responsibility for agreeing most aspects of the SB, with the Leader due to make final decisions, there are several areas where the Forum holds responsibility, and these are now being presented for a decision.
- 6.6 This report focuses on the SB and CSSB elements of the Schools Budget where DSG funding is allocated to LAs by way of:
- A pupil-led NFF that uses the most up to date census data relating to number on roll, deprivation, low prior attainment and English as an additional language measures (SB)
 - School based funding, based on prior year costs for business rates and other property factors such as schools operating across split sites (SB)

- Two funding protection mechanisms (SB):
 - A minimum per pupil funding amount for the year (£4,265 for primary aged pupils in 2022-23 and £5,525 for secondary).
 - A minimum increase / maximum decrease in per pupil funding from the previous year (+2% for 2022-23 in BF)
- A per pupil amount for defined on-going LA education related responsibilities together with an amount for deprivation, based on number of Ever 6 Free School Meals pupils. Nationally, funding is split 90% via pupil head count and 10% via Ever 6 (CSSB).
- Contribution to previously agreed historic costs (for supporting vulnerable pupils) (CSSB).

Funds allocated through the CSSB continue to be subject to transitional funding adjustments as a result of the reforms, with the historic amount of funding expected to continue to reduce by 20% per annum to a nil value at 2025-26. A £0.050m funding reduction is expected for BF in 2022-23.

Progress to date

6.7 Previous meetings of the Forum agreed the following key budget decisions:

- that subject to affordability, the factor values in the BF Funding Formula should be set at the NFF rates used by the DfE. Should this not be affordable, then each factor value would be scaled by the same proportionate amount.
- that Minimum Per Pupil Funding (MPPF)¹ values are set at £4,265 for primary aged pupils and £5,525 for secondary aged pupils. These are the same values as used by the DfE in the NFF.
- that the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG)² is set at the maximum amount permitted by the DfE and delivers per pupil funding increases from 2021-22 for all schools of at least +2.00%.
- any cost associated with providing all schools with the agreed minimum percentage increase in per pupil funding from 2021-22 should be met by those schools receiving the largest increases in per pupil funding, typically those above the average percentage increase
- that de-delegation of budgets for the services requested by the council continues for maintained mainstream schools, with funding rates increased by 2.6%. The new option to de-delegate School Improvement Services was also agreed, but with no charge in 2022-23 as the remaining School Improvement grant is expected to be sufficient to meet LA costs.
- that a £20 per pupil contribution continues to be made by maintained schools towards the cost of delivering 'general' education related statutory and regulatory duties.

¹ The NFF includes MPPF values are applied to all school budgets where a top up is added if the normal operation of the Funding Formula does not deliver sufficient funds – for 2022-23 this is £4,265 for primary aged pupils and £5,525 for secondary. LAs had discretion to apply these values in their local funding formula but are now mandatory at local level, unless agreed by the DfE that they are unaffordable. The MPPF calculation required by the DfE excludes funding for business rates.

² The MFG compares per pupil funding allocations between years and where the change is below the minimum threshold, a funding top-up is added to meet the minimum per pupil change requirement. The MFG calculation required by the DfE excludes funding for business rates and fixed lump sum allocations. The cost of top-up funding is financed by scaling back increases to schools experiencing funding gains.

- meeting the diseconomy costs at new and expanding schools in a measured way from a combination of council reserves, Schools Budget reserves, and funding allocated for the relevant year from the DfE.
- that a centrally managed Growth Fund should be maintained for in-year allocation to qualifying schools.
- on-going central retention by the Council of the existing Central School Services Block items.
- The preferred approach to be taken in balancing the forecast shortfall on the SB as follows:
 1. Draw down funds from the Reserve created by the council to help finance the additional costs of new and expanding schools, where £0.182m is available.
 2. Draw down funds from the Reserve created in the unallocated Schools Budget to support the additional costs of new and expanding schools, where £0.746m is available.
 3. Fund schools at a scaled percentage of the NFF, with all factors scaled by the same percentage. Scaling of 0.1% to the NFF equates to around £0.070m.
 4. For April 2023, there should be at least £0.500m in Reserves to fund the medium-term cost of new schools (current balance is £0.928m).
 5. Ordinarily, around £0.250m of funding is withdrawn each year from Reserves.

Final budget proposals for 2022-23

- 6.8 As the DfE data that must be used for funding purposes has emerged, and more work has been undertaken on other budget calculations, a number of changes to budgets are now being proposed from those anticipated at the December meeting of the Forum. There are no changes recommended to previously agreed principles.

Confirmed Schools Block DSG income

- 6.9 The DfE published verified October 2021 school census and the other data that must be used to calculate 2022-23 school budgets at the end of 20 December. This confirmed 8 fewer primary aged pupils than previously expected and a 1 less pupil in DSG Growth Fund³ calculation which result in a £0.032m reduction in SB DSG income to £84.434m (£81.992m from per pupil funding, £0.738m for the Growth Fund and £1.704m for non-pupil-based school costs, such as business rates).

³ The Growth Fund comprises 3 elements: funding for significant in-year increases in pupil numbers at existing schools; allocations to schools requiring additional financial support to meet Key Stage 1 Infant Class Size Regulations; and pre-opening, diseconomy and post opening costs for new schools.

Changes in funding allocations to schools:

- 6.10 This section only reports on budget areas that have changed from the December meeting of the Forum.

Change in pupil numbers - £0.027m overall decrease in funding

- 6.11 Paragraph 6.9 above confirmed 8 fewer primary pupils were on roll than previously expected. This results in a £0.027m reduction in budget allocations to relevant schools.

Changes in AEN - £0.233m overall increase in funding

- 6.12 The published DfE data set includes updated pupil profile measures to reflect latest characteristics which are used as proxy measures for targeting funds towards pupils with the greatest needs. This is the data that must be used in the local Funding Formula and generally results in changes to the estimated calculations made to this point. The October 2021 census data has shown a significant level of change with an overall increase in funding allocations of £0.233m.

- 6.13 Members of the Forum will be aware that the DfE uses lagged data to fund LAs through the units of resource in the SB DSG. This means that despite requiring LAs to fund schools on the latest data, they in turn receive funding based on prior year data which was already reflected in earlier DSG funding notifications and will not be updated. Clearly, where there is an increase between years, there will be a cost pressure in the SB. This is one of the most common reasons why LAs may not be able to fully fund school budgets at the NFF rates with the DfE setting out in the recent *Fair Funding for All* consultation that this is recognised and “Currently, we class LAs which have local factor values within 1% of the respective NFF values as ‘mirroring’ the NFF”.

- 6.14 The proxy measures used in the data set indicate relative levels of deprivation (Free School Meals (FSM), Ever6 FSM⁴ and Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)⁵, Low Prior Attainment (LPA) from national tests, incidence of English as an additional language (EAL) and high in-year pupil mobility.

The following sections set out the changes that have occurred against the information available in December.

Primary schools – Change in AEN measures (£0.196m):

- FSM numbers are up by +182 / +16.5% (+£0.090m).
- Ever6 FSM deprivation numbers are up by +107 / +8.8% (+£0.066m)
- IDACI scores vary by post code and are banded by severity and therefore changes are more difficult to interpret. The pure numbers are up by +9 / +0.80% (+£0.002m).

⁴ Ever6 FSM counts the proportion of pupils on roll on the October 2021 census (was previously January census) that were recorded as eligible for FSM in any of the censuses (autumn, spring and summer, including the alternative provision (AP) and pupil referral unit (PRU) census) over the previous 6 years census.

⁵ IDACI uses post code data to calculate the probability of a family with children living in that area being eligible to income support benefits. The higher the probability, the higher the funding top-up – via bandings.

- LPA⁶ scores are down by -47 / -2.0% (-£0.056m). With the coronavirus pandemic resulting in the cancellation of national tests, the 2019 results have been replicated in 2021.
- EAL numbers are up by +60 / +7.2% (+£0.036m)
- Mobility numbers are up by +58 / +87.4% (+£0.057m)

Secondary schools – change in AEN measures (+£0.037m):

- FSM numbers for Secondary are up by +92 / +11.2% (+£0.046m).
 - Ever6 FSM deprivation numbers are down by -70 / -6.5% (-£0.064m)
 - IDACI scores vary by post code and are banded by severity and therefore changes are more difficult to interpret. The pure numbers are up by +4 / +0.9% (+£0.002m)
 - LPA⁷ scores are down by -1 / -1.0% (£-0.002m).
 - EAL numbers are up by +36 / 26.5% (+£0.055m)
- 6.15 The most significant changes in data and therefore budget allocations relate to actual FSM (+£0.136m), EAL (+£0.091m), high pupil mobility (+£0.057m) and LPA (-£0.058m).
- 6.16 The increases in pure FSM numbers and EAL, as evidenced in the October 2021 census reflect the changing current pupil profile in schools. For pupils identified with a first language other than English, funding is allocated for three years after they enter the statutory school system.
- 6.17 The mobility factor allocates funding to schools with a high proportion of pupils with an entry date in the last 3 years which is not typical. For year groups 1 to 11, 'typical' means that the first census on which a pupil is recorded as attending the school (or its predecessors) is the October census. 'Not typical' means that the first census a pupil is recorded as attending the school is a January or May census. For the reception year, 'typical' means the first census in October or January.
- 6.18 In general, if the first census when the pupil was in the school was a spring or summer census, they are a mobile pupil. This excludes reception pupils who start in January. The mobility factor excludes pupils who joined in the summer term after the summer census, or pupils who joined in October before the autumn census. To be eligible for mobility funding, the proportion of mobile pupils in a school must be above the threshold of 6%.
- 6.19 For the calculation of LPA funding allocations, following the cancellation or incompleteness of assessments in summer 2020 and summer 2021 due to coronavirus (COVID-19), LAs are required to use 2019 assessment data as a proxy for assessments which would have taken place in 2020 to 2021. Funding is allocated to primary pupils identified as not achieving the expected level of development in the early years

⁶ Primary schools receive funding through the LPA factor for all pupils who did not reach the expected level of development at early years foundation stage (EYFS). EYFS data for pupils in Reception is not available as they take the test at the end of the Reception year. To include an element for Reception children in the funding calculation, the total number of eligible pupils is derived by working out the proportion of LPA-eligible pupils in years 1 to 6 and multiplying this proportion by the total pupil count, which includes pupils in Reception.

