



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Kerry Nicholls
kerry.nicholls@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4602

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 1 April 2014

To: Members of the
EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA (Chairman)
Councillor Julian Benington (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Nicholas Bennett J.P., Julian Grainger and
David McBride

A meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee will be held at Bromley Civic
Centre on **TUESDAY 8 APRIL 2014 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

AGENDA

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**
In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing 4 working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Wednesday 2nd April 2014.
- 4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7TH JANUARY 2014 AND MATTERS OUTSTANDING** (Pages 3 - 10)
- 5 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2013/14 & ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2014 TO 2018** (Pages 11 - 18)
- 6 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2013/14** (Pages 19 - 32)
- 7 COST IMPLICATIONS OF RECHARGES - BEHAVIOUR SERVICE AND PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT ALTERNATIVE PROVISION** (Pages 33 - 38)

8 PUPIL PREMIUM TO HELP DISADVANTAGED PUPILS (Pages 39 - 42)

Appendix 1 to this report is a Part 2 (Exempt) matter at Item 14.

9 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO INFORMATION ITEMS

a CONSULTATION - FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING 2015/16 (Pages 43 - 80)

b ATTAINMENT FIGURES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES THAT ARE SIMILAR TO BROMLEY (Pages 81 - 84)

10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.00pm, Tuesday 24th June 2014

7.00pm, Tuesday 9th September 2014

7.00pm, Thursday 16th October 2014

7.00pm, Tuesday 6th January 2015

7.00pm, Tuesday 3rd March 2015

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

The Chairman to move 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.

Items of Business

Schedule 12A Description

13 PUPIL PREMIUM TO HELP DISADVANTAGED PUPILS (Pages 85 - 88)

This item relates to a Part 1 (Public) report at Item 8.

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

14 COUNCIL-RUN NURSERY PROVISION (Pages 89 - 112)

Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under the authority.

EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 7 January 2014

Present:

Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA (Chairman)
Councillor Julian Benington (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Nicholas Bennett J.P.,
Julian Grainger and David McBride

Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education

Also Present:

Jane Bailey, Interim Assistant Director: Education
David Bradshaw, Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance
James Mullender, Senior Accountant

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions had been received from members of the public.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2ND OCTOBER 2013 AND MATTERS OUTSTANDING

In considering the minutes of the previous meeting, it was noted that Members had requested Clare House, St Peter and St Paul's and Chelsfield Primary Schools be included in the Schedule of Members' visits for the 2013/14 academic year which had not yet been published.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd October 2013 be agreed.

5 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2013/14

Report CSD14012

On 20th November 2013, the Executive received the 2nd quarterly capital monitoring report for 2013/14 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2013/14 to 2016/17. The Sub-Committee considered a report outlining the changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Education Portfolio.

The Chairman was pleased to announce that an additional £300k of Government grant would be made available to the Local Authority in 2015/16 and 2016/17 to fund capital works in schools to meet the growing demand for additional pupil places. A one-off sum of £400k had also been provided for 2014/15 to equip kitchens in Local Authority maintained schools to support the provision of free school meals to all Key Stage 1 pupils from September 2014. No announcement had yet been made regarding how these free school meals would be funded. Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP noted that free school meals for Key Stage 1 pupils might also increase take-up of school meals at Key Stage 2 and above. The Chairman highlighted the link between free school meals and the Pupil Premium and underlined the need for schools to continue to encourage parents to register for Pupil Premium if their children were eligible as this enabled schools to access significant additional funding.

In response to a query from a Member regarding the £297k carry forward of Children's Centre funding from 2012/13 to make essential repairs to Castlecombe and Mottingham Children's Centres, the Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that the Local Authority continued to be in dispute with the project manager and company which had carried out the initial work under the Surestart capital scheme. The Local Authority contribution to the Phoenix Pre-School SEN Service was an historic carry forward of funding, and Members of the Sub-Committee were advised that following disagreement over the terms of the work, the Local Authority had never been billed by the Bromley Primary Care Trust. These funds were being held in abeyance in case they were required but would otherwise be released in due course.

A Member noted the capital work that had been undertaken at Langley Park Boys School as part of the Building Schools for the Future programme, including the enhanced performance space. The Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that the project should be completed on budget, excluding additional funds which had been provided by the Department for Education to fund asbestos removal. The Local Authority had contributed £2m to the enhanced performance space for which a community use agreement was in place, allowing groups such as the Bromley Youth Music Trust to access the facilities. A trading account had been established for the enhanced performance space, and it was hoped that the income generated through the rental of this space would support the maintenance of the facility into the future.

RESOLVED that the revised Capital Programme agreed by the Executive on

20th November 2013 be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Education for approval.

**6 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET MONITORING REPORT
2013/14**

Report ED13140

The Sub-Committee considered a report setting out the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio based on expenditure to the end of November 2013. The Schools' Budget, funded from the Dedicated Schools' Grant and specific grants was forecast to be in an underspend position of £2,087,000, which would be carried forward into the next financial year. The controllable part of the Non-Schools' budget, funded from Council Tax, Revenue Support and specific grants, was forecast to be in an overspend position of £35,000.

In considering the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio, the Chairman highlighted the overspend of £146k currently projected for the Behaviour Support (Secondary) Sold Service and confirmed that this was due to low take up of the service during 2013/14. Another Member noted the overspend of £155k currently projected for Bromley Adult Education College and queried if Jobcentre Plus would fund the courses being run to support people back into employment. The Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that funding for these courses was included as part of the Skills Funding Agency grant for 2013/14 and that no additional funding would be provided.

A Member underlined that the Education Psychology Service was projected to overspend by £90k on its trading account due to a shortfall of anticipated income and a higher than budget level of staff time allocated to it. This would be partly offset by a £40k underspend on the statutory element of the service and staff turnover, but the service was unlikely to break even for the 2013/14 financial year. The Education Psychology service formed part of the market testing exercise being undertaken on a range of Education services, as did the Adult Education Service, and consideration was being given to how the quality of Education services could be best maintained and monitored into the future, whether delivered in-house or by an alternate provider.

