

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2010

Present:

Councillor Robert Evans (Chairman)
Councillors Reg Adams, Nicholas Bennett J.P., Judi Ellis,
Roxy Fawthrop, John Getgood, Diana MacMull,
Anne Manning and Stephen Wells

Dolores Bray-Ash JP, Brian James and Nancy Thompson
Karen Nicholson, Alison Regester and Dr Jenny Selway

Also Present:

Councillor Stephen Carr, Councillor Peter Fookes,
Councillor Brian Humphrys, Councillor Peter Morgan and
Councillor Ernest Noad

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David McBride, Councillor Reg Adams attended as his substitute. Apologies for absence were also received from Joan McConnell and Michael Youlton. Apologies for lateness were received from Delores Bray-Ash.

22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Roxy Fawthrop declared that her sister attended a school in the Borough. Councillor Judi Ellis declared that she had a son who was a teacher in the Borough. Mrs Nancy Thompson declared that she was Chairman of Governors of one of the Schools due to receive funding in respect of Item 9j and Mrs Alison Regester declared that she owned and ran a private day nursery in the Borough. Mr Brian James declared the same interests as at the previous meeting of the Committee, with the exception that he was no longer the Chairman of Governors at a school outside the Borough, although he still remained on the Governing Body. In respect of Item 10, Mr James declared that he had a young adult son who was currently part of the Learning Disability transition process.

**23 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE
PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

No questions were received.

**24 MINUTES OF THE CYP PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
15 JUNE 2010**

In respect of minute 13, Councillor John Getgood noted that the school with the largest budget deficit, Clare House, had been left out of the discussion and Councillor Getgood stated that he felt that this had been unfair on the other schools that had been named in the discussion.

The Head of CYP Finance responded to the issue raised by Councillor Getgood and outlined the reasons for the deficit which included poor financial management by the previous head teacher of the school budget and a high cost staffing structure, that had been identified through comparisons with other schools through the Local authority and benchmarking. Management action to achieve a recovery plan under new management had been agreed by the School and the Local Authority and this action included restructuring of the staffing structure, an evaluation of Service Level Agreement and Contracts and tighter financial controls and budget monitoring. As a result of this action, Officers projected that the School's deficit would improve from 2012/13 with the School achieving surplus by 2014.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15th June 2010 be agreed.

**25 PROGRESS ON MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS
MINUTES
Report LSCD10128**

The Committee reviewed a report updating Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

The Chairman asked for an update regarding the issue of admission arrangements in neighbouring boroughs. The Assistant Director (Access and Inclusion) reported that LB Bexley had employed a consultant who had made recommendations but no decisions by Members had been taken. It had been reported anecdotally to the admissions team that Kent CC had changed its pass rate for examinations so that their local pupils had to achieve a different pass rate to "out-of-borough" pupils. The Assistant Director (Access and Inclusion) explained that legal advice had not yet been sought as to how this change would affect the Greenwich Judgement. The legal advisor to the Committee undertook to review the arrangements and report back to the Committee before the next meeting.

Referring to Minute 11B, the Chairman sought an update on comments made by Mrs Alison Register regarding undertaking CRB checks. The Assistant

Director (Access and Inclusion) reported that Officers were working with providers in the private and voluntary sector and that an education safeguarding committee had been established to keep pace with changes. Mrs Regester reported that an Early Years Forum had taken place since the last meeting and at the Forum she had asked how many routinely checked their providers every three years. No one indicated that they did this every three years which suggested that the checks were not being undertaken routinely.

In terms of the Placement Planning Working Group, the Chairman suggested that the Members on the Working Group should be Cllrs Evans, Wells, Humphrys and McBride.

A Co-opted Member asked for an update on the presentation that Bromley MyTime made to the Children and Young People Trust Board. The Portfolio Holder reported that MyTime had attended the meeting and provided some information but they had been asked to attend a further meeting in the autumn in order to expand on the information provided to the Trust Board.

Mr David Gibson, Assistant Director (Housing and Residential Services), ACS, attended the meeting and provided the Committee with an update on the progress of the Foyer Scheme. A briefing paper was tabled and this provided an update on the current provision.

The Assistant Director (Access and Inclusion) provided an update on services available at Children and Family Centres in response to the issues raised by Cllr Ellis at the previous meeting. The Committee was informed that Crèche facilities were available at the Cotmandene Centre. Parents who were accessing provision at the Centre could access a crèche facility for up to four hours while the parent remains on site, with the parent retaining responsibility for their children. However, there was no day-care provision at the Cotmandene Centre. Day-care provision was included in the full core offer of Children's Centres based on an assessment of need – for example, full day-care provision was available at Community Vision in the west of the Borough and Blenheim in the east, as these were areas with high deprivation. The needs analysis for the Cotmandene Centre did not support the development of a full day-care offer. In addition during the past 12 months, Cotmandene Children and Family Centre has provided a wide range of services to meet local needs which included child and parent health services, counselling, evidence-based parenting courses and one to one family support/advice, early education sessions and help for parents to get back into work and training.

RESOLVED that the progress on matters arising from previous meetings be noted.

26 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

A number of written and oral questions were asked of the Portfolio Holder and these are attached at **Appendix A**.

27 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

The Committee noted the decision that had been taken by the Portfolio Holder since the last meeting on 15th June 2010.

**28 CYP BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11
Report DCYP10112**

The Committee considered a report providing Members with the first budget monitoring position for 2010/11 based on spending up until the end of May 2010. As in previous years, the financial information was separated between the schools' budget – funded from the Dedicated Schools' Grant and specific grants, and the non-schools – budget funded from Council Tax, Revenue Support Grant and specific grants. The schools' budget funded from the DSG was forecast to underspend by £72,000 in 2010/11. However, there was a deficit carried forward from the previous financial year of £185,000, making the net forecast by the end of this year a deficit of £113,000. There was provision within the central schools' budget contingency to offset this forecast overspend. The controllable part of the non-schools' budget was forecast to overspend by £890,000. However, this was after allowing for management action to use resources efficiently in the Children's Social Care Services (staffing and placements) and use of grants to offset existing expenditure. Details were provided in paragraph 3.6 of the report.