⁷ Secondary schools receive LPA funding for all pupils who did not achieve the expected level at KS2 in one or more of reading or writing or mathematics. LPA pupil numbers for year groups 8 to 11 inclusive are weighted so that those who have sat the more challenging key stage 2 tests (introduced in academic year 2015 to 2016) do not have a disproportionate effect on the LPA factor.

foundation stage profile (EYFSP) and for secondary pupils not reaching the expected standard in KS2 at either reading or writing or maths.

- 6.20 In calculating the overall budget requirement, estimates are also made of the likely impact from the per pupil funding protection measures in the school funding system. These are explained further below, but where a school in the Minimum Per Pupil Funding Level (MPPFL) has received additional funding through the AEN data update, this will have a consequential reduction in MPPFL top up funding. The total funding reduction through the revised AEN data is -£0.031m.

New schools – £0.085m overall decrease in funding

- 6.21 There is also an impact on new schools from the AEN data update. The *new and expanding school funding policy* fixes the total budget relevant schools receive and therefore has not changed from the AEN update. However, in terms of setting the funding for relevant schools there are 2 separate budget lines, both of which have changed as a result of the updated AEN data:

Step 1: calculate the amount distributed through the BF Funding Formula

Step 2: deduct the amount distributed through the BF Funding Formula Allocation from the amount due through the *new and expanding school funding policy* and pay this to relevant schools as a diseconomy top up

- 6.22 With additional pupils on roll at the new schools, the allocation through the BF Funding Formula for AEN has increased by £0.085m. However, there is no change to the total budget as this is determined through the *new and expanding school funding policy*, and therefore, in order to ensure new schools receive the amount on the policy, diseconomy funding needs a corresponding reduction.
- 6.23 Annex 1 sets out the budget requirement for the whole of the Growth Fund, including allocations due to individual schools. The Forum is the statutory decision maker on the setting the budget for the Growth Fund and is recommended to agree these amounts.

Business rates - £0.047m overall increase in funding

- 6.24 The final SB DSG notification confirms that the amount of deduction for school rates to in future be paid centrally by the DfE will be £0.047m higher than previously reported.

Meeting DfE per pupil funding requirements

- 6.25 After LAs have calculated school budgets through their local Funding Formula, there are 2 mandatory checks required by the DfE to ensure that each individual school budget has received the minimum permitted:

1. amount of per pupil funding for the relevant year i.e. the MPPF value
2. increase in per pupil funding from the previous year i.e. the MFG

MPPF values – £0.031m overall decrease in funding

- 6.26 The DfE has set mandatory MPPF values of £4,265 for primary aged pupils and £5,525 for secondary. These are the minimum per pupil funding rates that an LA must pay their schools unless agreed by the DfE. These final proposals generate additional payments of £0.705m, with 13 primary schools receiving an aggregate £0.704m and 1 secondary school £0.001m. This is a decrease of £0.169m compared to 2021-22 when additional

payments of £0.874m were made to 19 primary schools and £0.041m made to 1 secondary school.

MFG – no change in net nil cost

- 6.27 To limit turbulence between financial years at individual school level, the MFG must be applied to each school's per pupil funding rate. Where the normal operation of the local Funding Formula does not deliver the necessary change, an appropriate top-up is paid. For 2022-23, the DfE again requires each LA to set their MFG at between +0.5% and +2.0%.
- 6.28 The Forum has previously agreed that the maximum +2.0% increase is applied with top-up payments to be financed from capping gains at other schools that are receiving above average increases in per pupil funding. Schools receiving top-ups to the MPPF values are excluded from contributing to the cost of the MFG.
- 6.29 There has been very little financial impact from the MFG in recent years as school funding rates have increased. In 2021-22, 6 primary schools received an MFG funding top up which in total amounted to £0.028m. The 2022-23 deduction is £0.031m, allocated to 6 primary schools, and 1 secondary school. As previously agreed, this cost will be funded by a proportionate deduction to schools receive an above average increase in per pupil funding.

Centrally managed budgets within the CSSB

- 6.30 The confirmed DSG allocation has included the latest pupil data which confirms a further £0.005m DSG income. This will be used to reduce the funding transfer from the SB with no change to previously agreed budgets which are set out again at Annex 2.

Summary of proposed changes – SB and CSSB

- 6.31 Based on the data set provided by the DfE and other relevant information, a series of changes have been set out above that the council proposes are reflected in the 2022-23 SB and CSSB budgets. Table 3 below summarises the changes proposed to the 2021-22 budgets which results in a balanced budget for the CSSB and a funding shortfall on the SB of £0.510m. Annex 3 sets out the changes made in Table 3 from the December Forum meeting.

Table 3: Summary final budget proposals for 2022-23 – needs updating

Ref.	Item	Schools Block		Central Services Schools Block	Total
		Delegated school budgets	Growth Fund - LA Managed		
		A	B	C	D
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
1	2021-22 Schools Block budget	81,505	345	1,058	82,908
2	2021-22 base budget	81,505	345	1,058	82,908
3	Provisional 2022-23 DSG funding	84,089	345	867	85,301
4	Internal Schools Block funding transfer	125	-125	0	0
5	On-going contribution to CSSB pressures	-141	0	141	0
6	2022-23 forecast income	84,073	220	1,008	85,301
7	+Surplus of income / - Deficit of income	2,568	-125	-50	2,393
8	<u>Changes for 2022-23</u>				
9	Impact of change in pupil numbers (+127)	786	0	0	786
10	New schools - 2022-23 change in cost pressure	-69	0	0	-69
11	Impact from confirmed data changes - January	233	0	0	233
12	In-year growth allowances, KS1 classes etc	0	-125	0	-125
13	Rates: revaluation and inflation	0	0	0	0
14	Split site funding - impact of cost review	50	0	0	50
15	School Amalgamations - impact on lump sum	-50	0	0	-50
16	Cost of new year NFF funding rates at circa +3%	2,128	0	0	2,128
17	Reductions on Central School Services	0	0	-50	-50
18	Total changes proposed for 2022-23	3,078	-125	-50	2,903
19	Shortfall to DSG Funding	-510	0	0	-510
20	<u>Memo items:</u> Total calculated requirement [2 + 18]	84,583	220	1,008	85,811
	Sub total:	84,803			
21	MPPFL	705	0	0	705
22	MFG	31	0	0	31
23	Cost of new schools	923	0	0	923

Managing the budget shortfall

- 6.32 The Forum has previously agreed that the 2022-23 budget should be set with each BF factor value at the same amount as the NFF values, if necessary, scaled by the same proportional amount to the affordable value. These proposals result in a £0.510m funding shortfall which equates to an increase of £0.164m from the amount anticipated in December.
- 6.33 Taking account of information available in December, the Forum was presented with a suggested approach to managing the budget gap as follows:
1. Draw down funds from the Reserve created by the council to help finance the additional costs of new and expanding schools, where £0.182m is available.

2. Draw down funds from the Reserve created in the unallocated Schools Budget to support the additional costs of new and expanding schools, where £0.746m is available.
 3. Fund schools at a scaled percentage of the NFF, with all factors scaled by the same percentage. Scaling of 0.1% to the NFF equates to around £0.070m..
 4. For April 2023, there should be at least £0.500m in Reserves to fund the medium-term cost of new schools (current balance is £0.928m)
 5. Ordinarily, around £0.250m of funding is withdrawn each year from Reserves.
- 6.34 The £0.510m funding gap is larger than recently experienced and presents difficulties in terms of maintaining suitable balances to manage in-year pressures and budget risks, most notably around reducing pupil numbers, diseconomy funding at new schools and pupils with high needs. The Executive Director: Resources has considered the current budget position and reflecting on his statutory duty to formally certify that the budget is sound, considers that a £0.510m draw down from Reserves, which is 55% of available reserves, and would result in remaining balances of £0.418m, too large to agree and that school budgets need to be set below the NFF rates to maintain at least £0.500m in Reserves.
- 6.35 Forum members will be aware that in applying a top slice, this must still ensure that each school receives the funding protection measures required through the MFG – a minimum 2% increase in per pupil funding from 2021-22 – and the MPPFL – minimum per pupil funding amounts of £4,265 for Primary schools and £5,525 for secondary. Therefore, a top slice will impact only on schools above these funding levels.
- 6.36 A further implication of these funding protection measures is that as the percentage of scaling increases, the contribution from schools closest to the MFG and MPPFL thresholds becomes capped at the point they receive funding protection themselves. The effect of this is the proportionate cash value delivered reduces as the scaling increases. Therefore, a top slice of 0.1% would deliver around £0.070m, 0.2% £0.130m (a further £0.060m) and 0.3% £0.180m (a further £0.050m).
- 6.37 In terms of the proportion of NFF values to be applied, the Executive Director: Resources considers that this should be set at the amount required to fund the net additional cost pressure arising from the increased AEN funding allocations, as recorded on the October 2021 census. With the lagged approach to funding, the council does not receiving extra funding for these new costs.
- 6.38 As set out above, the net additional cost arising from updated SEN data is £0.233m, which reduces to a net £0.148m pressure after reflecting the consequential £0.085m reduction in new school diseconomy funding.
- 6.39 Funding at 99.75% of NFF values delivers £0.154m and would require a £0.356m draw down from Reserves and leave a remaining balance of £0.572m. The average per pupil funding rate would be 2.7%. This is the recommended approach.

2022-23 individual school budgets

6.40 These budget proposals result in a 2.7% average per pupil funding increase⁸ from 2021-22, with the following headline summary data available from individual school budgets (NB in this context, per pupil funding is calculated from the whole Formula Budget allocation less business rates):

- 1 Both primary and secondary schools receive an average increase in per pupil funding of 2.7 %.
- 2 The highest per pupil increase in a primary school is 5.1%, with 3.4% in secondary. The lowest increases are 1.2% and 2.0% respectively
- 3 7 schools receive an MFG top up when the guaranteed increase is set at the maximum 2% permissible by the DfE. The total cash value of support amounts to £0.031m.
- 4 The MPPF level amount has increased by 2.0% for Primary and Secondary schools. With 14 schools needing to receive top-ups to this level. The total cash value of support amounts to £0.705m.
- 5 The average per pupil funding amount for a primary school would be £4,348 and £5,841 for a secondary.

6.41 Paragraph 6.40 above identifies the lowest increase in per pupil funding in a primary school at 1.2%. There are 3 further primary schools with per pupil funding increases below the minimum 2% increases in NFF factor values which is the minimum increase that schools would expect to receive. These low increases all arise at schools where there have either been large changes in AEN top ups or core pupil numbers. These changes can result in significant changes in per pupil funding amounts and will not result in additional funding top ups through the MPPF protection if the school is already funded above the minimum permitted level.