A Member noted the list of waivers to financial regulations which had been approved, allowing certain contracts with a value exceeding £50k to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations. The Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that these waivers had been requested for a range of reasons including enabling immediate action to be taken on specific projects such as urgent capital works. Use of these exemptions were reported to Audit Sub-Committee on a bi-annual basis for Members' consideration.

The Portfolio Holder for Education was pleased to report the significant savings currently being realised in Special Educational Needs (SEN) expenditure. This had been achieved through a wide range of measures including robust officer

action, increased local provision at Bromley Specialist Schools, strong representation at tribunals and increased accessibility of short breaks within the Borough. As more schools converted to academy status, grant funding would continue to decrease and it was important to ensure that grants continued to be utilised in a flexible manner where appropriate. A Member noted the potential to introduce personal budgets for children and young people with special educational needs. The Interim Assistant Director: Education confirmed that the Bromley and Bexley SEND Pathfinder project included the piloting of personal budgets for children and young people with special educational needs as part of the new Education, Health and Care Plan. Approximately 70 Education, Health and Care Plans were currently in place and a Working Group was considering how the personal budget element of these plans might work.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The latest 2013/14 budget projection for the Education Portfolio be noted; and,**
- 2) The Education Portfolio Budget Monitoring Report 2013/14 be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Education for approval.**

7 DRAFT EDUCATION BUDGET 2014/15

The Head of Education and Care Services Finance outlined the draft Education Portfolio Budget 2014/15, which incorporated future costs pressures and initial draft savings options and would be reported to the Council's Executive on 15th January 2014 and the Education PDS Committee on 30th January 2014. Members were requested to consider the proposed savings and identify any further action to be taken to reduce the cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.

The Chairman noted that £950k of potential savings had been identified for the Education Portfolio which would offset a reduction of £550k in Education Services Grant. Dedicated Schools Grant for 2014/15 had been set at £231m. No figures had been provided for 2015/16 onwards, but it was hoped that some indication would be provided by Summer 2014. The level of Education Services Grant remained a concern, and Members were advised that the Education Division would receive a total annual grant of £721k if all schools converted to academy status.

In considering Bromley Youth Music Trust, the Portfolio Holder for Education confirmed that the level of Local Authority funding to the Trust had been reduced by £20k for a fourth consecutive year. A new Director had been appointed by the Trust and it was hoped that further work would be undertaken to identify alternate funding sources, such as the Arts Council or sponsorship by private businesses. A Member highlighted the value of music workshops for children and young people which were delivered by the Trust across the Borough. Another Member noted the importance of identifying how many children and young people in the Borough accessed Bromley Youth Music Trust provision.

Members of the Sub-Committee discussed the way in which children and young people were able to contribute to Council decision-making. It was important to ensure that children and young people continued to have the opportunity for representation in Council decision making processes. The Bromley Youth Council had recently undertaken some excellent work on cyber-bullying and was currently exploring issues around adolescent mental health, however Members were concerned that the current Youth Council model was not representative of all schools across the Borough and that the service was delivered at a relatively high cost. Another Member noted that any consideration given to how children and young people contribute to Council decision making processes should also include the work of the Bromley Youth Advisory Panel.

A Member underlined the high quality of provision at the Duke Youth Centre and requested that it not be included as part of any potential closure programme. The Portfolio Holder for Education also highlighted the excellent work undertaken by the Phoenix Youth Centre, and noted the value of youth provision delivered at a number of other youth centres across the Borough. There was scope to discuss how the Duke of Edinburgh Award might best be administered in future, with the potential for local academy schools or the Scout Association to be licensed to administer the scheme.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The financial forecast for 2014/15 to 2016/7 be noted;**
- 2) Members' comments on the initial draft savings options for 2014/15 be noted and,**
- 3) Members' comments on the initial draft Education Portfolio Budget be provided to the Council's Executive.**

8 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO INFORMATION ITEMS

The Sub-Committee considered an information briefing outlining nursery provision within adult education. Bromley Adult Education College currently operated three Ofsted-registered day nurseries at the Widmore, Kentwood and Poverest Centres which provided child care for adult education staff and students as well as for local residents during term time only.

In discussion, Members were concerned at the level of uptake of the day nursery provision, particularly by adult education staff and students, and noted that the nurseries did not appear to cover the full range of premises costs of their provision, such as rent and utilities. Members queried whether there was sufficient demand to continue to operate the day nurseries and emphasised the wide range of alternate child care provision available across the Borough.

Members requested that a further report be provided to the next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee which gave full details of Council-run nursery provision at both the Community Vision and Blenheim Children's Centres and the

three day nurseries at the Widmore, Kentwood and Poverest Centres.

RESOLVED that the information briefing be noted.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee would be held at 7.00pm on Tuesday 8th April 2014.