The Head of CYP Finance introduced the report and outlined the budget pressures that would be affecting the department into the future.

The Portfolio Holder expressed the hope that the Government's amount of a review of children's social care would assist in addressing the broad range of difficulties experienced by the Local Authority in relation to recruitment and retention of social workers.

The Committee considered a number of aspects of the report and a Member asked what steps the department had taken to rationalise the education estate. The Director CYP outlined the Local Authority's framework for the review of school place capacity, school organisation and projected demand. Members had received reports and the Portfolio Holder had approved an increase in capacity at three primary schools given the rise in pupil numbers. The Local Authority had a strong track record in identifying opportunities to change school organisation through amalgamations, closures and where appropriate developing new provision. The challenging financial context would require detailed consideration of efficient models of school organisation

and that would be under review by the CYP PDS Working Party during autumn 2010.

A Member questioned the cause of the underspend on nursery placements and asked whether the forecasts had been inaccurate or whether there had been less uptake of places. The Head of CYP Finance reported that forecasts for 3 and 4 year old children were the hardest to undertake and that an explanation of why numbers of 3 and 4 year olds did not correlate with the numbers of places would be reported back to the Committee.

Another Member asked for an update on the success of the Riverside facility, and the Assistant Director (Access and Inclusion) reported that the facility had been thriving since it opened in January 2010. The facility had initially opened with around 20 pupils and by September 37 pupils would be enrolled, this eventually rising to 45 pupils. The Assistant Director stressed that without the new Riverside provision all these pupils would have been placed out-of-borough and whilst the level of out-of-borough placements was not reducing this was because of a significant increase in volumes of children and other areas of development of provision in Bromley were being identified.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (i) consider the projected variations, note the service pressures, especially in Children's Social Care Services;**
- (ii) endorse the latest budget position and note the action being taken to minimise the forecast overspend;**
- (iii) recommend to the Executive that it approves the inclusion of the following Specific Grants to departmental budgets:**
 - (a) Surestart Aiming High For Disabled Children - £25,000**
 - (b) 14-19 Prospectus - £11,000**
 - (c) Fair Play Playbuilder - £18,000**
- (iii) recommend to the Executive that it approves the inclusion of the following Area Based Grants to departmental budgets:**
 - (d) Think Family - £22,000**
 - (e) January Guarantee - £27,000**

These Area Based Grants would be applied to reduce the overspending in Children's Social Care. Details of all these new and additional grants are given in paragraph 3.11 of the report.
- (iv) Note and agree to the brought forward balances, highlighted in Appendix 8 of the report, being made available to the respective services in 2010/11 as follows:**
 - (f) To Youth Services and Office Services £27,642**
 - (g) To Standards & Achievement £109,765.**

**29 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE CHILDREN
AND YOUNG PEOPLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) MEMBERSHIP OF SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES
Report DCYP10095**

The Portfolio holder introduced a report outlining nominations for LA Governor Appointments for fifteen schools in the Borough.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the following LA Governor appointments, subject to CRB checks:

Bickley Primary School	Cllr Kate Lymer (Bickley Ward)
Cator Park School	Mr Anthony Thompson (Bromley)
Crofton Infant School	Mr Chris Munday (Petts Wood)
Cudham CE Primary School	Cllr Richard Scoates (Darwin Ward)
Farnborough Primary School	Mrs Naomi Kimber (Farnborough)
	Mr Dave Stacey (Orpington)
Green St Green Primary School	Cllr Samaris Huntington- Thresher (Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward)
Hayes Primary School	Mr Simon Narracott (Bromley)
James Dixon Primary School	Mr Len Blomstrand (Penge)
Langley Park School for Boys	Mr Alan Short (Beckenham)
Marjorie McClure School	Mr Harry Ward (Chislehurst)
Pickhurst Junior School	Mrs Stella Brackpool (Bromley)

Mr Duncan Parr
(Beckenham)

Red Hill Primary School

Mr John Thorogood
(Chislehurst)

Scotts Park Primary School

Cllr Ellie Harmer
(Plaistow and Sundridge)

Stewart Fleming Primary School

Mrs Gillian Mallard
(Bromley)

Warren Road Primary School

Cllr Russell Jackson
(Chelsfield and Pratts
Bottom Ward)

B) THE GOVERNMENT'S REFORM AGENDA: EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES
Report DCYP10113

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report providing an overview of the policy direction and key areas for reform, including the academies agenda, together with the potential implications and strategic planning issues for Bromley Council's local policy and strategy.

The Director CYP provided a presentation to the Committee outlining the main aspects of the Government's Reform Agenda for education and wider children's services, and the implications for schools, individually and collectively, and for the Borough. The Director stressed that the reform agenda was moving at a fast pace, in many areas only headline information was available and details were awaited.

Referring to the proposed amendments made by the House of Lords to the Academies Bill, and specifically the duty to consult, a Member asked about the range of consultees. The Director CYP explained that the Bill had no requirement on schools to consult, however, the proposed amendments suggested a duty to consult with parents and the local community. As yet there was no information regarding how the consultation should be undertaken.

Another Member asked whether there was any information emerging regarding the school leaving age, the abolition of AS examinations, the future of the International Baccalaureates and International GCSEs and whether CRB checks would be portable. The Director CYP responded that as yet there was no information regarding these areas. The Secretary of State for Education had indicated that he wanted to reform qualifications. In terms of the CRB checks, the Department was awaiting further information.

A Co-opted Member expressed concern regarding the delay imposed for special schools applying to be academies and asked which officers and organisations would be briefed. The Director CYP confirmed that special schools with 'outstanding' status could only apply for 'conversion' to Academy status from September 2011. All head teachers and governors had been invited to the Director's briefing sessions during June and July. The Local Authority would continue to provide guidance and advice to schools as further details of changes emerged in the autumn.