Submission of DfE pro-forma budget statement

6.42 The DfE closely monitors the progress of LAs in setting their individual school budgets and requires the completion and submission of a template that sets out the Funding Formula to be used, associated units of resource and total cost. The deadline for return has been set at 21 January 2022. Annex 5 sets out the pro forma which the Forum is recommended to agree is submitted to the DfE.

The £84.649m total recorded on the pro forma reconciles to the £84.803m at row 20 of columns A and B in Table 3, less the £0.154m impact of funding schools at 99.75% of NFF values.

Other grant income

6.43 In addition to the DSG, schools also receive revenue funding from other specific grants including School Sixth Forms (currently -£1.638m), the Pupil Premium (-£2.122m), Primary PE and Sports Premium (-0.438m), the Universal Infant Free School Meals Grant (-£1.244m), the Teachers' Pension Grants (-£0.117m) and Teachers' Pay Grant (-£0.041m). All of these amounts are subject to change in 2022-23 and budgets will be updated once new year funding allocations are confirmed.

⁸ This average excludes funding for new schools as there are separate, specific funding rules in place for calculating these budgets.

6.44 Furthermore, as part of the School Funding settlement, on 16 December, DfE confirmed that in the 2022 to 2023 financial year, schools will be allocated additional funding, to provide support for the costs of the Health and Social Care Levy, including the 1.25% increase in employer National Insurance contributions and wider costs. This funding will be allocated through the new Schools Supplementary Grant with the DfE estimating this at £2.420m for BF. This amounts to on average around £146 per pupil, equivalent to a further 3.0% increase to the 2.7% included in the BF Funding Formula.

6.45 The Schools Supplementary Grant will be allocated to schools as follows:

- basic per-pupil rate of £24 for early years provision in schools
- basic per-pupil rate of £97 for primary pupils
- basic per-pupil rate of £137 for key stage 3 pupils
- basic per-pupil rate of £155 for key stage 4 pupils
- lump sum of £3,680 for all schools
- FSM6 per-pupil rate of £85 per eligible primary pupil
- FSM6 per-pupil rate of £124 per eligible secondary pupil

The 5.74% Area Cost Adjustment will be added to these amounts.

6.46 The DfE has also announced 2022-23 arrangements for the pupil premium calculations for schools. The Funding rates will increase by around 3% from 2021-22 (Primary pupils now: £1,385 Secondary pupils: £958 Looked-after children: £2,410 Children who have ceased to be looked-after: £2,410 Service children: £320).

Actual cost pressures estimated for 2022-23

6.47 As reported to the Forum in December, schools will experience a range of cost pressures next year which, based on the following assumptions are estimated at between 3.7% and 4.2% from:

1. Cost of pay awards are not yet known, and schools are advised to assume 2%.
Using Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR)⁹ data relating to BF maintained schools, the Teachers' pay award represents around 50% of all school costs which will clearly have a significant impact on inflationary pressures. However, with the implementation date from September 2022, and minimal full year effect cost from the September 2021 award this reduces the overall increase to total costs to around 1.0%.
For the Local Government pay costs that comprise around 25% of all school costs, this increases overall school costs by around 0.5%.
2. The overall cost of performance related pay and contractual increments are assumed to be self-financing from appointing new staff on lower pay points than those leaving.
3. The underlying deficit on the Local Government Pension Scheme is being reduced by way of additional lump sum contributions. Payments due from schools in the BF Local Government Pension Scheme are forecast to increase by £0.1m, which is equivalent to around a 0.7% cost increase to the local

⁹ The CFR framework provides a standard template for schools to collect information about their income and expenditure by financial years, which maintained schools provide to their local authorities in a financial statement each year. It is a national financial benchmarking website available for public use.

government pay bill and 0.2% increase in total costs.

4. The general rate of inflation on non-pay costs (September Consumer Price Index) is 3.2% with many predictions for this rising to 4% to 5% in 2022. These costs comprise around 25% of all school costs, with a 4% average increase resulting in total school costs increasing by 1.0%.
5. The 1.25% increase in employer National Insurance contributions that is due to take effect from April 2022 will apply to around 75% of school budgets, this increases overall school costs by around 1.0%

6.48 Taking account of the 2.7% increase in per pupil funding through the BF Funding Formula and 3.0% through the Schools Supplementary Grant, on average, schools will receive around a 5.7% increase in pupil funding which is expected to be more than sufficient to cover rising costs, although this will be greatly influenced by the final cost of any yet to be agreed pay awards.

Other decisions required from the Schools Forum

6.49 The content of this report complies with requirements of the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2020. In addition to this, in setting the 2022-23 Schools Budget, there are also requirements from the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2012 that need to be complied with.

6.50 There is a requirement to seek comments from the Forum in respect of administration arrangements for the allocation of central government grants. No changes are proposed on existing arrangements whereby relevant costs are absorbed by the council in normal day to day operations and the Forum is requested to agree this approach continues.

Conclusion and Next steps

6.51 On average, schools can expect to receive a 5.7% increase in per pupil funding which continues the improved financial settlement experienced in recent years. Uncertainty remains around the financial impact from the coronavirus pandemic, including needing to finance additional costs in 2022-23 financial year.

6.52 The Leader of the council is expected to agree the 2022-23 Schools Budget on 18 January, based on final recommendations agreed by the Schools Forum, which will then need to be reported to the DfE through submission of the national pro-forma, with individual schools receiving budget allocations by the middle of January.

6.53 As usual, schools can expect to receive an initial budget notification for 2022-23 by the end of January. This will include the confirmed BF Funding Formula allocation, plus estimates for funding from the Early Years and a best estimate of likely DfE grant allocations. A final budget statement with updates where available to the provisional amounts will be provided before the end of March. This will include High Needs Block funding.

7 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

7.1 The relevant legal implications are addressed within the main body of the report.

Director of Resources

7.2 Included within the supporting information.

Equalities Impact Assessment

7.3 The budget proposals ensure funding is targeted towards vulnerable groups prioritised by the DfE NFF and a BFC specific EIA is not required.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

7.4 The likely impact from the funding reforms and the additional resources that will be allocated to schools through the 2020-23 spending review is that schools will be receiving real terms increases in funding in each of the next 3 years. However, some strategic risks do exist including:

1. Falling pupil numbers in some primary schools at a time of surplus places will create budget difficulties through having to operate with relatively small class sizes.
2. The ability of schools with deficits to manage their repayments. Two secondary and four primary schools have significant licensed deficits that need to be repaid.
3. Cost pressures on school responsibilities to meet SEND needs of pupils up to the £10,000 limit when numbers are rising.
4. Managing the additional diseconomy revenue costs arising from the new / expanded schools programme.
5. On-going impacts from the coronavirus pandemic.

7.5 These risks will also be managed through support and assistance to schools in the budget setting process which is a well-established programme. It has ensured that schools develop medium term solutions to budget shortfalls and draws on funding retained to support schools in financial difficulty or through the allocation of short to medium term loans. There remains a de-delegated budget of £0.185m (after academy deduction) to support schools in financial difficulties that meet qualifying criteria.

7.6 The financial impact from new schools is also being managed through the measured use of accumulated DSG balances and up to £1m contribution from the council.

Climate Change Implications

7.7 The recommendations from this report are not expected to have an impact on emissions of carbon dioxide.

8 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

8.1 People Directorate Management Team, schools and the Schools Forum.

Method of Consultation

8.2 Written reports to People Directorate Management Team and the Schools Forum, formal consultation with schools

Representations Received

8.3 Included in reports.

Background Papers

None:

Contact for further information

Paul Clark, Finance Business Partner – People Directorate

(01344 354054)

paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Doc. Ref

[https://bfcouncil.sharepoint.com/sites/fina/bpm/FIBPSCB-FIN9.6/Schools Forum/\(108\) 130122/2022-23 Schools Budget Final Proposals v1 - 0.25% scaling.docx](https://bfcouncil.sharepoint.com/sites/fina/bpm/FIBPSCB-FIN9.6/Schools_Forum/(108)_130122/2022-23_Schools_Budget_Final_Proposals_v1_-_0.25%_scaling.docx)

Proposed financing and associated budget for the Growth Fund

	Primary	Secondary	Current Proposed 2022-23	Previously Reported 2022-23	Change	Actual 2021-22	Change from 2021-22
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>New schools:</u>							
Dis-economy costs	234.8	690.7	925.5	1,010.2	-84.6	994.2	-68.7
	234.8	690.7	925.5	1,010.2	-84.6	994.2	-68.7
<u>Retained Growth Fund</u>							
Start-up costs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Post opening costs	22.5	0.0	22.5	22.5	0.0	15.0	7.5
In-year pupil growth	46.5	46.5	93.0	93.0	0.0	215.0	-122.0
KS1 classes	105.0	0.0	105.0	105.0	0.0	115.0	-10.0
	174.0	46.5	220.5	220.5	0.0	345.0	-124.5
Total estimated costs	408.8	737.2	1,146.0	1,230.7	-84.6	1,339.2	-193.2
<u>Costs by school:</u>							
KGA - Oakwood	78.8	0.0	78.8	91.2	-12.7	137.9	-59.5
KGA - Binfield	178.5	690.7	869.2	941.5	-74.8	871.3	-4.6
Total estimated costs	257.3	690.7	948.0	1,032.7	-84.6	1,009.2	-61.2

The yellow highlighted cell indicates the total £0.220m budget proposed for the BFC centrally manage Growth Fund as referenced in paragraph 6.23.