The Meeting ended at 8.36 pm

Chairman

Matters Outstanding from Previous Meetings

Minute Number/Title	Decision	Update	Action	Completion Date
2nd October 2013				
10 Any Other Business	That a meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee be convened to consider the results of the market testing process for commissioning of Education Services.	A meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee would be convened when the market testing process, agreed by the Council's Executive on 16 th October 2013, had been completed.	Democratic Services	TBC
7th January 2014				
8 Education Portfolio Information Items	That a further report outlining Council-run nursery provision at both the Community Vision and Blenheim Children's Centres and the three day nurseries at the Widmore, Kentwood and Poverest Centres be provided to the next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee.	A report outlining Council-run nursery provision would be considered at the meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee on 8 th April 2014.	Head of Schools, Early Years Commissioning and Quality/ Head of Service, Bromley Adult Education College	April 2014

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
FSD14031

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 8th April 2014

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2013/14 & ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2014 TO 2018

Contact Officer: Martin Reeves, Principal Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4291 E-mail: martin.reeves@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Finance

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

On 12th February 2014, the Executive received a report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the 3rd quarter of 2013/14 and presenting for approval the new capital schemes supported by Council Directors in the annual capital review process. The Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for the five year period 2013/14 to 2017/18. This report highlights changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Education Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio is set out in Appendix A, detailed comments on individual schemes are included at Appendix B and the new schemes approved for this Portfolio are set out in paragraph 3.7.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 12th February 2014.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Affective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. The Council continuously reviews its property assets and service users are regularly asked to justify their continued use of the property. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley". The capital review process requires Council Directors to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council; Supporting Independence
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £550k for new schemes (see para 3.7)
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £72.4m for the Education Portfolio over five years 2013/14 to 2017/18
 5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 0.25 fte
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 9 hours per week
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Capital Expenditure

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive on 12th February, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 3rd quarter of 2013/14. The Executive also considered and approved new capital schemes supported by Council Directors in the annual capital review process. This report identifies changes relating to the Education Portfolio and the table in paragraph 3.2 summarises the overall position following the Executive meeting.

Capital Monitoring – variations agreed by the Executive on 12th February 2014

3.2 The base position prior to the 3rd quarter's monitoring exercise was the revised programme approved by the Executive on 20th November 2013, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. Changes to the Education Portfolio Programme approved by the Executive in February are shown in the table below and further details are included in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6. The revised Programme for the Education Portfolio (including new schemes) is attached as Appendix A and detailed comments on individual schemes are included at Appendix B.

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	TOTAL 2013/14 to 2017/18
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Programme approved by Executive 20/11/13	12,767	15,256	553	553	0	29,129
<u>Variations agreed by Executive 12/02/14</u>						
Basic Need - additional grant support (para 3.3)	0	0	20,635	21,667	0	42,302
Universal Free School Meals - new grant (para 3.4)	0	387	0	0	0	387
Rephasings from 2013/14 to later years (para 3.6)	-5,899	5,899	0	0	0	0
Total Q3 Monitoring variations	-5,899	6,286	20,635	21,667	0	42,689
New schemes (para 3.7)	0	0	0	0	550	550
Revised Education Capital Programme	6,868	21,542	21,188	22,220	550	72,368

3.3 Basic Need – government grant allocations for 2015/16 and 2016/17 (£42,302k increase)

The Executive was informed that additional grant allocations for Basic Need (school expansions) had been notified by the Department for Education. We will receive £20,635k in 2015/16 and £21,667k in 2016/17 and the Executive approved the inclusion of these sums in the Capital Programme.

3.4 Universal Free School Meals – new grant allocation for 2014/15 (£387k increase)

The Executive was informed of a new government grant recently announced by the Department for Education to upgrade school kitchens to facilitate the provision of free school meals. Bromley will receive £387k in 2014/15 and the Executive approved the inclusion of this sum in the Capital Programme.

3.5 Scheme rephasing

In reports last year to both the June and July meetings, the Executive was informed of the final outturn for capital expenditure in 2012/13 and noted that the overall level of unanticipated slippage into later years (some £4.1m) was significantly lower than in previous years and had continued the improvement seen at the end of 2011/12. Slippage of capital spending estimates has been a recurring theme over the years and Members were pleased to note that, following a review of the system for capital monitoring and for estimating the phasing of expenditure, carried

out after the 2010/11 final outturn, a more realistic approach towards anticipating slippage was apparently taken in setting the revised (final) estimates for 2011/12 and 2012/13 in February 2012 and 2013 respectively.

- 3.6 Some £2,741k of the overall slippage from 2012/13 into 2013/14 related to Education Portfolio schemes and this was analysed in the 1st quarter's monitoring report to the Budget Sub-Committee meeting in October 2013. In that report, the Sub-Committee was also informed that, following the 1st quarter's monitoring exercise, a total of £7.7m was rephased on Education schemes (Basic Need) from 2013/14 into later years. In the 2nd quarterly report to this Sub-Committee in January, Members were advised that a further £2.0m had been rephased by the Executive in November and, as is shown in the table in paragraph 3.2, a total of £5.9m was rephased by the Executive in February. This is itemised in the table below and comments on scheme progress are provided in Appendix B.

Capital Expenditure – Rephasing in Q3 monitoring	2013/14	2014/15
	£000	£000
Langley Park Boys School	-934	934
The Highway Primary School	-100	100
Reconfiguration of special schools	-117	117
Seed Challenge Fund	-342	342
Security works	-45	45
Children and Family Centres	-618	618
Capital maintenance in schools	-775	775
Basic Need	-2,400	2,400
Extended services	-44	44
Hawes Down Co-location	-249	249
Short Breaks capital	-67	67
Phoenix Pre-School SEN service	-208	208
Total Education Programme rephasing	-5,899	5,899

Annual Capital Review – new scheme proposals

- 3.7 In recent years, we have steadily scaled down new capital expenditure plans and have transferred all of the rolling maintenance programmes to the revenue budget. Our general (un-earmarked) reserves, established from the disposal of our housing stock and the Glades Site, have been gradually spent and have fallen from £131m in 1997 to £31.8m (including unapplied capital receipts) as at 31st March 2013. Whilst opportunities to dispose of property assets are being rigorously pursued, the level of receipts is not as high as in the past and new capital spending will effectively have to be met from our remaining revenue reserves.
- 3.8 As part of the normal annual review of the Capital Programme, Chief Officers were invited to come forward with bids for new capital investment. Invest to Save bids were particularly encouraged, but none were received, and it is assumed that any such bids will be submitted in due course through the earmarked reserve that was created in 2011. Apart from the normal annual capital bids relating to school and highway schemes, four bids were recommended for approval, with a total value of £2.2m, all of which would require funding from the Council's resources. None of these related to this Portfolio, but the normal annual provisions for Schools Access Initiative works (£150k), Formula Devolved Capital £390k) and feasibility studies (£10k) were approved and have now been included in the Capital Programme.