A Member sought clarity regarding academy status for underperforming schools. The Director CYP explained that the Academies Bill determined that the Secretary of State would have the power to convert underperforming schools.

Councillor John Getgood raised a procedural issue relating to the motion that had been deferred to the Committee from Full Council. Following legal advice and a vote, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the motion to a future meeting. Councillor Getgood was against deferring consideration of the motion.

Concerns were also raised by a Member that as schools transferred to academy status and top-sliced Local Authority funding, there may be insufficient funding available to support young people who had been excluded. This would represent a huge loss to the collective responsibility that had existed in the past. The Director CYP responded that this was a concern and that a lot would depend on the ability to negotiate with schools to focus DSG funding to support vulnerable groups such as those children with behavioural issues. The importance of engaging with all schools in order to minimise risks was highlighted.

The Chairman sought assurances that the Department was in a position to sell its services to other Boroughs and schools. The Director CYP confirmed that the Department, and Council, had a strong track record in the provision of sold services to former grant maintained schools, now foundation status schools. During August Officers would be modelling the full costs of services which could be offered to those schools 'converting' to Academy status. Consideration would also be given to other Local Authority markets.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (i) **consider the policy direction, key areas for reform and implications for Bromley;**
 - (ii) **note that further reports will be presented to Members to outline forward planning arrangements for local implementation.**
- C) OFSTED ANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF SAFEGUARDING AND LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SERVICES WITHIN THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY
Report DCYP10106**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the findings and recommendations of the Ofsted Inspection of Children's Safeguarding and Looked After Children Services.

In 2009, Ofsted introduced a new three yearly announced inspection regime for safeguarding and looked after children services. This inspection replaced the Joint Area Review methodology which ceased on 31 March 2009. A significant change in the new methodology was that the inspection process started immediately following the letter of notification to the Director of Children and Young People (CYP) Services with the requirement to submit an extensive range of documentation and data regarding service performance. Bromley was notified in writing of the inspection on the 25 March 2010. The fieldwork commenced on 11 April 2010 and the five strong inspection team arrived on that date having previously reviewed a wide range of documentary evidence. The fieldwork period included over 70 individual meetings and focus groups with staff, partners and children and young people and visits to a range of settings across the Borough. The inspection report was published on 24 May 2010.

Ofsted judged services for both safeguarding and Looked After Children as adequate overall but with some good features in both. The Local Authority was required to produce an action plan for submission to Ofsted setting out how it would make improvements.

The Chairman reported that the report had been thoroughly reviewed by the Executive Working Party for Child Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting and asked that the minutes of this meeting be circulated to all Members.

Ms Jenny Selway reported that there was also a Health Action Plan resulting from the inspection.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett noted that the improvement plan had not been endorsed by Members prior to the Ofsted Inspection and questioned why this had not happened. The Director CYP reported that the Local Authority had not received any advanced notification of the inspection. The CYP Department held a number of individual plans, all of which received Member approval over time. These plans had been consolidated into one overarching Children's Social Care Improvement Plan for consideration during the inspection. There had been no opportunity for formal Member approval. However, during the process the Portfolio Holder had been kept informed and the Lead Inspector had accepted that one coherent plan had been developed from a number of plans which had previously been before Members.

The Portfolio Holder, Executive Assistant and Committee thanked Officers for all the work that had been undertaken over a Bank Holiday weekend in order to support the inspection process, especially as the Local Authority had received no notice of the inspection.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the proposed draft Post-Inspection Action Plan and timescales.

**D) BROMLEY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD: ANNUAL REPORT 2009/2010
Report DCYP10111**

The Portfolio Holder introduced the third annual report of Bromley Safeguarding Children Board.

A Member questioned the amount of bureaucracy surrounding the Bromley Safeguarding Children Board and the Director CYP reported that Safeguarding Board arrangements were defined by statute and had been subject to the Ofsted Inspection of safeguarding arrangements. The Inspection Report had suggested that the Bromley Safeguarding Board had been effective.

RESOLVED that the Bromley Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report be noted.

**E) PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THREE PRIMARY SCHOOLS
Report DCYP10102**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the actions taken to establish additional places at Bickley, Princes Plain and Unicorn Primary Schools. The statutory notice period had completed and the report recommended that the decisions were now implemented.

The Chairman asked whether any comments had been received from Kelsey and Eden Park Ward Members regarding parking at Unicorn Primary. The Assistant Director Access and Inclusion reported that no comments had been received to date.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder is recommended to agree that the proposals be implemented to increase the Published Admission Numbers at Bickley Primary School from 30 to 60, Unicorn Primary School from 30 to 60 and Princes Plain Primary School from 45 to 60.

**F) REVISED INSTRUMENTS OF GOVERNMENT
Report DCYP10096**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining two Instruments of Government that had been submitted for approval by Beaverwood School for Girls and St Paul's Cray CE Primary School. Each school must have an Instrument of Government recording the name of the school and the constitution of the Governing Body. It is the Governing Body's responsibility to prepare a draft instrument for submission to the LA, who must be content that the draft complies with all applicable statutory requirements.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to (1) approve the revised instruments of Government for Beaverwood School for Girls and St Paul's Cray CE Primary School. (2) Instruct that the Instrument be

made by the Common Seal of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.

**G) ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING - POST COMPLETION
REVIEW REPORTS
Report DCYP10109**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining the post completion review of schemes within the capital programme. Existing capital programme procedures required that a post completion review be carried out within 12 months of the completion of schemes within the programme. The report presented by the Portfolio Holder outlined the findings of the Post Completion Review carried out in respect of Bishop Justus School.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the findings of the Post Completion Review carried out in respect of Bishop Justus School.