Services proposed to be centrally managed by the Council

Budget Area	Schools Budget Funded		
	2021-22 Final Budget	2022-23 Previously Reported Funding	2022-23 Proposed Budget
<u>Combined Services Budgets:</u>			
Family Intervention Project	£100,000		£100,000
Educational Attainment for Looked After Children	£133,590		£133,590
School Transport for Looked After Children	£42,890		£42,740
Young People in Sport	£15,960		£0
Common Assessment Framework Co-ordinator	£42,470		£42,470
Domestic Abuse	£2,000		£2,000
Education Health Partnerships	£15,000		£0
SEN Contract Monitoring	£32,680		£32,680
<i>Central School Services - historic commitments</i>	£384,590		£353,480
<u>Other Permitted Central Spend</u>			
<u>Miscellaneous (up to 0.1% of Schools Budget):</u>			
Forestcare out of hours support service	£5,150		£5,150
Borough wide Initiatives	£28,930		£9,720
Support to Schools Recruitment & Retention	£7,920		£5,000
<u>Statutory and regulatory duties:</u>			
'Retained' elements	£275,755		£284,720
<u>Other expenditure:</u>			
School Admissions	£186,690		£192,760
Schools Forum	£20,935		£20,940
Boarding Placements for Vulnerable Children	£62,470		£50,000
Central copyright licensing	£85,560		£85,560
<i>Central School Services - on-going responsibilities</i>	£673,410		£653,850
Total Central School Support Services	£1,058,000		£1,007,330
<u>Funding</u>			
Historic commitments	£259,636	£207,710	£207,710
On-going responsibilities	£652,671	£653,850	£658,880
Total Funding	£912,307	£861,560	£866,590
Existing agreed transfer from Schools Budget	£145,770	£145,770	£140,740
Central School Services Total Funding	£1,058,077	£1,007,330	£1,007,330

Changes from 9 December 2021 Forum to 13 January 2022 Forum

Ref.	Item	Schools Block		Central Services Schools Block C £'000	Total D £'000
		Delegated school budgets A £'000	Growth Fund - LA Managed B £'000		
1	2021-22 Schools Block budget	0	0	0	0
2	2021-22 base budget	0	0	0	0
3	Provisional 2022-23 DSG funding	-32	0	5	-27
4	Internal Schools Block funding transfer	0	0	0	0
5	On-going contribution to CSSB pressures	5	0	-5	0
6	2022-23 forecast income	-27	0	0	-27
7	+Surplus of income / - Deficit of income	-27	0	0	-27
8	<u>Changes for 2022-23</u>				
9	Impact of change in pupil numbers (+127)	-27	0	0	-27
10	New schools - 2022-23 change in cost pressure	-85	0	0	-85
11	Impact from confirmed data changes - January	233	0	0	233
12	In-year growth allowances, KS1 classes etc	0	0	0	0
13	Rates: revaluation and inflation	47	0	0	47
14	Split site funding - impact of cost review	0	0	0	0
15	School Amalgamations - impact on lump sum	0	0	0	0
16	Cost of new year NFF funding rates at circa 3%	-31	0	0	-31
17	Reductions on Central School Services	0	0	0	0
18	Total changes proposed for 2022-23	137	0	0	137
19	Shortfall to DSG Funding	164	0	0	-164

SNFF Units of Resource compared to BF Funding Formula

Factor	National Core NFF	BF Actual NFF ¹	BF 2022-23 Actual ²	BF 2021-22 actual	BF 2020-21 Actual	BF 2019-20 Actual
	Unit of resource					
Per pupil funding:						
Age Weighted Pupil Unit: Primary	£3,217	£3,402	£3,393	£3,301	£3,014	£2,769
Age Weighted Pupil Unit: Secondary - KS3	£4,536	£4,796	£4,784	£4,655	£4,239	£4,087
Age Weighted Pupil Unit: Secondary - KS4	£5,112	£5,405	£5,392	£5,246	£4,812	£4,297
Additional needs funding:						
Deprivation						
Current FSM top up (Primary)	£470	£497	£496	£486	£475	£373
Current FSM top up (Secondary)	£470	£497	£496	£486	£475	£634
FSM anytime in last 6 years: Primary	£590	£664	£622	£608	£591	£88
FSM anytime in last 6 years: Secondary	£865	£915	£912	£888	£850	£385
IDACI ³ band F: Primary	£220	£233	£232	£227	£222	£182
IDACI band E: Primary	£270	£286	£285	£275	£264	£445
IDACI band D: Primary	£420	£486	£443	£433	£396	£192
IDACI band C: Primary	£460	£470	£485	£470	£427	£412
IDACI band B: Primary	£490	£518	£517	£502	£459	£738
IDACI band A: Primary	£640	£676	£675	£655	£633	£607
IDACI band F: Secondary	£320	£338	£338	£328	£316	£1,349
IDACI band E: Secondary	£425	£449	£448	£439	£427	£1,254
IDACI band D: Secondary	£595	£629	£628	£613	£564	£2,940
IDACI band C: Secondary	£650	£687	£686	£666	£612	£1,998
IDACI band B: Secondary	£700	£740	£738	£719	£659	£15,723
IDACI band A: Secondary	£890	£941	£939	£914	£886	£2,831
Low prior attainment						
Low prior attainment: Primary	£1,130	£1,195	£1,192	£1,157	£1,124	£917
Low prior attainment: Secondary	£1,710	£1,808	£1,804	£1,755	£1,698	£1,216
English as an additional language (EAL)						
EAL: Primary	£565	£597	£596	£581	£564	£427
EAL: Secondary	£1,530	£1,617	£1,614	£1,570	£1,519	£777
LAC					£0	£0
Mobility						
Mobility: Primary	£925	£978	£976	£951	£923	£315
Mobility: Secondary	£1,330	£1,406	£1,403	£1,363	£1,319	£0
Lump sum:						
Lump sum: Primary	£121,300	£128,263	£127,942	£124,508	£120,684	£160,143
Lump sum: Secondary	£121,300	£128,263	£127,942	£124,508	£120,684	£148,573

¹ Includes BF area cost uplift at 5.74%

² Funded at 99.75% of BF Actual NFF values

³ IDACI is a deprivation measure linked to low family income and a pupil's home address post code. It determines the probability of a pupil living in a low income household from their post code and weights funding according to severity of deprivation. It does not require individual pupil data to determine entitlement

2022-23 Pro Forma BF School Budget Statement

Local Authority Funding Reform Proforma

Note: only relevant lines are presented

LA Name:	Bracknell Forest
LA Number:	867

Pupil Led Factors

Reception uplift		No	Pupil Units		0.00			
Description		Amount per pupil		Pupil Units		Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)
1) Basic Entitlement Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU)	Primary (Years R-6)	£3,393.15		9,842.67		£33,397,661	£67,897,419	39.56%
	Key Stage 3 (Years 7-9)	£4,784.38		4,220.00		£20,190,065		23.91%
	Key Stage 4 (Years 10-11)	£5,391.92		2,653.92		£14,309,694		16.95%
Description		Primary amount per pupil	Secondary amount per pupil	Eligible proportion of primary NOR	Eligible proportion of secondary NOR	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)
43 2) Deprivation	FSM	£495.74	£495.74	1,108.00	838.61	£965,005	£3,241,790	3.84%
	FSM6	£622.31	£912.36	1,216.00	1,095.82	£1,756,508		
	IDACI Band F	£232.05	£337.52	1,184.78	708.89	£514,191		
	IDACI Band E	£284.78	£448.27	5.01	8.00	£5,014		
	IDACI Band D	£443.00	£627.58	1.00	1.00	£1,072		
	IDACI Band C	£485.19	£685.59	0.00	0.00	£0		
	IDACI Band B	£516.83	£738.33	0.00	0.00	£0		
	IDACI Band A	£675.04	£938.73	0.00	0.00	£0		
3) Looked After Children (LAC)	LAC March 19			71.00		£0	£773,775	0.00%
4) English as an Additional Language (EAL)	EAL 3 Primary	£595.94		835.58		£497,956		0.84%
	EAL 3 Secondary		£1,613.78		129.72	£209,346		0.08%
5) Mobility	Pupils starting school outside of normal entry dates	£975.65	£1,402.83	68.13	0.00	£66,474		
Description		Weighting	Amount per pupil (primary or secondary respectively)	Percentage of eligible pupils	Eligible proportion of primary and secondary NOR respectively	Sub Total	Total	Proportion of total pre MFG funding (%)
6) Low prior attainment	Primary low prior attainment		£1,191.87	23.56%	1,517.92	£2,737,763	£5,501,304	6.52%
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 7)	64.53%	£1,803.63	21.96%				
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 8)	64.53%		22.09%				
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 9)	64.53%		21.90%				
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 10)	63.59%		23.07%				
	Secondary low prior attainment (year 11)	58.05%		21.41%				

Other Factors

Factor	Lump Sum per	Lump Sum per	Lump Sum per Middle	Lump Sum	Total (£)	Proportion of total
Middle schools distance threshold	2.00	Middle school pupil number average	69.20	Apply middle school distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or
All-through schools distance threshold	2.00	All-through pupil number average	62.50	Apply all-through distance taper	Yes	NFF, tapered or
9) Fringe Payments					£0	0.00%
10) Split Sites					£125,000	0.15%
11) Rates					£1,578,880	1.87%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding minimum per pupil funding level and MFG Funding Total)					£83,724,079	99.16%

14) Additional funding to meet minimum per pupil funding level					£705,030	0.84%
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula (excluding MFG Funding Total)					£84,429,109	100.00%

15) Minimum Funding Guarantee			2.00%	£30,589	
Apply capping and scaling factors? (gains may be capped above a specific ceiling and/or scaled)					Yes
Capping Factor (%)	2.80%	Scaling Factor (%)	10.83%		
Total deduction if capping and scaling factors are applied				-£30,589	
Total Funding for Schools Block Formula				£84,429,109	

Growth fund (if applicable)				£220,500.00
-----------------------------	--	--	--	-------------

Total Funding For Schools Block Formula (including growth and falling rolls funding)				£84,649,609
---	--	--	--	--------------------

% Distributed through Basic Entitlement				80.42%
% Pupil Led Funding				91.69%
Primary: Secondary Ratio				1 : 1.34

TO: SCHOOLS FORUM
DATE 13 JANUARY 2022

2022/23 PROPOSALS FOR THE LOCAL AUTHORITY BUDGET **Director of Resources**

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present to the Forum for comment a summary of the Council's draft budget proposals for 2022/23 as agreed by the Executive on 14 December 2021, with a particular focus on the impact expected on the People Directorate.
- 1.2 Preparations for next year's budget have been undertaken against a backdrop of continued uncertainty on medium term funding and the impact of the pandemic.
- 1.3 The papers for the Executive meeting had to be published before the Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement announcement. This set out individual authority funding calculations for 2022/23 only and was announced on 16 December. Therefore, in the absence of the Provisional Settlement, the Executive report was based on several high-level assumptions regarding government funding for Bracknell Forest in 2022/23 informed, where possible, by the national position included in the 2021 Spending Review (SR21).
- 1.4 All comments received on these draft budget proposals will be submitted to the Executive on 8 February 2022 alongside any impact from the announcement of the Finance Settlement. This will allow the Executive to determine its final budget package and recommend the appropriate Council Tax level to Council, which will formally approve the 2022/23 budget and Council Tax on 23 February 2022.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That the Schools Forum comments on the 2022/23 budget proposals of the Executive for the People Directorate in respect of:**
 - i. **The revenue budget (Annexes A to C), and**
 - ii. **The capital programme (Annexe D).**

3 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Executive seeks the views of the Schools Forum as an interested party.