Post-Completion Reports

- 3.9 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. Following the major slippage of expenditure at the end of 2010/11, Members confirmed the importance of these as part of the overall capital monitoring framework. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and

evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. A post-completion report on the Priory School – Local Learning Centre scheme will be submitted to this Sub-Committee in the near future.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. The capital review process requires Chief Officers to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to the Executive on 12th February 2014. Changes agreed by the Executive for the Education Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in paragraph 3.2.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Departmental monitoring returns January 2014. Approved Capital Programme (Executive 20/11/13). Capital appraisal forms submitted by Chief Officers in November 2013. Report to Council Directors' meeting 15/01/14.

This page is left intentionally blank

EDUCATION PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 12th FEBRUARY 2014									
Capital Scheme/Project	Total Approved Estimate	Actual to 31.3.13	Estimate 2013/14	Estimate 2014/15	Estimate 2015/16	Estimate 2016/17	Estimate 2017/18	Responsible Officer	Remarks
	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's		
SCHOOLS									
SECONDARY SCHOOLS									
14-19 Diploma SEN 2.3d - Secondary School Investment Strategy								Rob Bollen	DSG £3,580k, Targeted Capital Grant £7,340k, S106 £500k
Newstead Wood	2500	2500						Rob Bollen	
Darrick Wood	1700	1700						Rob Bollen	
Hayes	1500	1500						Rob Bollen	
Riverside	500	500						Rob Bollen	
Ravenswood	2500	2500						Rob Bollen	
St Olave's	500	500						Rob Bollen	
Bullers Wood	1700	1700						Rob Bollen	
Contingency	204	204						Rob Bollen	£316k t/f to cover potential spend pressures on Langley Boys
	11104	11104	0	0	0	0	0		
Langley Park Boys School - BSF (Building Schools for the future) 2.3b	38338	36404	1000	934				Rob Bollen	BSF One School Pathfinder; government grant £35,800k; LBB contribution £2,006k re: enhanced performance space; £316k t/f from Secondary Investment Strategy
TOTAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS	49442	47508	1000	934	0	0	0		
PRIMARY SCHOOLS									
Primary Capital Programme 2.7								Rob Bollen	DCSF capital grant; £800k allocated to Riverside ASD scheme
Bickley Primary - expansion	1463	1463						Rob Bollen	£1,395k Primary Capital Programme (PCP) grant; £24k from Access initiative; £50k from extended services; £6k t/f to Highway
Princes Plain Primary - expansion	1270	1270						Rob Bollen	£1,114k PCP, £250k S106 £94k t/f to Highway
The Highway Primary - partial rebuild	5428	5174	154	100				Rob Bollen	£2,620k PCP, £500k Children & Family Centre grant, £300k Early Years, £600k planned maint; £93k schools capital maint in 11/12; £140k revenue cont in 11/12, £94k from Princes Plain; £434k from other PCP schemes.
Other schemes funded by Primary Capital Programme grant	3186	3186						Rob Bollen	Balance of PCP grant after allocations to Bickley, Princes Plain, Highway and Riverside ASD; £100k from maintenance re Pickhurst Infants; £144k for Crofton Juniors from School kitchens funding; £428k t/f to Highway
TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS	11347	11093	154	100	0	0	0		
SPECIAL SCHOOLS									
Provision for children with social, emotional & behavioural difficulties	250	145	105					Tessa Moore	Invest-to save: reduction in out of borough placements £800k in a full year; additional costs £290k in a full year (funded from DSG)
Reconfiguration of Special Schools	5180	5063	0	117				Tessa Moore	Prudential borrowing (costs to be met from schools' budget); DSG contributions; £567k hydrotherapy pool approved by Executive 31/3/10
TOTAL SPECIAL SCHOOLS	5430	5208	105	117	0	0	0		
OTHER EDUCATION SCHEMES									
Formula Devolved Capital 2.1a	5994	4032	393	393	393	393	390	Mandy Russell	100% government grant; reduced allocation in 2011/12 settlement
Seed Challenge Fund	1864	1272	250	342				Rob Bollen	£300k "suitability" funding in 2011/12; £11k for Farnborough scheme
Schools Access Initiative	1690	630	160	450	150	150	150	Rob Bollen	DDA requirement; £150k p.a from schools' revenue budget; £24k to Bickley PCP
Security Works	920	530	195	195				Rob Bollen	£150k "suitability" funding in 2011/12
Children and Family Centres	6662	5944	100	618				Tessa Moore	100% DfES grant; £500k for Highway scheme, £750k for Hawes Down Co-location, grant cut by £802k; £297k revenue cont c/f from 12/13
Suitability / Modernisation issues in schools - general 2.2	922	455	100	367				Rob Bollen	Now funded by 11/12 capital maintenance settlement; £46k from suitability surveys; £350k to Farnborough Primary
Capital maintenance in schools	7658	5370	1513	775				Rob Bollen	100% government grant - 2011/12 settlement; £300k to seed challenge; £150k to security works; £150k to suitability/modernisation settlement; £80k to Hawes Down Co-Location & £93k to The Highway in 11/12; £161k t/f from modernisation fund
BBC Need	62589	1864	2700	15723	20635	21667		Rob Bollen	100% government grant - 2011/12 settlement; additional grant £1,182k in 11/12 & £4,090k in 12/13
Universal free school meals	387	0	0	387				Rob Bollen	100% government grant
Extended Services 2.10	731	687	0	44				Tessa Moore	DCSF capital grant; £142k for Hawes Down; grant cut by £134k; £50k to Bickley PCP; £225k not required
Hawes Down Co-Location 2.16	1802	1503	50	249				Tessa Moore	Co-location grant £470k, Short breaks capital £220k, Children & Family Centres grant £750k, Early Years capital £70k, Extended Services £142k, school contribution £70k; £80k schools capital maint (roof) in 11/12
Short breaks capital	224	17	50	157				Hilary Rogers	100% government grant
Early Education for Two Year Olds	558	0	85	473				Nina Newell	100% government grant
Feasibility Studies	50	0	10	10	10	10	10	Rob Bollen	
OTHER SCHEMES									
Phoenix Pre-School SEN service - Council contribution	300	92	0	208				Rob Bollen	Prudential borrowing - costs to be met from schools' budget.
Youth centres - Capital improvements	72	69	3					Paul King	Youth Capital Fund grant £72k
TOTAL OTHER EDUCATION SCHEMES	92423	22465	5609	20391	21188	22220	550		
TOTAL EDUCATION PORTFOLIO	158642	86274	6868	21542	21188	22220	550		