**H) SCHOOL LUNCH GRANT
Report DCYP10097**

The Portfolio holder introduced a report providing an evaluation of the use of the school lunch grant from September 2009 to June 2010.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett suggested that the Portfolio Holder write to the Secretary of State asking if the remaining School Lunch Grant could be returned to the Department of Education and the balance offset against the in-year grant savings of £1.4 million that the Local Authority had to make.

The Portfolio Holder agreed to write a letter setting out this proposal as suggested by Cllr Bennett.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio holder be recommended to (1) approve the proposals for use of the school lunch grant as detailed in the main body of the report and the distribution as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report. (2) Approve the proposal to retain funding from schools until receipt of required response and/or recover funding from schools which are non-compliant.

**I) 2010/11 IN-YEAR GRANT REDUCTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
FOR EDUCATION: PROPOSED STRATEGY TO DELIVER
THE TARGET REDUCTION OF £1.4M WITHIN BROMLEY'S
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SERVICES - PART 1
Report DCYP10114**

On 24 May 2010 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced £6.2 billion worth of Government savings from previously announced expenditure for the current financial year 2010/11. The Secretary of State for Education announced on 16 June how the Department for Education would make its contribution to these savings through reductions to Area Based Grant and

funding devolved from the Department to Local Authorities and other National agencies; the in-year reduction of Area Based Grants to Bromley Children and Young People Services is £1.42m.

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report making recommendations to Members on how to meet the £1.42m in-year budget reduction of CYP Area Based Grant and requesting authority to consult with staff as appropriate.

The Head of CYP Finance explained to the Committee that further update reports would be taken to Members as further information emerged.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett questioned whether the Department would be able to meet the required £1.4 million cuts as well as other costs associated with the cuts and reductions in staffing, such as redundancy costs. The Member suggested that the Department should look to make saving of around £2 million in order to ensure that the required savings were made. The Director CYP confirmed that only six weeks had elapsed since the DfE announcement of the cuts, officers were working to identify options for service reductions to achieve the necessary savings. However, in addition to the cuts required by the Government the Department was also facing significant budget pressures in areas such as the recruitment and retention of social workers, children's placement and SEN. Every area of the Department's work was being reviewed to see where savings could be made. The Director stressed that Officers were doing their utmost to protect front line services but that it was inevitable that some service areas would be affected. The Director also reported that she had been in consultation with the Chief Officers to see if there were grants available in any other areas that could be used to off-set aspects of the in-year grant cuts to support services to young people.

The Chairman asked how the cuts outlined in Appendix 2 of the report relating to school improvement would affect service delivery. The Assistant Director (Learning and Achievement) reported that in the short term an impact assessment had not been undertaken but that the in-year effects of the DfE grant cuts would be staff reductions. The Assistant Director (Learning and Achievement) provided assurances that retaining services for vulnerable schools and pupil groups would be the first priority.

Another Member asked if any savings could be realised through the abolition of the Comprehensive Area Assessment and this meant that previous levels of statistical analysis required by the last Government were no longer needed.

A Co-opted Member, supported by the Committee, congratulated Officers in the progress that had been made in progressing and managing the in-year grant cuts announced by the Government in such a short space of time. RESOLVED that (1) the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the proposed strategy for delivering the £1.42m reduction in expenditure within CYP as a consequence of the Government's announcement of in-year reduction in Area Based Grants for 2010/11; (2) the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder be recommended to note that consultation with any affected staff and the trade unions will be undertaken.

This is on the basis that if staff cannot be redeployed into other employment opportunities then the Council's policy on the payment of redundancy payments will apply.

**J) EARLY YEARS CAPITAL FUNDING - PROPOSED
PRIORITISATION OF REMAINING FUNDS
Report DCYP10098**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report setting out proposals for how the remainder of Early Years Capital funding would be allocated to Early Years and Childcare Providers.

The Assistant Director Access and Inclusion reported that this was one area where unspent funds were under review by the Department for Education.

The Chairman sought assurances that the Local Authority was not committing capital to projects that could be lost and these assurances were provided.

Officers reported that they had been in contact with all early years providers who may be vulnerable to the loss of funding advising them of the urgency of finalising schemes and submitting them for approval.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to (1) approve the schemes recommended for priority approval; (2) approve the priority ranking for remaining schemes within the Capital Funding budget, should funds become available; (3) approve the allocation of funding as set out in the report.

**K) REVIEW OF PHASE 3 CHILDREN AND FAMILY CENTRE
CAPITAL PROGRAMME
Report DCYP10107**

The Portfolio holder introduced a report outlining a proposed revision of the Phase 3 Children and Family Centres (CFCs) capital programme since the last report dated 2 December 2009 (DCYP09168) in the light of emerging changes to the new Government's Sure Start policy. The report also provided an assessment of the resulting implications and risks to the programme as well as highlighting ongoing planning to contribute to the sustainability of the Children and Family Centre programme.

The Chairman asked when the Committee would receive a report on the use of Children and Family Centres and Officers confirmed that this would be presented in November 2010.

A Member sought assurances that libraries would be provided with the necessary information and leaflets in order to signpost service users to Children and Family Centres and Officers confirmed this information would be provided to the libraries.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to (1) approve a revised set of schemes which reduces the programme from six to two and reprioritises the remaining capita to areas of deprivation and other CYP Portfolio priorities; (2) approve plans not to proceed with CFC projects within Beckenham, Bromley Central and Chislehurst Libraries, and the proposal in Chilham Way. (3) Endorse proposals to continue to progress the schemes at Hawes Down and the Highway with increased capital funding allocations to each development to accelerate the schemes.

**L) FINAL STANDARDS FUND (GRANT 1.1) ALLOCATION
2009/10
Report DCYP10108**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report outlining proposals for distributing the 2009/10 unallocated Standards Fund (Grant 1.1).

The Head of CYP Finance tabled a letter from the Chairman of the Schools Forum, along with a response to the letters from the Director CYP and the Committee noted the two letters.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the proposed allocation (Option 2).