4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The range of options being considered are set out in the main reports on the public access website.

5 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

- 5.1 This report presents a summary of the Council's revenue and capital budget proposals for 2022/23 that were prepared on information and assumptions available at the end of November 2020 and are therefore subject to change as more information emerges or changes occur as part of the consultation process. The focus of this report is proposals from the People Directorate, with full details of the council's budget proposals available at:

[Agenda for Executive on Tuesday, 14 December 2021, 5.00 pm | Bracknell Forest Council \(bracknell-forest.gov.uk\)](#)

Revenue Budget

Commitment budget

- 5.2 Initial preparations for the 2022/23 budget have focussed on the Council's Commitment Budget for 2022/23 – 2024/25. This brings together the Council's existing expenditure plans, taking account of approved commitments and the ongoing effects of service developments and efficiencies that were agreed when the 2021/22 budget was set.
- 5.3 A number of changes are proposed to the Commitment Budget since it was last considered by the Executive in February. The main changes relate to:
- removal of items approved for one year only in 2021/22 including staff retention initiatives (-£0.500m), support for the local economy (-£0.600m) and people experiencing mental health issues (-£0.250m), invest to save funding to support climate change / carbon reduction initiatives (-£0.150m) and the temporary hire of modular accommodation at Sandhurst Secondary School (-£0.200m).
 - A decrease in the projected cost of the Waste PFI arrangement partly due to reductions in tonnages as a result of the introduction of food waste collections (-£0.434m)

The overall impact of these changes is to decrease the Council's Commitment Budget by £2.309m compared to the position reported in February 2021.

- 5.4 Taking account of these changes, Table 1 summarises the position and shows that base expenditure (excluding schools) is planned to decrease by £1.763m to £72.323m next year, before consideration is given to allowances for inflation and the budget proposals identified by individual directorates in 2022/23. The commitment budget relating to the People Directorate is shown in Annexe A.

Table 1: Summary Commitment Budget 2022/23-2024/25

Item	Planned Expenditure		
	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000
Base Budget	74,086	72,323	73,142
<i>Movements in Year:</i>			
Central	-1,468	-4	122
Delivery	-388	274	-31
People (excluding schools)	-927	-182	20
Non Departmental / Council Wide	1,020	731	579
<i>Total Movements</i>	-1,763	819	690
Adjusted Base	72,323	73,142	73,832

Spending Review 2021

5.5 On 27 October 2021 the Government set out the results of the 2021 Spending Review (SR21), a multi-year Spending Review which set resource and capital budgets for 2022/23 to 2024/25 for government departments. This was published alongside the Autumn Budget 2021. The key points were:

- Core spending power for local authorities is estimated to increase by an average of 3% in real-terms each year over the SR21 period (although this assumes all Councils increase Council Tax by the maximum permissible level each year);
- The government is providing councils with £4.8 billion of new grant funding over the SR21 period (£1.6 billion each year) for social care and other services, with details for individual authorities to be announced in the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement in December. The Government has indicated that it expects that flat cash sum to provide some front loading for any remaining impact of the pandemic;
- Funding for the cost of the increase in employer's national insurance contributions (a levy to help fund health and social care) is included in the £1.6bn as are a £200 million commitment to increase Supporting Families funding, funding for cyber security and funding to improve local delivery and transparency;
- The Business Rates multiplier will be frozen for a second year. This will be cost neutral for the Council as compensation for the loss of income will be provided via a section 31 grant;
- A new temporary business rates relief will be introduced for eligible retail, hospitality and leisure properties for 2022/23. Eligible properties will receive 50% relief, up to a £110,000 per business cap. Again, grant will be provided to ensure this is cost neutral.

5.6 The Spending Review made no mention of whether local government would receive a three-year financial settlement or whether and when local government finance reforms, such as the fair funding review and the move to a 75% rates retention scheme would be implemented. Further clarification was also awaited on the future of the New Homes Bonus and any Business Rates Baseline reset. With this level of uncertainty remaining,

it was felt most likely that a detailed multi-year settlement was unlikely to be forthcoming.

- 5.7 Funding from central government is currently received through a share of Business Rates, Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and Specific Grants. SR21 did not refer to RSG but it was assumed it would either be frozen or increased in line with inflation (3.1%) to -£1.836m for 2022/23 (-£1.781m in 2021/22). It was expected that Business Rates Baseline Funding, the other element of the 2022/23 Settlement Funding Assessment, would be frozen in line with the Business Rates multiplier (-£16.832m).

Grants

- 5.8 The Council also receives substantial external funding through a number of specific grants for which the following assumptions were included within the budget projections:

1. *New Homes Bonus (NHB)*. This is used to reward local authorities for net additional homes added to the Council Tax Base, thereby seeking to incentivise authorities to encourage housing growth in their areas. It is unringfenced and can therefore be used for local priorities. The SR20 confirmed that a consultation would be launched on the future of the NHB, with a view to implementing reform in 2022/23. The consultation was launched in February 2021, the outcome of which has yet to be published and there was no mention of NHB in SR21.

The Council's budget planning assumed that NHB grant would be reduced by between £0.9m and £1.9m in 2022/23 (mid-range £1.4m). This reflects the fact that the legacy payment of £0.187m relating to 2018/19 has now dropped out of the calculation, housing growth in 2021/22 whilst significant is not at the exceptional levels experienced in 2020/21 (which resulted in a one-off receipt of -£2.473m in 2021/22) and any change in the scheme would be likely to reduce overall funding.

2. *Other Specific Grants*. This mainly relates to ring-fenced Public Health, NHS funding streams and Better Care Fund which are reflected in the base budget. The ring-fence on Public Health is likely to be retained in 2022/23 and SR21 has confirmed that the grant will be maintained in real terms over the next three years, however indicative figures have yet to be provided at an individual council level.

It has been assumed that all social care grants from 2021/22 will be rolled forward into 2022/23 and the Council will benefit from a share of the additional £1.6bn of grant funding. No indicative figures were available as distribution options would be consulted upon through the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement in December. Based on the proportion the Council has received from different grant streams in recent years an annual allocation of between -£1.7m and -£2.2m (-£1.95m mid-range) was felt to be realistic.

The Better Care Fund (BCF) is a pooled budget which consists of several schemes, some of which are managed by the Council and some by the Clinical Commissioning Group. The NHS contribution to adult social care through the BCF is expected to increase in real terms in 2022/23, in line with the overall NHS long-term settlement. It has been assumed that this will be cost neutral for the Council at this stage.

Information on several other smaller grants normally follows several days or weeks after the Provisional Settlement and any changes will be incorporated into the February budget report to the Executive along with any changes in the Final Settlement.

Business Rates

- 5.9 Another important income stream for the Council is Business Rates, a proportion of which is retained locally following the introduction of the Business Rates Retention reforms in April 2013. The level of Business Rates changes each year due to inflationary increases (set by central government), the impact of appeals and local growth or decline as local businesses and economic conditions expand or contract. The Government sets a baseline level of funding against which any growth or reduction is shared between local and central government. It has been assumed this will be frozen in line with the Business Rates multiplier (-£16.832m).
- 5.10 Currently the Council collects significantly more Business Rates than it is allowed to keep and only receives approximately 30% of any Business Rates growth. There has however been considerable volatility in Business Rates income and the Government has stated that it will move all telecommunications networks onto the Central Rating List in April 2023, which will affect the treatment of a large multi-national company and remove a large part of the Council's retained growth at that point.
- 5.11 An unavoidable consequence of this has been significant volatility in Bracknell Forest's Collection Fund balance each year since 2014. In 2020/21 a deficit of -£11.498m was projected on the Business Rates element of the Collection Fund. This was almost solely due to the additional Business Rates reliefs granted by the Government after income estimates were submitted at the beginning of the year. Section 31 grant was provided in 2020/21 to compensate councils for the resultant loss of income and this was subsequently transferred into the Business Rates Reliefs Reserve at the year-end so that it can be used to fund the deficit when it becomes payable in 2021/22. The deficit has been reversed out of the budget proposals in Table 4 due to the one-off nature of this cost. A final projection for the Collection Fund in 2021/22 will need to be made by the 31 January which will be incorporated into the February budget report. Early indications are that there will be a significant deficit for the same reason as last year with section 31 grant again being received as compensation.
- 5.12 The timing of the introduction of a new Business Rates system is uncertain but it won't be until at least 2023/24. To coincide with this, it is expected that a fair funding review will be used to calculate the new baseline funding levels for individual councils based on an up-to-date assessment of their relative needs and resources, reflecting the Government's Levelling Up policy. Existing grants including RSG and most likely the Public Health Grant will be incorporated into the revised baseline and more responsibilities are likely to be transferred to Local Government to ensure that the new system is fiscally neutral overall. The timing of any baseline reset which could be actioned in isolation is also uncertain. The outcome of these deliberations is impossible to determine at this time, although it will almost certainly have a significant long-term detrimental impact on the funding of the Council.
- 5.13 Changes to the Central List for Business Rates to be introduced in 2023/24 will mean that all of the additional business rates that the Council has secured through the company referred to above will no longer benefit Bracknell Forest. As the Council uses a substantial element of Business Rates growth (approximately £4m) to support the budget, this will result in a significantly increased budget gap in the future.

Council Tax

- 5.14 Council Tax at present levels will generate total income of -£66.826m in 2022/23. It was expected that the number of properties paying Council Tax would increase significantly over the coming years and to date the Council Tax Base has remained broadly in line with predictions. The Council Tax Base for 2022/23 has been calculated as 48,249 Band D equivalents which at current levels would generate total income of -£67.702m in 2022/23. This represents a net increase of 595 (-£0.834m) arising from the occupation of new properties during 2022/23 plus a small decrease in the take-up of the Local Council Tax Benefit Support Scheme (-£0.042m).
- 5.15 The surplus/deficit on the Council Tax element of the Collection Fund in 2021/22 will need to be assessed by the 15 January 2022. Early indications are that there will be a modest surplus.
- 5.16 The Government limits Council Tax increases by requiring councils to hold a local referendum for any increases equal to or more than a threshold percentage which is normally included in the Local Government Financial Settlement. Following the outcome of SR21, the Government is proposing a core referendum limit of 2% plus the option for councils with responsibility for adult social care, including Bracknell Forest, to set an adult social care precept of up to a further 1%. In 2021/22 the Council was given the option of setting an additional adult social care precept of up to 3% which could be raised in 2021/22 or spread across two financial years. 1.5% was raised in 2022/22 leaving the option to raise a further 1.5% in 2022/23, which would be in addition to the 2%+1% referred to above. Each 1% increase in Council Tax would generate approximately -£0.677m of additional income. The referendum principles will be confirmed in the provisional settlement.
- 5.17 The Executive at its meeting in February will recommend to Council the level of Council Tax considering the Final Settlement, the results of the consultation and the final budget proposals.