EDUCATION PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2013/14 - 3rd QUARTER MONITORING						
Capital Scheme/Project	ESTIMATES FOR 2013/14					Responsible Officer Comments
	Actual to 31.3.13	Approved Estimate Nov 2013	Actual to 10/12/13	Amount rephased into 2014/15	Revised Estimate Feb 2014	
	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	£'000's	
SCHOOLS						
SECONDARY SCHOOLS						
14-19 Diploma SEN 2.3d - Secondary School Investment Strategy						
Newstead Wood	2500	0			0	
Darrick Wood	1700	0			0	
Hayes	1500	0			0	
Riverside	500	0			0	
Ravenswood	2500	0			0	
St Olave's	500	0			0	
Bullers Wood	1700	0			0	
Contingency	204	0			0	
	11104	0	0	0	0	
Langley Park Boys School - BSF (Building Schools for the future) 2.3b	36404	1934	801	-934	1000	Moving into the final stages, final account being agreed with contractor. Element of retention that needs to move into 2014/15. £934k rephased into 2014/15.
TOTAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS	47508	1934	801	-934	1000	
PRIMARY SCHOOLS						
Primary Capital Programme 2.7						
Bickley Primary - expansion	1463				0	
Princes Plain Primary - expansion	1270				0	
The Highway Primary - partial rebuild	5174	254	119	-100	154	Scheme completed. Final account discussions/final payments being made. Any funding that may remain can be returned to Basic Need as allocations were made from this funding source to underpin this scheme. £100k rephased into 2014/15.
Other schemes funded by Primary Capital Programme grant	3186				0	
TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS	11093	254	119	-100	154	
SPECIAL SCHOOLS						
Provision for children with social, emotional & behavioural difficulties	145	105	113		105	Work ongoing. Linked with the Grovelands site/field study centre
Reconfiguration of Special Schools	5063	117	4	-117	0	Works completed, residual amounts could be used for the new Riverside scheme. £117k rephased into 2014/15.
TOTAL SPECIAL SCHOOLS	5208	222	117	-117	105	
OTHER EDUCATION SCHEMES						
Formula Devolved Capital 2.1a	4032	393	368		393	In and out to Schools
Seed Challenge Fund	1272	592	153	-342	250	£300k transferred from maintenance to support programmes as per previous years. Schools have to contribute to projects. £342k rephased into 2014/15.
Schools Access Initiative	630	160	42		160	Ongoing discussions with schools. Funding often ad hoc as needs arise as schools take particular cohorts of children. Can also be linked top larger schemes and integrated into those. Funded through DSG.
Security Works	530	240	95	-45	195	Ad hoc security works for schools. Additional £150k transferred from maintenance to support schemes as per previous years. Some rephasing £45k into 2014/15 due to delays in starting projects.
Children and Family Centres	5944	718	1	-618	100	Potential funding for issues arising out of Castlecoombe and Mottingham. £618k rephased into 2014/15.
Suitability / Modernisation issues in schools - general 2.2	455	100	3		100	Additional £150k transferred from maintenance budget as per previous years.
Capital maintenance in schools	5370	2288	1013	-775	1513	Various programmes as per the reports to PDS. £775k rephased into 2014/15.
Basic Need	1864	5100	1671	-2400	2700	Various projects as per PDS reports. £2.4m rephased into next year as not all we be needed in year. Covering expansion programme in all schools.
Universal free school meals	0	0	0		0	New government grant allocation for 2014/15.
Extended Services 2.10	687	44	0	-44	0	£44k rephased into 2014/15, may not be required
Hawes Down Co-Location 2.16	1503	299	1	-249	50	£249k rephased into 2014/15, may not all be required.
Short breaks capital	17	117	0	-67	50	Used on various expenditure such as equipment and adaptations. £67k rephased into 2014/15.
Early Education for Two Year Olds	0	85	12		85	One-off funding to assist in the capital expenditure of two year old care in nurseries.
Feasibility Studies	0	10	0		10	
OTHER SCHEMES						
Phoenix Pre-School SEN service - Council contribution	92	208	0	-208	0	Ongoing discussion with the PCT. Payment being deferred until agreement to terms are met. £208k rephased into 2014/15.
Youth centres - Capital improvements	69	3	0		3	Likely to complete this year
TOTAL OTHER EDUCATION SCHEMES	22465	10357	3359	-4748	5609	
TOTAL EDUCATION PORTFOLIO	86274	12767	4396	-5899	6868	

Report No.
ED14045

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Education Budget Sub-Committee**

Date: **8th April 2014**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

**TITLE: EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET MONITORING REPORT
2013/14**

Contact Officer: David Bradshaw, Head of Education and Care Services Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director of Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. REASON FOR REPORT AND SUMMARY OF BUDGET POSITION