**M) THE BROMLEY SEED CHALLENGE SCHEME
Report DCYP10110**

The Portfolio Holder introduced a report setting out the proposed allocation of £300,000 available within the Council's Capital Programme through the Bromley Seed Challenge Scheme to deal with priority premises issues at Bromley schools.

A Member questioned the use of the boundary fencing at Red Hill Primary School and the Head of Construction and Maintenance reported the fence was to separate the school from the car park.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio holder be recommended to (1) approve the list of schemes set out in Appendix 1 of the report. (2) that, where appropriate, the Director of Children and Young People Services be authorised to submit planning applications at the appropriate time in respect of the schemes set out in the report.

**N) CYP FORWARD ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME
Report DCYP10105**

The Portfolio Holder introduced the Forward Rolling Work Programme for the year ahead, based on items scheduled for decisions by the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder and items for consideration by the children and Young People PDS Committee.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett suggested that the Committee established a Working Group to review and scrutinise the provision of Children and Family Centres across the Borough. After lengthy discussions it was agreed that the Committee would consider whether a working party was necessary in late November when discussions could be better informed.

Another Member suggested that the Chairman should be given some flexibility to amend and agree the work programme in light of the pace of changes emerging from Government.

Turning to Appendix 2 of the report and the rolling programme of contracts and service level agreements, the Strategic Commissioning Manager reported that the current financial situation meant that there was uncertainty around all contracts identified in the Forward Rolling Work Programme. The expectation that 2011/2012 budgets would not be confirmed until very late in the current financial year meant that it was likely that there would be delays in the procurement process, affecting the Department's ability to put new contracts in place (where the service would be continued) immediately following the end date of the current contracts.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree the Forward Rolling Work Programme.

**30 TRANSITION STRATEGY FOR YOUNG PEOPLE WITH
 LEARNING DISABILITIES
 Report ACS10040**

The Committee considered a report setting out action being taken by Adult and Community and Children and Young People services to support young people and adults with learning disabilities to lead more fulfilling and independent lives and to manage the cost pressures arising from growing numbers of children with a learning disability moving through to adult services. The report sought Members' endorsement of the development of a cross portfolio strategy which encapsulated the Council's approach to working with children and families from an early age to prepare them for more independent lives as adults in the community.

The Assistant Director Commissioning and Partnerships, ACS, informed the Committee that there was currently a number of strategies covering this area and Officers wanted to specifically focus on young people with learning disabilities who transitioned through to adults services.

The Committee welcomed the report and the proposals it contained, and highlighted the need to support young people right through life and ensure that the right provision was identified early.

RESOLVED that the preparation of a joint Adult and Community and Children and Young People transition strategy for learning disabilities be endorsed.

**31 CYP ROLLING WORK PROGRAMME - FUTURE ITEMS FOR
THE CYP PDS COMMITTEE**

This item was considered under Minute 29o.

**32 REFERENCE FROM PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Report LDCS10112**

The Committee considered a report outlining the details of the Young Persons Substance Misuse Grant and updating Members in relation to the end of year performance position with regard to the Young People substance Misuse Plan.

The Head of Community Safety introduced the report and the Committee considered a number of the targets outlined in the report. The Chairman noted that the target for satellite sessions and been well exceeded and the Head of Community Safety confirmed that the over performance had been built into the new target that had been developed.

A Member commented that it was difficult to make a judgement on any of the targets as the report had not indicated the number of service users. The Head of Community Safety confirmed that there were 164 new presentations of people into treatment in 2009/10.

In responding to a question regarding CAHMS, the Head of Community Safety confirmed that individuals were receiving treatment in good time and that out of 18 people who had been referred to the service, only 2 had continued to receive treatment at the year end.

Another Member asked if there were any outcome measures and Head of Community Safety reported that Substance Misuse Treatment Plans would be forwarded to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee (and the CYP PDS Committee) in September 2010 and this report would recast performance measures.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**33 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION)
(VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT 2000**

RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business listed below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

34 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE CYP PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15 JUNE 2010

RESOLVED that the exempt minutes from the CYP PDS meeting held on 15th June 2010 be agreed.

35 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS PART 2 DECISIONS

The Committee noted Part 2 decisions that had been taken by the Portfolio Holder since the meeting on 15th June 2010.

36 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF PART 2 PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS

A) SEN TRANSPORT

Members considered and supported the recommendations in the report.

B) CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SERVICE: CONTRACTS OVERVIEW 2010/2011

Members considered and supported the recommendations in the report.

C) CONSIDERATION FOR AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT FOR ADVOCACY AND INDEPENDENT VISITORS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE FROM RECONSTRUCT

The Committee considered and supported the recommendations in the report.

D) BROMLEY MENCAP BUDDYING SHORT BREAK SCHEME - CONTRACT EXEMPTION PROPOSAL

The Committee considered and supported the recommendations in the report.

The Meeting ended at 11.06 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Minute Annex

Questions for the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder – 20.07.10

Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Councillor John Getgood

Please will you clarify the situation regarding proposals to close the Entry to Employment service (E2E) based at Castlecombe Youth centre? When was this decision taken?

Reply:

The Entry to Employment programme (E2E) based at the Castlecombe Youth Centre commenced in June 2008 and was commissioned by the Learning and Skills Council. Under these commissioning arrangements the programme required to deliver to a set of qualitative and quantitative criteria. Funding was directly related to the outcomes delivered by the programme. In January 2010 the Learning and Skills Council raised concerns that the programme operated by the Youth Service had not met the criteria and performance profile and that the contract would cease with effect from 31 July 2010. Since 1st April 2010 with the dissolution of the Learning and Skills Council the Local Authority is now responsible for 16-19 commissioning for learners. The funding of programmes such as E2E is the responsibility of the newly created Young Persons Learning Agency (YPLA). We await decisions of this new agency on the future of such programmes. The Local Authority, once the comprehensive spending review outcomes are announced will also be considering how such programmes can be funded in the future.