Budget Proposals for 2022/23

Service pressures and Developments

- 5.18 In preparing the 2022/23 draft budget proposals each directorate has evaluated the potential pressures on its services and those relating to the People Directorate are set out in Annexe B. Table 2 summarises the pressures by directorate.

Table 2: Service Pressures/Development

Directorate	£'000
Central	230
Delivery	1,130
People (excluding schools)	2,627
Non-Departmental / Council Wide	1,262
Total Pressures/Developments	5,249

- 5.19 As in 2021/22, a Best Case and Worst Case approach has been adopted when identifying pressures with the Council's draft budget reflecting the Best Case position as shown in Table 2 above. The additional potential impact of the worst case scenarios (£1.789m) will be a key factor to consider when setting an appropriate level for the General Contingency.

- 5.20 Many of the pressures are simply unavoidable as they relate to current levels of demand or legislation changes. They do, however, also support the six strategic themes included in the new Council Plan in the following way
- caring for residents and their families (£2.529m);
 - providing education and skills (£0.745m);
 - providing value for money (£1.633m);
 - protecting and enhancing the environment (£0.070m).
- 5.21 Service pressures will be kept under review throughout the budget consultation period. There is always the risk in Social Care services in particular, that the numbers of people requiring care packages, the content of existing care packages and contract inflation will vary considerably from the assumptions included in these draft budget proposals. Any revisions to service pressures will be reported to the Executive in February.
- 5.22 In addition to these revenue proposals the Council continues to invest in its priorities through targeted capital expenditure. Details are set out below from paragraph 5.39, but any revenue cost implications arising from the capital proposals are included in these draft budget proposals.

Service Economies

- 5.23 Members and officers have held regular meetings to determine options for savings and a list of potential draft budget savings has been developed. This list totals -£2.869m and is summarised in Table 3 with areas relating to the People Directorate set out in more detail in Annexe C. As in previous years, savings have focused as far as possible on increasing efficiency, income generation and reducing central and departmental support rather than on front line services. There will potentially be some impact on services, although this has been minimised to a large degree.

Table 3: Summary Service Economies

Directorate	£'000
Central	-327
Delivery	-1,100
People (excluding schools)	-472
Non-Departmental / Council Wide	-970
Total Savings	-2,869

Council Wide Issues

- 5.24 Apart from the specific departmental budget proposals there are some Council wide issues affecting all directorates' budgets which need to be considered. The precise impact of these corporate budgets is likely to change before the final budget proposals are recommended, however the current view on these issues is outlined below:

a) Capital Programme

The scale of the Council's Capital Programme for 2022/23 will impact upon the revenue budget and is itself subject to consultation. All new spending on services will need to be funded from new capital receipts (including CIL),

government grants, developer contributions or borrowing. Current proposals are set out further below from paragraph 5.39 and will present additional revenue costs of £0.067m in 2022/23 and £0.367m in 2023/24.

b) Interest and Investments

The coronavirus outbreak has done huge economic damage to the UK and economies around the world, and with the Bank Rate expected to experience a increase from the 0.1% initial rate, the forecast includes five increases over the three-year forecast period to March 2025, ending at 1.25%. The Council, in close co-ordination with its Treasury Management advisers, will monitor medium and long-term interest rates and take any necessary decisions based on the information available to effectively and efficiently fund the capital programme.

c) Provision for Inflation and Pay Awards

At this stage the inflation provision is not finalised. For planning purposes, a sum of £4.400m (£1.198m 2021/22) has been added to the draft budget proposals on the assumptions that:

- 2022/23 pay awards will be 2% (the unexpected 2021/22 pay award has also had to be funded based on the latest offer by national employers of 1.75%);
- Employers NI contributions will be increased by 1.25% for the levy to help fund health and social care (noting that additional grant will be received that is supposed to cover the additional cost)
- contracts will be negotiated where possible to minimise inflation;
- fees and charges will be increased in line with the Council's income policy.

The Council will need to consider where it is appropriate and necessary to provide for inflation over the coming weeks so that the actual inflation provision can be added to the final budget report in February 2022.

d) Fees and charges

Increases in fees and charges are determined by the overall economic conditions, the willingness of customers to pay the higher charges and continued demand for Council services. The Council policy for fees and charges requires each Directorate to consider the level of charges against the following criteria:

- fees and charges should aim, as a minimum, to cover the costs of delivering the service;
- where a service operates in free market conditions, fees and charges should at least be set at the market rate;
- fees and charges should not be levied where this is an ineffective use of resources, i.e. the cost of collection exceeds any income generated.

Certain other fees will attract the percentage determined by statute.

e) Contingencies

The Council manages risks and uncertainties in the budget by way of a general Corporate Contingency added to the Council's budget. Every year the Council faces risks on its budget in relation to demand led services, Business Rates and the general economic climate.

At this stage the General Contingency has been maintained at £2.250m, however, this will continue to be reviewed to ensure the risk associated with Worst Case pressures are adequately reflected within the allocation.

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

Spending on schools

- 5.25 The SR21 reaffirms the government's commitment in the Spending Round 2019 that over the 3 years 2020/23 there will be a 15% increase in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding which the Institute for Fiscal Studies has indicated restores school spending to pre-austerity levels, although this will now have been impacted by Covid-19. For 2022/23, the DfE has increased the Bracknell Forest per pupil funding element of school budgets by 2.8%.
- 5.26 Despite the additional funding, there is a significant medium-term financial pressure on the Schools Budget arising from the cost of new schools that are being built in response to new housing and the resultant need for more school places. In order to provide sufficient places when they are required, new schools will need to open at the start of the developments but will take a number of years to fill up as house building continues. During this period, new schools need additional financial support to cover what can be significant diseconomies of scale.
- 5.27 This cost pressure is not adequately resourced in the funding settlement from the DfE and over the medium term is expected to create a funding shortfall of around £4m. To help manage this, as part of the 2019/20 budget, the Executive agreed that £1m of Council reserves would be made available as part of a funding package which would also include £1m from accumulated balances in the DSG with the remaining circa £2m being met from the annual funding allocation to schools from the DfE. The final £0.182m balance is proposed to be applied to the 2022-23 budget.
- 5.28 In light of the significant financial pressures that councils are experiencing on the High Needs budgets (those intended to support pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)), the DfE has introduced a more rigorous monitoring and intervention regime where council areas have deficit balances or experience a significant reduction in a surplus. The DfE will also underwrite any accumulated deficit to remove any potential pressure on a council's General Fund and other resources that would otherwise result to take steps to finance the debt.
- 5.29 However, recent communications have suggested that this is a 3-year time limited period to enable councils to move towards a position of containing annual expenditure within annual income and that councils should be planning to manage any

accumulated debt at April 2023 from their own resources. Without any interventions, the forecast balance for HN budgets is a cumulative deficit of £20m. This is clearly not an affordable position for a small unitary authority like Bracknell Forest and it is essential that emerging plans to address the deficit are agreed quickly and enacted by the Council and schools.

- 5.30 In terms of the more rigorous DfE monitoring and intervention regime, as the accumulated DSG balance at 31 March 2021 amounted to a £2.6m deficit, meetings are now being held with the DfE and officers of the council and the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Learning. Through these the Council will explain the action plan it is putting in place to address the rising costs being experienced and how and when this will achieve a balanced budget.
- 5.31 Taking account of the latest information, -£113.63m of grant income is estimated to be available to the Council for 2022/23 through the specific ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This comprises -£84.47m for the Schools Block, -£7.56m for the Early Years Block, -£20.74m for the High Needs Block and -£0.86m for the Central Schools Services Block.
- 5.32 In addition to the DSG, schools also receive revenue funding from other specific grants including School Sixth Forms (currently -£1.638m), the Pupil Premium (-£2.560m), Primary PE and Sports Premium (-0.438m) and the Universal Infant Free School Meals Grant (-£1.245m). All these amounts are subject to change in 2022/23.

Summary position on the Revenue Budget

- 5.33 Adding the draft proposals to the Commitment Budget and taking account of the corporate issues identified above would result in total expenditure of £89.355m as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary of proposals:

	£'000
Commitment Budget	72,323
Budget Pressures	5,249
Budget Economies	-2,869
Capital Programme	67
Inflation Provision	4,400
Reversal of the one-off transfer into the Business Rates Reliefs Reserves for the projected Collection Fund - Business Rates deficit in 2020/21	11,498
Reduction in new Homes Bonus (mid-range)	1,400
One-off Covid-19 grant received in 2021/22	2,654
Share of addition £1.6bn funding for social care and other services (mid-range)	-1,950
Removal of Covid-19 specific contingency	-3,417
Draft Budget Requirement 2022/23	89,355

- 5.34 Without the Provisional Finance Settlement, assumptions have had to be made on the level of grant income. It has been assumed that the Council can anticipate income of up to -£86.342m. This arises from Revenue Support Grant (-£1.808m mid-range), Business Rates baseline funding (-£16.832m) and Council Tax at the 2021/22 level (-£67.702m).

- 5.35 With the potential overall cost of the budget package being consulted on in the region of £89.355m, this leaves a potential gap of around £3.013m. Should the final budget proposals include the Worst Case pressures the budget gap would increase to £4.877m. Members can choose to adopt any or all of the following approaches in order to bridge the remaining gap:
- an increase in Council Tax;
 - an appropriate contribution from the Council’s revenue reserves, bearing in mind the Medium Term financial position.

Reserves

- 5.36 The Council will have an estimated £10.3m available in General Reserves at 31 March 2022, if spending in the current year matches the approved budget. Details are contained in Table 5.