- 1.1 This report reviews budget monitoring based on spending to the end of January 2014.
- 1.2 The Schools' Budget is funded from Dedicated Schools' and specific grants and is forecast to be underspent by £3,774,000. Any over or underspends on this budget are carried forward into the next financial year.
- 1.3 The Non-Schools' Budget is funded from Council Tax, Revenue Support and specific grants and the controllable part of it is forecast to be in an underspend position of £184,000.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Education PDS Budget Sub committee are invited to:

- (i) Consider the latest 2013/14 budget projection for the Education Portfolio;**
- (ii) Refer the report to the Portfolio Holder for approval**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Education Portfolio budgets
 4. Total current budget for this head: £14,211k
 5. Source of funding: RSG, Council Tax, DSG, other grants
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 2,074 Full Time Equivalent, of which 1,760 are based in schools.
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

The 2013/14 projected outturn for the Education Portfolio is detailed in Appendix 1, broken down over each division within the service. Appendix 2 gives explanatory notes on the movements in each service.

The Schools' Budget

- 3.1 An element of the Education budget within Education Care and Health Services (ECHS) department is classed as Schools budget and is funded by the Dedicated schools Grant (DSG); this is projected to underspend by £3,774,000. Legislation requires that any variance should be carried forward to the next financial year. Details are contained within Appendices 2 and 4.

The Non-Schools' Budget

- 3.2 An element of the Education budget within ECHS is classed as Non Schools Budget and this is projected to underspend by £184,000. This has improved since the last monitoring reported to the Education Budget Sub Committee of £35,000 overspend. Details of the variations are contained within Appendix 2 and 4.
- 3.3 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as “controllable” and “non-controllable” in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as “controllable” as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has influence and control. “Non-controllable” budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder’s service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include for example cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This ensures clear accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the “controllable” budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance.

Full Year effect for 2014/15

- 3.4 The full year effect pressure currently stands at £877k. This is in part due to the impact of the Education Services Grant (ESG), formerly known as LA LACSEG. As Schools convert to Academy status, DfE reduce the grant given to authorities to reflect a transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Authority to the Academy. Growth of £550k for 2014/15 will broadly deal with this issue. However the impact will continue as schools continue to convert.
- 3.5 There are also full year effects of pressures arising from the Adult Education Service. There have been changes to the funding regime by central government in which courses that were previously chargeable are now free to the user. This has resulted in an increase in the number of students claiming full fee remission as they are unemployed. Many of these are enrolling on the courses BAEC provides in response to the Job Centre requests. Moreover the SFA grant allocation for 2013/14 academic year was less than anticipated, partly due to the 24+ funding scheme, which has been converted into a ring-fenced student loan allocation, irrespective of take-up, and has resulted in a fixed cut of £53K from the main grant allocation. This will in part be mitigated by a reduction in staffing costs and running expenses. The service has plans for further efficiency savings. However it is likely that at least one of the grant funding streams will be further reduced, as well as a continued decline in tuition fee income.
- 3.6 The full year effect pressures will need to be contained in 2014/15 and actions will have to be taken by the Department to offset these pressures.

Directors Comments

- 3.7 The outturn is broadly in-line with the predictions made in the previous monitoring report, although our savings have accelerated. The significant underspend on DSG will need to be addressed with the guidance of schools' forum and the actions taken to control vacancies to ensure that overspends across the portfolio, such as those seen in the Adult Education Service, could be offset.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan includes the aim of effective monitoring and control of expenditure within budget and includes the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.
- 4.2 Bromley's Best Value Performance Plan "Making a Difference" refers to the Council's intention to remain amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in Outer London and the importance of greater focus on priorities.
- 4.3 The four year financial forecast report highlights the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2013/14 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.
- 4.4 Chief Officers and Departmental Heads of Finance are continuing to place emphasis on the need for strict compliance with the Council's budgetary control and monitoring arrangements.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The 2013/14 budget for the Education Portfolio is projected to be overspent by £35,000 at the year end based on the financial information as at 30th November 2013. The main reasons are listed below in table 1.

Table 1**Breakdown of pressures in 2013/14 and the impact on 2014/15**

	<u>2013/14</u> <u>£'000</u>	<u>2014/15</u> <u>£'000</u>
Access		
- Trading Accounts	33	0
- Education welfare service	-51	0
- Capital & Facilities Management	-24	0
- Access & Admission	-27	0
- Early Years Support	-144	0
- Transport Grants	-20	0
- Nurseries	-80	0
- Business Support	-3	0
Adult education - fee and income losses	221	221
School Standards - staff savings	-21	0
SEN and Inclusion		
- Transport savings	-199	0
- SEN and Education Psychologists	-13	0
- Trading Accounts	35	0
Workforce development and governor services - vacancies	-24	0
Education commissioning and business services	-2	0
Other strategic functions	-9	0
ESG Grant Allocation	333	656
Youth Service - staffing	-28	0
Bromley Children's Project - vacancies and use of TTF grant	-161	0
TOTAL OVERALL PRESSURE FOR THE PORTFOLIO	<u>-184</u>	<u>877</u>

5.2 A detailed breakdown of the projected outturn by service is shown in Appendix 1 with explanatory notes in Appendix 2. Appendix 3 shows the full year effect of any pressures and savings. Appendix 4 shows the split between Schools Block and Local Authority Block and Appendix 5 gives the analysis of the latest approved budget.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	2013/14 Budget Monitoring files in ECHS Finance Section