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Getgood commented that E2E was an important phase of youth service work and asked the Portfolio Holder about the prospects for keeping the service.

Reply:

Councillor Noad responded that until it was clear what would be funded by the Young Persons Learning Agency it would be impossible to say whether the service could continue as a result of the other cuts that were being implemented across Children and Young Peoples Services.

Do you know why Kelsey Park Sports College was included in the Secretary of State for Education's list of BSF projects that would not be proceeding?

Reply:

Under the previous Government's BSF programme the Local Authority submitted in 2008 a bid for capital funding to support schemes to improve the capacity, suitability and condition of its secondary school building stock. This bid featured schemes for 16 schools, grouped into 3 phased projects. We were advised in March 2009 that Bromley had received approval in principle to the first project; this featured 6 schools – Kelsey Park, Cator Park, Kemnal Technology College, The Ravensbourne and The Priory in partnership with Burwood Special School.

Bromley was to receive BSF funding in 2011/12 to address these schemes. The announcement over the last two weeks by the new Secretary of State for Education regarding cuts to the BSF programme, including Bromley, is in relation to the BSF bid of which Kelsey Park features as one of the schemes which would not proceed.

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Getgood stated that the way the news had come out emphasised the chaotic and rushed way that the new Secretary of State was working. Cllr Getgood asked the Portfolio Holder what representations had been made to the Secretary of State.

Reply:

Cllr Noad agreed that it was regrettable that the announcement had been made. But Cllr Noad highlighted that the Secretary of State had corrected himself and apologised. The Portfolio Holder assured Cllr Getgood that the Department would continue to campaign vigorously and would hopefully receive more information in the future.

Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Ms Fiona Murphy

1) Why, when both Ed Balls the Labour Education Minister and Michael Gove the new Conservative Education Minister were urging Bromley Council to let Harris Academies turn Kelsey into a mixed Harris Academy from September 2010 would Bromley not agree to this?

Reply

I am aware that you have been in correspondence with the Local Authority regarding the possibility of Kelsey Park Sports College becoming an Academy within the Harris group of academies, and have received responses to the questions you have posed regarding the role and actions of the Local Authority. I would like to take this opportunity to ensure that the facts are publicly known.

Kelsey Park Sports College is a Foundation School and currently enjoys many of the freedoms of an Academy: it is its own admission authority, is the trustee of the land and it is the "employer" of its staff. Any proposal to establish a co-educational academy under the current regulations for changes to school organisation would require a decision of the school's Governing Body as the responsible authority. The Local Authority has no powers to direct the school to become an academy, however, we have worked with the Head Teacher and Governors to secure a trajectory of improvement in achievement of the students.

I can reassure you that the Local Authority has been working in partnership with the Head Teacher and Governing Body of Kelsey Park to pursue academy status. It was only with the previous Prime Minister's announcement of the National Challenge Initiative in Autumn 2008 that Kelsey Park Sports College was identified as a school which could potentially be considered to transfer to academy status. Also in Autumn 2008 the Mayor of London announced his plans to establish a network of 10 academies across

London. As the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People I wrote to the Mayor of London outlining a proposal to explore with him the establishment of an academy in Bromley.

In parallel, the Director (Children and Young People) advised the Office of the Schools' Commissioner of our intention to pursue a potential academy for Kelsey Park Sports College. This work started in early 2009 and continued throughout the Summer and Autumn through a series of meetings with officials from the former Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), Elected Members and Local Authority senior officers. Bromley's priority is to secure a transition to academy status in which Kelsey Park can retain its local accountability and sit within the framework of Bromley Schools.

The process of application for Academy Status involved determining a specification for potential sponsors and seeking a suitable sponsor through a "sponsor competition". It was the role of the Office of the Schools' Commissioner to identify potential sponsors in partnership with the Local Authority. This it failed to do adequately – it was the Local Authority who approached the sponsors, a total of five, with two being interviewed in the Autumn 2009 – Harris Academies Trust and the London Development Agency on behalf of the Mayor of London with its educational partner the Academies Enterprise Trust. Bromley's preferred option in meeting the needs of young people in the Borough as a whole was to work with the Mayor of London as part of his plans to sponsor 10 London academies.

Our submission in March 2010 to the former DCSF, for ministerial consideration, identified the Academy Enterprise Trust (AET) in partnership with the London Development Agency (LDA) on behalf of the Mayor of London as the preferred sponsor partnership to support Kelsey's transition to academy status. These agencies have worked with the London Borough of Enfield during 2009/10 to establish two, highly successful, transition academies. It was Ed Balls as the Secretary of State in April 2010 who decided not to progress our application indicating we would have to apply again under new arrangements planned to be introduced. We await the new Government's guidance.

At no point did Ed Balls, Secretary of State for Children's Services urge or instruct the Local Authority to work with the Harris Academies Trust. The leader of the Council received a letter from Michael Gove when he was Shadow Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families stating his interest in support of Kelsey Park becoming an academy and also his knowledge of Lord Harris's interest in seeing Kelsey Park as part of the Harris Academy Foundation. We also received a letter from Lord Harris expressing interest in the potential of Kelsey Park becoming an academy with the Trust as a potential sponsor. In both instances, we confirmed that we were working with the DCSF Office of the Schools' Commissioner, we wished to develop a co-sponsor arrangement with partnership of the Local Authority, the School Governing Body and an academies sponsor with the London Development Agency. We have received no further communications from Ed Balls, Michael Gove or Lord Harris.

On your question of Kelsey becoming a 'mixed' school, ie co-educational. The Local Authority undertakes a regular review of school places and organisation; at the time of the last review in 2007 it was concluded that there are sufficient pupil places in the Beckenham and related areas and no case

for a new secondary school. However, Members and officers are scheduled to undertake a fresh review across primary and secondary schools in autumn 2010 as part of our 3-year planning cycle.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Murphy asked the Portfolio Holder to clarify his comments regarding Foundation Status.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that Local Authorities could only impose academy status on schools that were considered to be failing and Kelsey was not a failing school.