Table 5: General Reserves as at 31 March 2022

	£m
General Fund	10.3
Planned use in 2021/22	(0.0)
Estimated Balance as at 31 March 2022	10.3

- 5.37 The Council has, in the past, planned on maintaining a minimum prudential balance currently assessed to be £4.5m. This assessment is based on the financial risks which face the Council and the Executive Director: Resources considers these in the February report to the Executive at which a final decision on the use of balances can be taken, taking account of the financial position likely to face the Council over the next five years.
- 5.38 The Council will also have an estimated £18.4m in the Future Funding Reserve as at 31 March 2022, which has been deliberately established to help manage the Medium Term financial position.

Capital Programme

Introduction

- 5.39 Each year the Council agrees a programme of capital schemes. These schemes are mainly funded from:
- the Council’s capital receipts
 - Government Grants
 - other external contributions
 - internal and external borrowing
- 5.40 The Council’s total usable capital receipts generated from disposing of assets at 31st March 2021 are zero as all receipts have been applied to fund prior capital investment. Similarly, all receipts realised during the current financial year will be used to finance the 2021/22 Capital Programme. The Council is partly reliant on capital receipts and other contributions to fund its capital programme, although interest generated from capital receipts can also help support the revenue budget in the short term. However,

with investment rates at historic lows it makes more economic sense to offset borrowing.

- 5.41 The proposed capital programme for 2022/23 has been developed, therefore, on the assumption that it will be funded by a combination of Government grants, other external contributions, capital receipts and borrowing only if required. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions and some small miscellaneous property sales should enable £3.25m of the capital programme to be funded from receipts. Internal resources will be used in the first instance and borrowing from external sources (e.g. the PWLB) will be used only when necessary. The financing costs associated with the General Fund Capital Programme have been provided for in the Council's revenue budget plans which are set out above.

New Schemes

- 5.42 Within the general financial framework outlined above, Service Departments have considered priority schemes for inclusion within the Council's Capital Programme for 2022/23 – 2024/25. Given that both capital and revenue resources are under pressure, each Department has evaluated and prioritised proposed schemes into broad categories in line with the Council's agreed Asset Management Plan approach. Having done this, only the very highest priority schemes and programmes are being recommended for inclusion in the Capital Programme.

Elements of the capital programme

- 5.43 The capital programme is structured into categories of spend as follows:
- *Unavoidable and committed schemes*; these are required to ensure that the Council is not left open to legal sanction and includes items relating to health and safety issues, new legislation etc. Committed schemes also include those that have been started as part of the 2021/22 Capital Programme and have not yet completed.
 - *Maintenance (Improvements and capitalised repairs)*; an assessment is made of the state of each building and highways element and its repair priority with a condition rating and repair urgency to inform spending requirements which are intended to address the most pressing high priority works. Maintenance of school buildings is financed from DfE School Condition Grant, with the expenditure budget set at the equivalent amount to the grant income.
 - *ICT Schemes*; To support new ways of working that have become the norm in recent times, the Council will be required to invest in technology and IT infrastructure over the coming years.
 - *Rolling programmes*; cover more than one year and give a degree of certainty for forward planning schemes to improve service delivery. They make an important contribution towards the Council's established Asset Management Plans and mainly include ICT programmes.
 - *Other desirable schemes*; are other high priority schemes that meet the needs and objectives of their service.
 - *Invest to save schemes*; these are schemes where the additional revenue income or savings arising from their implementation exceeds the Council's borrowing costs.

Summary

- 5.44 A summary of the cost of schemes proposed by directorates is set out below in Table 6. A detailed list of new schemes from the People Directorate is included in Annexe D. Total requested Council funding for schemes amounts to £9.309m, which includes £4.150m for schemes that have commenced in the current year and will continue into 2022/23. New, additional funding requested is therefore £5.159m.

Table 6: Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2024/25

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Service Area	£000s	£000s	£000s
Delivery	8,099	4,411	1,947
People	4,333	0	0
Central Directorates	3,914	2,820	2,820
Total Capital Programme	16,346	7,231	4,767
Less Externally Funded	7,037	2,820	2,340
Council Funded Programme	9,309	4,411	2,427

Funding options

- 5.45 Following the introduction of the Prudential Borrowing regime local authorities are able to determine the level of their own capital expenditure with regard only to affordability on the revenue account. In practice this represents the amount of borrowing they can afford to finance and will necessitate taking a medium-term view of revenue income streams and capital investment needs.
- 5.46 To achieve its aim of ensuring that capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable, the Local Government Act requires all local authorities to set and keep under review a series of prudential indicators included in the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities. The Capital Programme recommended in this report can be sustained and is within the prudential guidelines. Full Council will need to agree the prudential indicators for 2022/23 to 2024/25 in February 2022, alongside its consideration of the specific budget proposals for 2022/23 and the Council's medium-term financial prospects.

Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2022/23

- 5.47 A detailed impact assessment of the Provisional Settlement, which was announced on 16 December, has not yet been completed. However, at this point the headlines appear to be as follows:
- It is a single year settlement for 2022/23 only, with indications that there will be a significant redistribution of resources from 2023/24, which will be subject to consultation;
 - The long-planned move to 75% business rates retention is no longer part of Government policy, being felt to run counter to "Levelling Up";
 - The Council's overall assumptions for Government support have proved to be accurate, except for the unexpected announcement of a one-off Services Grant for 2022/23 only, worth £1.2m for Bracknell Forest.

6 ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The Council is legally obliged to calculate the Council Tax Base for 2022/2023 by 31 January 2022. Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as inserted by the Localism Act 2011, imposes a duty on the Council, as a billing authority, to calculate its Council Tax by applying a formula laid down in that Section. The formula involves a figure for the Council Tax Base for the year, which must itself be calculated. The Local Authority (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 require a billing authority to use a given formula to calculate the Council Tax Base.
- 6.2 The authorisation for incurring capital expenditure by local authorities is contained in the legislation covering the service areas. Controls on capital expenditure are contained in the Local Government Act 2003 and regulations made thereunder.

Director: Resources

- 6.3 The financial implications of this report are included in the supporting information.

Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.4 The Council's final budget proposals will potentially impact on all areas of the community. A detailed consultation process is planned in order to provide individuals and groups with the opportunity to comment on the draft proposals. This will ensure that in making final recommendations, the Executive can be made aware of the views of a broad section of residents and service users. Several of the budget proposals require specific equality impact assessments to be carried out. Consultation with equalities groups that are likely to be affected by the proposal is part of the assessment process.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.5 A sum of £2.25m is currently included in the draft proposals to meet the costs of unpredictable or unforeseen items that would represent in year budget risks. The Executive will need to make a judgement on the level of Contingency at its meeting in February.
- 6.6 The Director: Resources, as the Council's Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer), must formally certify that the budget is sound. This will involve identifying and assessing the key risk areas in the budget to ensure the robustness of estimates and ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place to manage those risks, including maintaining an appropriate level of reserves and Contingency. This formalises work that is normally undertaken each year during the budget preparation stages and in monthly monitoring after the budget is agreed. The Director: Resources will report his findings in February, when the final budget package is recommended for approval.
- 6.7 The scale of the Council's Capital Programme for 2022/23 will impact upon the revenue budget and will itself be subject to consultation over the coming weeks. All new spending on services will need to be funded from new capital receipts or borrowing. The generation of capital receipts in future years may mitigate the impact on the revenue budget, but as the timing and scale of these receipts is uncertain their impact is unlikely to be significant.

- 6.8 There are also a range of risks that are common to all capital projects which include:
- Tender prices exceeding the budget
 - Planning issues and potential delays
 - Uncertainty of external funding
 - Building delays due to unavailability of materials or inclement weather
 - Availability of staff with appropriate skills to implement schemes

6.9 These can be managed through the use of appropriate professional officers and following best practice in project management techniques. The report also identifies the risk associated with the shortfall in maintenance expenditure compared to that identified by the latest condition surveys. With only those highest priorities receiving funding in 2022/23, there will be a further build up in the maintenance backlog and a risk that the deterioration in Council assets will hamper the ability to deliver good services.

Climate Change Implications

6.10 Detailed consideration will be given to the impact of the final capital budget proposals in February 2022, although in general terms improvements to current assets and the construction of new facilities using modern designs and construction techniques are expected to have positive climate change implications.

7 CONSULTATION

Principal Groups Consulted

7.1 The Overview & Scrutiny Commission will be consulted on the budget proposals and may also choose to direct specific issues to individual overview and scrutiny panels. Targeted consultation exercises will be undertaken with business rate payers, the Schools Forum, town and parish councils and voluntary organisations. Comments and views will be sought on both the overall budget package and on the detailed budget proposals. In addition, this report and all the supporting information are publicly available to any individual or group who wish to comment on any proposal included within it. To facilitate this, the full budget package will be placed on the Council’s web site at <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal>. There will also be a dedicated mailbox to collect comments.

7.2 The timetable for the approval of the 2022/23 Budget is as follows:

Executive agree proposals as basis for consultation	14 December 2021
Consultation period	15 December 2021 - 25 January 2022
Executive considers representations made and recommends budget.	08 February 2022
Council considers Executive budget proposals	23 February 2022

Background Papers
None

Contacts for further information

Paul Clark, Finance Business Partner - CYPL
paul.clark@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

(01344 354054)

Doc. Ref. [https://bfcouncil.sharepoint.com/sites/fina/bpm/FIBPSCB-FIN9.6/Schools Forum/\(108\) 130122/2022-23 LA Budget Proposals from the council - Schools Forum.docx](https://bfcouncil.sharepoint.com/sites/fina/bpm/FIBPSCB-FIN9.6/Schools Forum/(108) 130122/2022-23 LA Budget Proposals from the council - Schools Forum.docx)

Description of Commitment Budget Items for 2021/22 to 2023/24

Department and Item	Description	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000
People Directorate				
Suitability surveys	Suitability and access surveys are undertaken every three years to update the Asset Management Plan so that up to date information is available to inform investment decisions on the capital programme.	-20		20
Schools Budget – Funding for New Schools	There is a significant medium-term financial pressure on the Schools Budget arising from the cost of new schools that are being built in response to new housing and the resultant need for more school places. New schools generally need to open at the start of the developments and will take several years to fill up as house building continues. During this period, they need additional financial support to cover what can be significant diseconomies of scale. This cost pressure is not adequately resourced in the funding settlement from the government and to protect school budgets the Council agreed to provide up to £1m of funding over four years. £0.818m has been allocated to date (£0.227m in 2021/22) and at this stage it is anticipated the remaining £0.182m will be required in 2022/23.	-45	-182	
Schools Budget - High Needs deficit	Bracknell Forest along with many other councils has had to set a deficit budget for the High Needs Block. This deficit will be balanced in the Council's budget by a contribution from school reserves as it will need to be met from the DSG over the medium term.	TBC		
Home-Start and Journey to Parenthood	Two years of Public Health funding was secured for this family support programme in 2020/21.	7		
Education & Learning – NEET Prevention Programme	Full year effect of providing the enhanced NEET prevention programme for 16-19 year olds in-house.	-25		