This page is left intentionally blank

Education Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

2012/13 Actuals £'000	Division Service Areas	2013/14 Original Budget £'000	2013/14 Latest Approved £'000	2013/14 Projected Outturn £'000	Variation £'000	Notes	Variation Last Reported £'000	Full Year Effect £'000
EDUCATION CARE & HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT								
Education Division								
1,879	Access	1,469	1,147	831	Cr 316	1	Cr 155	0
Cr 511	Adult Education Centres	Cr 618	Cr 630	Cr 409	221	2	155	221
148	School Standards	115	168	147	Cr 21	3	0	0
4,099	SEN and Inclusion	4,718	4,751	4,574	Cr 177	4	Cr 96	0
0	Workforce Development & Governor Services	0	1	Cr 23	Cr 24	5	Cr 13	0
0	Education Services Grant	Cr 3,282	Cr 3,282	Cr 2,949	333	6	328	656
74	Schools Budgets	Cr 1,431	Cr 1,485	Cr 1,485	0	7	0	0
158	Other Strategic Functions	148	170	161	Cr 9	8	0	0
0	Early Years	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 50	Primary Schools	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 1,368	Secondary schools	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 17	Special Schools	0	0	0	0		0	0
400	Education Commissioning and Business Services	0	0	Cr 2	Cr 2	9	5	0
131	School Improvement	0	0	0	0		0	0
4,943		1,119	840	845	5		224	877
Children's Social Care								
2,002	Bromley Youth Support Programme - (Youth Svce)	1,773	1,802	1,774	Cr 28	10	Cr 28	0
1,453	Referral and Assessment Children's Centres	2,086	2,401	2,240	Cr 161	11	Cr 161	0
3,455		3,859	4,203	4,014	Cr 189		Cr 189	0
Early Intervention Grant								
Cr 11,798	Early Intervention Grant	0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 11,798		0	0	0	0		0	0
Cr 3,400	TOTAL CONTROLLABLE FOR EDUCATION - ECHS	4,978	5,043	4,859	Cr 184		35	877
11,787	Total Non-Controllable	5,553	5,553	5,553	0		0	0
4,731	Total Excluded Recharges	3,618	3,615	3,615	0		0	0
13,118	TOTAL EDUCATION PORTFOLIO - ECHS	14,149	14,211	14,027	Cr 184		35	877
Memorandum Item								
Sold Services								
	Education Psychology Service (RSG Funded)	0	0	35	35	} 12	90	0
	Education Welfare Service (RSG Funded)	0	0	Cr 46	Cr 46		Cr 46	0
	Behaviour Support (Secondary) (RSG Funded)	0	0	126	126		146	0
	Workforce Development (DSG/RSG Funded)	0	0	9	9		9	0
	Governor Services (DSG/RSG Funded)	0	0	2	2		2	0
	Community Vision Nursery (RSG Funded)	0	0	Cr 21	Cr 21		Cr 45	0
	Blenheim Nursery (RSG Funded)	0	0	Cr 58	Cr 58		Cr 52	0
	Catering & Cleaning (RSG Funded)	0	0	32	32		32	0
	Business Partnerships (RSG Funded)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total Sold Services	0	0	79	79		136	0

REASONS FOR VARIATIONS**1. Access Cr £316k**

There is a projected underspend of £97k within the Education Welfare Service as a result of an overachievement of trading account income, which is also requiring fewer resources to generate, and a vacancy within the statutory element of the team.

The budget for behaviour services was delegated to schools for 2013/14, so the secondary outreach budget is no longer funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant, and was set up as a trading account. There is a projected shortfall of income of £126k due to lower than anticipated uptake of respite placements, a fall in income generated from packages due to long term sickness, and higher than budgeted resources required to generate this income.

There is a projected overspend of £8k expected for capital and facilities management. This is made up of an overspend of £32k relating to the catering and cleaning sold service which was terminated on 31st July, with just a strategic element remaining until 31st October, partly offset by an underspend on capital management due a vacant post following the restructure of Access and Admissions.

Also within Access, there are underspends of £27k in Admissions due to a reduction in hours (early implementation of 2014/15 savings), £20k on statutory transport grant payments, and £144k on Early Years staffing (of which £111k is a saving for 2014/15).

The council's two in-house nurseries, which were moved onto trading accounts this year, are currently expected to generate surplus income of £79k. These trading accounts weren't set up as full-cost recovery, so this surplus is only covering part of the £155k corporate recharges currently allocated to the nurseries. In addition, there remains £80k of creditor provisions made at the end of 2012/13 which is no longer required.

	Projected Variations £'000
Education Welfare Service	Cr 51
Trading Account	Cr 46
Capital & Facilities Management	Cr 24
Trading Account	32
Access & Admission	Cr 27
Early Years Support	Cr 144
Transport Grants	Cr 20
Business Support	Cr 3
Secondary Outreach Trading Account	126
Blenheim Nursery Trading Account	Cr 58
Effect of prior year provisions	Cr 23
Community Vision Trading Account	Cr 21
Effect of prior year provisions	Cr 57
	Cr 316

2. Adult Education - Dr £221k

An overspend of £221k is currently projected for Adult Education Centres. This is mainly a result of both lower levels of disposable income amongst some of the target audience and an increase in the number of students claiming full fee remission as they are unemployed. Many of these are enrolling on the courses BAEC provides in response to the Job Centre requests.

The SFA grant allocation for 2013/14 academic year is less than anticipated, with a shortfall of £61k. This is partly due to the 24+ funding scheme, which has been converted into a ring-fenced student loan allocation, irrespective of take-up, and has resulted in a fixed cut of £53K from the main grant allocation.

The reduction in the two main income streams above should be mitigated by a reduction in staffing costs and running expenses. Unfortunately this hasn't been achieved to the extent that the income has been fallen, with the latest projections showing an underspend of £19k.

Current forecasts for the attached nurseries show overspends of £16k overspend for Kentwood which is not achieving the fee income budget, and £6k for Poverest, and an underspend of £35k for Widmore. There is also a £22k overachievement of income for room bookings.