2) As a direct consequence of Bromley's refusal Kelsey have just lost £25m funding. You continue to favour an unknown combination of Academy provider with no local track record over Harris who have turned failing schools round in every borough surrounding Bromley, will you reconsider?

Reply:

With respect to your second question. The highlighting of Kelsey Park Sports College in recent announcement of the Secretary of State for Education on the future of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme was an error. This has been pointed out to the DfE by Bromley's Director, and should be corrected in future announcements. During our discussion with the Department for Children, Schools and Families on the future of Kelsey Park Sports College we were informed that an academy submission in itself would not give rise to a capital grant – it would need to be identified as part of the Local Authority BSF bid for capital for all schools in the borough

*Under the previous Government's BSF programme the Local Authority submitted in 2008 a bid for capital funding to support schemes to improve the capacity, suitability and condition of its secondary school building stock. This bid featured schemes for 16 schools, grouped into 3 phased projects. We were advised in March 2009 that Bromley had received approval in principle to the first project; this featured 6 schools – Kelsey Park, Cator Park, Kemnal Technology College, The Ravensbourne and The Priory in partnership with Burwood Special School. Bromley was to receive BSF funding in 2011/12 to address these schemes. The announcement over the last two weeks by the new Secretary of State for Education regarding cuts to the BSF programme, including Bromley, is in relation to the BSF bid and **not** to the academy submission which featured Kelsey.*

Supplementary Question

Ms Murphy reported that she had thought that Kelsey had been put in an Ofsted Category with notice to improve and asked the Portfolio Holder to provide further clarification.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder reported that Kelsey had been the subject of a second monitoring inspection and progress had been deemed satisfactory.

Oral Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Brian James:

Bromley Family Link Trustees have recently seen their work for children with disabilities diminish through the LBB commissioning process based mainly on cost. Does the Portfolio Holder have a view on the effect this has had on choice for children and the implication for other voluntary sector organisations who have now seen a charity's employees, and all associated costs, transfer into the public sector?

Reply

Commissioning within London Borough of Bromley has to operate within the Council's procurement procedures which are in place to ensure compliance with United Kingdom and European Union procurement law and secure value for money. With contracts which will exceed £50,000 in value the expectation is that there should be a fully open and competitive tendering process, with tender evaluation procedures that take into account both cost, quality and other relevant factors – in this case, the tender panel evaluating the bids included the independent chair of Parent Voice, representing parents of disabled children.

In evaluating bids, a number of factors were considered such as the experience of providing the required services, the accommodation and resources to be used, the ratio of staff to children and the training to be provided. It was considered that the award of the service to Riverside School would result in a great deal more provision for children with disabilities of all needs and age groups and generically offer greater choice than was previously the case

It is not considered that there are significant implications for other Voluntary Sector organisations in Bromley as a result of the outcome of this tendering process. Similar procurement requirements have been in place for several years and there is no evidence to suggest that this has disadvantaged the Voluntary Sector in Bromley in any consistent or identifiable way. Assessment of the information on Children and Young People (CYP) contracts in 2009/10 and 2010/2011 to date show that there has been virtually no change in either the volume of Voluntary Sector contracts or the proportion of annual contracted expenditure that is with the Voluntary Sector.

Supplementary Question:

Mr James commented that the ease of commissioning one provider for the authority to monitor and contact rather than a partnership or consortium of providers seems to have resulted in young people being at school for six days a week and up to 50 weeks a year. This had also resulted in significant costs, such as potential redundancy under TUPE, transferring from the voluntary sector to the public sector. Mr James asked whether the Portfolio Holder supported this restriction of choice for families of children with complex needs.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that he did not have sufficient information to answer the question and would provide a fuller response outside the meeting.

Written question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Councillor Nicholas Bennett

If he will reproduce the information he provided at the full council meeting on June 28th in response to my written question on the cost per pupil at each of the Borough's primary schools with the following information, in table format, for each school;

Overall finding of last Ofsted Report
 Number of pupils in the school
 Number of pupils from out of Borough
 Date of oldest school building on site

Reply

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Pratts Bottom Primary School	5990	Good with outstanding	59	11	1885
Dorset Road Infant School	5294	Good with outstanding	62	18	1893
Cudham Church of England Primary School	5273	Good	68	12	1851
Midfield Primary School	5266	Satisfactory	178	5	1953
Poverest Primary School	5211	Satisfactory	183	1	1952
Churchfields Primary School	5150	Good	216	13	1989
Manor Oak Primary School	5063	Good	160	1	1958
Chelsfield Primary School	4579	Good	88	9	1892
James Dixon Primary School	4429	Good with outstanding	266	23	1955
Princes Plain Primary School	4288	Outstanding	334	16	1934
Downe Primary School	4239	Good with outstanding	78	4	1906
Alexandra Infant School	4074	Good	178	11	1929
St Mary Cray Primary School	4041	Special Measures	126	2	1909
St Paul's Cray Church of England Primary School	4007	Good	184	1	1935
Mead Road Infant School	3943	Outstanding	84	5	1886

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Blenheim Primary School and Nursery	3923	Satisfactory	149	1	1965
Mottingham Primary School	3907	Note to improve	248	62	1938
Burnt Ash Primary School	3871	Good	428	185	1927
Hawes Down Infant School	3840	Good with outstanding	179	17	1931
Malcolm Primary School	3828	Satisfactory	206	16	1953
Castlecombe Primary School	3788	Good with outstanding	201	21	1995
Darrick Wood Infant School	3734	Outstanding	268	0	1968
Hillside Primary School	3720	Special Measures	352	9	1957
Leesons Primary School	3688	Satisfactory	204	0	1954
Raglan Primary School	3683	Good with outstanding	415	4	1891
Green Street Green Primary School	3670	Outstanding	407	8	1851
Hawes Down Junior School	3621	Good with outstanding	233	12	1965
Royston Primary School	3411	Satisfactory	367	17	1949
Tubbenden Primary School	3380	Good	587	5	1958
Unicorn Primary School	3367	Good with outstanding	220	2	2004
St Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary School	3354	Satisfactory	213	22	1890
Darrick Wood Junior School	3320	Satisfactory	359	4	1963
Crofton Infant School	3259	Good	538	2	1950
Worsley Bridge Junior School	3134	Note to improve	207	43	1954
Keston Church of England Primary School	3123	Outstanding	220	11	1971