Department and Item	Description	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000
Additional Income / Expenditure Reductions	Additional income and reductions in non-essential expenditure across a number of budget areas.	-13		
School Accommodation	The budget for the temporary hire of modular accommodation at Sandhurst Secondary school (due to emergency roof repairs) is no longer required.	-200		
Welfare Support	Additional one-off welfare support for our most vulnerable residents was provided in 2021/22 and funded from the one-off Local Council Tax Support Grant.	-327		
Mental Health Initiatives	One-off support for individuals experiencing mental health issues was provided in 2021/22.	-250		
Coopers Hill Site Officers	Redundancy of 2 site officers who worked at Coopers Hill (-£24,230) less budget required for extension of the corporate cleaning contract for Braccan Walk (£7,520).	-17		
School Crossing Patrollers	Savings currently being achieved due to vacancies. Over the years the Highways Engineering Team have provided enhanced walking, cycling and speed management schemes outside the majority of our schools, and continue to monitor and undertake improvement schemes where the need arises on an evidence based approach. Improvements are implemented through the annual Local Transport Plan Capital Budget.	-37		
Total		-927	-182	20

Revenue budget: proposed PRESSURES for the People Directorate

Description	Best Case 2022/23 £'000	Worst Case 2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000
<p>Adult Social Care Costs This represents the pressure on care packages. It has been calculated by taking current costs. The pressure also includes an estimate of the costs arising from young people turning 18 and transferring into Adult Social Care.</p>	1,792	1,880		
<p>Children Looked After This represents the pressure on care and accommodation charges. It has been calculated by taking current costs and estimating changes for the remainder of the financial year, including an anticipated reduction from young people turning 18 and transferring into Adult Social Care.</p>	395	759		
<p>Forestcare Unexpected costs have arisen this year, including increased office rental and ICT costs. In addition, income has reduced due to some contracts not being renewed. These pressures are expected to be for one year only whilst further work is carried out to move this trading account to a sustainable position.</p>	153	153	-153	
<p>Adults Assistive Equipment and Technology The equipment budget has consistently overspent in prior years due to increased use of equipment to facilitate people with care needs remaining at home. There are likely to be further pressures on the budget in the coming months due to inflation on shipping and material costs.</p>	132	212		
<p>Schools Budget The Department for Education are reducing by 20% per annum grant support for a range of areas supporting vulnerable pupils, such as education support for children looked after. Additionally, an academy conversion will result in lost income.</p>	71	71		
<p>Fostering Preparing new carers for fostering and providing support thereafter has persistently overspent. Having a strong pool of in-house foster carers is an effective cost avoidance measure and generally delivers good outcomes for children and young people.</p>	25	25		

Description	Best Case 2022/23 £'000	Worst Case 2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000
Adoption Cost allocation of the regional adoption service is through an agreed formula based on the proportion of adoptions by each local authority over the previous 3 years.	11	11		
School Standards Income Income generation has been below target for 3 years and is not expected to increase.	24	41		
Family Group Conferences An external review has confirmed a strong link from Family Group Conferences and future cost avoidance. There is a long-standing overspending which it is proposed is funded.	24	24		
Emergency accommodation There is growing demand for emergency housing accommodation which often has to be provided through expensive Bed & Breakfast accommodation. Actions are being taken to manage this demand but there remains a risk that despite this, costs continue to increase.	0	250		
PEOPLE TOTAL	2,627	3,426	-153	

Revenue budget: proposed ECONOMIES for People Directorate

Description Impact	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000
Heathlands nursing home New care home to open in early 2022. The Council will have a contract for 36 of these beds which will be provided at a competitive price.	-193	-14	
Homecare framework contract A new framework contract for homecare services will be established from 1 April. This will include a new flat rate which, whilst ensuring the providers currently paid a lower rate receive an increase, overall should have a beneficial impact on the budget.	-124		
Surplus budgets Based in prior year-outturns, budgets have been reduced where there are recurrent underspends or the action to achieve the saving has already been completed in prior years.	-115		
Lease of properties to registered providers Re-negotiation of leases of Council-owned properties to registered providers to provide extra-care housing.	-20		
Automation of business support Recording of conferences rather than minuting should enable a reduction in staff posts.	-15		
Income from schools A number of new Service Level Agreements will be offered to schools.	-5		
PEOPLE TOTAL	-472	-14	0

CAPITAL PROGRAMME - PEOPLE

	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	TOTAL £000
Committed				
10a Portman Close Flats	250	-	-	250
	250	-	-	250
Unavoidable				
No Schemes	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-
Rolling Programme / Other Desirable Non-Schools				
Departmental Bids:				
Garth Hill College - Atrium Balconies (up to £700k)	700	-	-	700
School Bids:				
School Security and Safeguarding	100	-	-	100
Fire Safety	110	-	-	110
Total	910	-	-	910
TOTAL REQUEST FOR COUNCIL FUNDING	1,160	-	-	1,160
External Funding - Other				
Non-Schools				
10a Portman Close Flats	250	-	-	250
Schools				
DfE Grant: Schools Capital Maintenance	2,040	-	-	2,040
DfE Grant: Devolved Formula Capital	250	-	-	250
Warfield - Migration Highway Works	633	-	-	633
	3,173	-	-	3,173
TOTAL EXTERNAL FUNDING	3,173	-	-	3,173
TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME	4,333	-	-	4,333

PEOPLE DIRECTORATE
2022/23 Capital Programme Bids
NEW SCHEMES

Garth Hill College - Atrium Balconies (Up to £0.7m)

The newly reconstructed school was opened in 2010 and was a One School Pathfinder project under the government's Building Schools for the Future programme. The school was designed and built with open balconies around the atrium and in the curriculum blocks protected by balustrades, which were themselves designed and constructed to be higher than Building Regulations required to specifically mitigate the potential risk of falls and falling objects. The sixth form centre was constructed in 2015 and has similar open balconies.

There have been no incidents since the new school building was opened and the school's risk assessment shows a low risk of falls and falling objects, however, a distressed pupil attempted to jump from the 2nd floor balcony in the atrium, but they were pulled back by a member of staff. This incident prompted a review of H&S by the governing body and the school has requested advice from the Council about what could/should be done to prevent this re-occurring in the future.

The following advice has been received from the Council's insurers:

The H&S Act 1974 states that you must reduce the risk to "as far as reasonably practicable" and cost cannot be a prohibitive factor unless it can be demonstrated that an immense cost would produce little or no benefit. However, I do not think that is the case here and improvements should be made here as a matter of urgency regardless of funding. The college would be negligent in not taking action should a further incident occur. The most effective way to reduce the risk to a minimum is to put a physical barrier up to all but ceiling height – this would prevent anyone climbing over and throwing objects which again, for those underneath, would cause serious harm. Human factors would require the removal of as many opportunities for error or violations and in my opinion in this environment robust measures would be required. I have attached an HSE briefing which considers falls from balconies in Health and Social Care settings of which they have included schools in this. It states "Balconies -Where assessment identifies that service users are at risk of falling, then sufficient protection should be provided to prevent them from accessing balconies or climbing over the balcony edge protection. This should take into account furniture or features with footholds which may allow access over the barrier (e.g. chairs, tables, plant pots, walls etc).

A feasibility & cost report has been commissioned by Property from Atkins which identified a proposed solution for the atrium at £300k. Following advice from the Council's insurers however the scope of the works has been expanded to include the curriculum blocks and sixth form centre. The above figures are therefore a budget estimate until the revised feasibility & cost report is received.

Warfield – Highways Works to Support Migration (£0.7m)

The school currently operates on split sites with half of its pupil numbers (210) on the All Saints Rise site, and the other half (210) on the Woodhurst site. Operating on two sites has imposed financial pressures on the school including duplication of staffing and resources which is creating a deficit budget for the school, which is anticipated to be at £50k by September 2022. The deficit budget that can only be managed in the short term through draw down of accumulated balances, and this is having a negative impact on the education of children by drawing resources away from teaching and learning.

In 2020 the Headteacher and Chair of Governors wrote to the Council highlighting financial and organisational issues operating over two sites and requesting to unite the whole school (420) on a single site by migrating the All Saints Rise pupils to Woodhurst.

Woodhurst was constructed in 2015 with capacity for 420 pupils, to allow for future expansion, however additional pupil numbers have not been forthcoming so the vacant 1FE capacity at Woodhurst is therefore available to allow the school to migrate. The Council's School Places forecasts suggest that North Bracknell currently has a surplus of 380 primary school places which is forecast to increase to 790 by 2025 so the spare capacity at Woodhurst can be taken up by migration without negatively impacting on the supply of primary school places in North Bracknell.

A statutory consultation on the migration proposal was undertaken in January/February 2021, and the results of this were a majority (52%) against migration, including a majority of parents (63%) who were also against it. The majority of negative consultation comments raised concerns with parking, travel and safe walking routes to school. In the light of this the school withdrew the proposal and the Council undertook to look into the highways implications of the migration proposal.

The Council's Managing Partner Atkins have been working with the BFC Highways team to draw up a schedule of works required to support migration, which include:-Provision of a new Toucan crossing-Widening access to two roundabouts - creation of additional parking and drop-off/pick-up at Woodhurst. The school is proposing to re-consult migration during Nov-Dec-21 with a view to the migration decision being taken in Feb-2 This is a Voluntary Controlled Church of England school. Preliminary discussions with the Oxford Church of England Diocese have indicated a willingness on their part to support the school to migrate. The Diocesan Authority's agreement would also have to be reached on the future use of the All Saints Rise site after the school migrates. Alternative uses include as a new primary SEMH Hub.1.

School Security and Safeguarding (£0.1m)

A number of small schemes relating to school security and safeguarding have been identified by individual schools that will not be picked up under the maintenance programme but have been supported by the Directorate as warranting support. These schemes will include secure fencing, gates and groundworks.

Fire Safety (£0.11m)

This budget will be used to update and replace fire safety measures at a number of schools, undertaking work such as the replacement of exit doors, internal fire doors and upgrades to fire alarm systems.