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Bromley Road Infant School	3108	Satisfactory	249	44	1853
St John's Church of England Primary School	3092	Satisfactory	300	27	1978
Clare House Primary School	3080	Satisfactory	210	0	1975
Gray's Farm Primary School	3073	Satisfactory	379	10	1953
St Philomena's Roman Catholic Primary School	3071	Good	217	4	1939
St James Roman Catholic Primary School	3058	Outstanding	215	0	1970
Edgebury Primary School	3054	Outstanding	224	25	1955
Farnborough Primary School	3050	Good	211	1	1990
St Peter and St Paul Catholic Primary School	3044	Good with outstanding	210	8	1970
Bickley Primary School	3036	Good with outstanding	269	2	1945
Southborough Primary School	3033	Satisfactory	414	6	1952
Alexandra Junior School	3017	Satisfactory	223	17	1951
Parish Church of England Primary School	3013	Good	429	25	1779
St George's, Bickley, Church of England Primary School	2988	Satisfactory	291	16	1955
Holy Innocents Catholic Primary School	2985	Good	211	5	1950
Red Hill Primary School	2967	Satisfactory	598	133	1951
Stewart Fleming Primary School	2960	Good	303	27	1939
The Highway Primary School	2949	Good	203	0	1951
Valley Primary School	2940	Outstanding	420	30	1880
Oaklands Primary School	2932	no OFSTED judgement	365	53	1967
Biggin Hill Primary School	2907	Satisfactory	431	52	1967

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Marian Vian Primary School	2869	Outstanding	616	55	1931
Perry Hall Primary School	2859	Good	416	8	1967
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	2857	Note to improve	213	17	1880
Pickhurst Infant School	2828	Outstanding	358	25	1953
Chislehurst (St Nicholas) Church of England Aided Primary School	2822	Good with outstanding	218	11	1868
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	2821	Good with outstanding	430	4	1939
Wickham Common Primary School	2819	Good	432	17	1936
Scotts Park Primary School	2806	Good with outstanding	393	6	1971
Pickhurst Junior School	2801	Good	458	23	1953
St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	2762	Outstanding	225	94	1953
Highfield Infants' School	2761	Outstanding	271	0	1972
Balgowan Primary School	2757	Good	648	10	1930
Crofton Junior School	2748	Good with outstanding	707	11	1936
Oak Lodge Primary School	2714	Good with outstanding	674	130	1955
Warren Road Primary School	2713	Outstanding	845	9	1938
St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Beckenham	2649	Good with outstanding	431	37	1965
Hayes Primary School	2644	Good with outstanding	631	7	1935
Highfield Junior School	2568	Outstanding	380	4	1959

**Written question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from
Councillor John Getgood**

Please will you provide a list, by school, of capital investments in Bromley Secondary Schools, other than those using per-capita devolved capital budgets, over the last ten years and those that are confirmed for future implementation? Please indicate how they have been or will be funded.

Response

The information in the attached spreadsheet identifies the capital schemes in secondary schools. This information has been collated from the Council's published capital programme and does not include devolved capital to schools, or any specialist schools' status funding and schemes from the council-wide Planned Maintenance Budget.

Approved Secondary School Capital Programme for Children's Services Department

<u>Financial Year Start / End of Project</u>	<u>Capital Scheme /Projects/Schools</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Funding Streams</u>
		£'000	
2000/01	Cator Park Heating & Insulation	110	Capital Receipts
2000/02	Urgent provision at Various Schools	45	Emergency fund to cover demand for school places. Subject to appraisal
2000/09	Expansion of Sec Sch Provision - Bishop Justus	36,600	£4m capital receipts balance from Government grant
2000/01	Cator Park Science lab	645	Capital receipts
2001/07	Kelsey Park School - Consolidation	1,604	DFES Grant £93k; capital receipts
2001/04	The Priory School - Expansion by 1 FE	2,207	Capital receipts
2002/03	Charles Darwin School - Dining Facilities	105	100% New Deals funding
2003/04	Science Labs for 21st Century	298	100% DFES Grant
2003/05	Temporary secondary school accommodation	608	Revenue Contribution £100k, Capital receipts
2003/04	Langley Park Boys -Autistic Spectrum Disorder Provision	233	100% New Deals funding
2005/07	Cator Park Girls School - Suitability issues	535	Capital Receipts
2005/07	Langley Park School for Boys- new mobile classrooms	85	Capital Receipts
2005/08	Post 16 Capital (various schools)	3,575	Fully funded from school revenue budget
2005 / ongoing	Post 16 Infrastructure provision (various schools)	4,759	Funded by additional £8.6m standard fund grant
2006/07	Darrick Wood Specialist - College Status	100	100% Govt grant
2006/10	Coopers Technology /Marjorie McClure School- Car park expansion	130	Capital receipts plus £28k from schools
2006/10	Langley Park School for Boys	35,800	BSF One School Pathfinder - 100% Govt grant
2006/10	Langley Park School for Boys - enhanced performance space	2,006	Capital receipts
2009/13	Secondary School Investment Strategy		
	Newstead Wood	2,500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Darrick Wood	1,700	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Hayes General	1,000	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Hayes SpaLD	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Riverside Orpington	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Ravens Wood	2,500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	St Olave's	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Bullers Wood (Lower amount approved in principle only)	1,700	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Langley Park Girls (Lower amount approved in principle only)	2,000	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Contingency	520	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
		<u>102,865</u>	

This page is left intentionally blank