	Projected Variations £'000
Reduction in grant income	61
Reduction in fee income	214
Officers & support staff pay	Cr 19
Teachers & assistants pay	15
Supplies and services	Cr 33
Premises costs	18
Kentwood nursery	16
Widmore nursery	Cr 35
Poverest nursery	6
Room lettings	Cr 22
	221

3. School Standards - Cr £21k

Due to delays in recruiting to the new School Standards team following the restructure of the EDC, there is a total non-recurrent underspend of £21k on staffing related budgets.

	Projected Variations	
	£'000	
School Standards	Cr	17
Primary Support Advisory Team	Cr	4
	Cr	21

4. SEN and Inclusion Cr £177k

SEN Transport is currently expected to underspend by £199k as a result of increased route efficiency and sharing of routes with An underspend of £35k is projected for the SEN assessment and monitoring team, mainly due to a 3 month vacancy, which has now been filled at a lower grade, as well as an adjustment of management time allocated to the SEND Pathfinder Grant.

The Education Psychology service is projected to overspend by £35k on the trading account, due to a shortfall of anticipated income, and a higher than budget level of staff time allocated to it. There is also a £22k overspend on the statutory element of the service.

	Projected Variations	
	£'000	
SEN Transport	Cr	199
SEN assessment and monitoring	Cr	35
Education Psychology Service		22
Trading Account		35
	Cr	177

5. Workforce Development & Governor Services - Cr £24k

There is an expected underspend on salaries budgets due to two vacancies, one of which the service has been unable to fill. This is partly offset by an underachievement of income on the workforce development trading account.

	Projected Variations	
	£'000	
Workforce Development & Governor Services	Cr	27
Workforce Development Trading Account		5
Governor Services Trading Account	Cr	2
	Cr	24

6. Education Services Grant - Dr £333k

The ESG grant allocation is currently expected to be £333k less than budget. The ESG allocation is re-calculated on a quarterly basis, so the grant will reduce in-year as schools convert to academies. The current projection is based on the 13 completed conversions to date, with no more expected before the end of the financial year. The full year effect of this is £656k.

In addition, 9 further applications have been approved by DfE and are expected to convert on 1st April 2014, along with the Pupil Referral unit on 1st September 2014. This will result in a projected shortfall for 2014/15 of £942k (less the £550k grant reduction allocated to the 2014/15 budget).

A further 31 schools are either committed to converting or exploring options. If these all convert during 2014/15, then Bromley will be left with just £1.2m for 2015/16 to cover the statutory 'LACSEG' duties plus those relating to the remaining 10 maintained schools.

7. Schools Budgets (no impact on General Fund)

Expenditure on Schools is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) provided for by the Department for Education (DfE). DSG is ring fenced and can only be applied to meet expenditure properly included in the schools budget. Any overspend or underspend must be carried forward to the following years Schools Budget. A total net underspend of £3,774k is currently projected on DSG funded services as outlined below.

With effect from September 2013, the EFA became responsible for directly providing the first £6k of SEN funding for academies, and would recoup the figure from the authorities DSG allocation. The final amount to be recouped was less than anticipated when setting the 2014/15 budget, resulting in a £1m underspend.

As a result of the funding changes for 2013/14, the SEN placements budget was built from a zero base. Current figures suggest that there will be an underspend of £570k, mainly due to a lower than budgeted number of placements and matrix support, which is partly offset by higher than budgeted average costs, plus creditor provisions made at the end of 2012/13 which will not be fully realised.

As part of the 2013/14 DSG allocation, £3.1m funding for SEN support in Further Education transferred from the EFA to the council. These placements were negotiated at the start of the academic year, resulting in underspends of £110k at Bromley College and other FE colleges, £522k with all other Independent Specialist Providers, and £113k on the social care element.

The Sensory Support and Inclusion services are projected to underspend by a total of £191k, mainly on staffing budgets as a result of staff working less hours than budgeted, employers pension contributions for staff not in the pension scheme, and staff time recharged to the SEND Pathfinder grant. There is also an amount of £183k relating to funding to support non-statemented children which, due to changes to the schools funding regulations, cannot be delegated to schools in year.

There is also a projected underspend of £31k for assessment and support of children with complex medical needs in mainstream schools, and an underspend of £210k within the pre-school SEN service, primarily due to staff vacancies, and staff working reduced hours.

Within the Behaviour Service, underspends are expected of £15k for the Early Intervention Service due to a staff vacancy, £183k for Progression Courses due to overachievement of income and a reduction in demand, and £70k relating to the part-year vacancy in the head of service post. There is a projected overspend of £69k on supply staff in the Home and Hospital service and rent payable relating to the Nightingale Centre, and £31k of 2012/13 costs relating to the Pupil Referral Service.

Free Early Education (FEE) for 2 years olds, which for 2013/14 onwards is now funded through DSG, is expected to underspend by £870k of the £2.8m budget. This is partly offset by a projected overspend of £570k on FEE for 3 & 4 year olds.

There is a projected underspend of £353k on Carbon Reduction Commitments. Schools are to be excluded from the CRC scheme with effect from 1st April 2014, so this budget has been removed for future years.

Although the council has excellent information on the number of children in each school year, there is an element of uncertainty on the geographic distribution. As a result, although many bulge classes are fully anticipated, some may have to be created to accommodate potentially only a couple of additional children, and has resulted in an overspend of £175k on the £1m budget.

Finally, there is a cost of £54k relating to the old School Improvement team as a result of the restructure not being completed until 31st April, as teachers' contracts can only be terminated at the end of April, August or December. There have also been a few post-closure transactions for the EDC trading account, totalling £15k, and a £59k underspend relating to security and utility costs for the old EDC site.

	Projected Variations	
	£'000	£'000
SEN		
Placements	Cr 331	
Effect of prior year creditors	Cr 239	
Equipment	Cr 60	
Ex-EFA SEN FE Support	Cr 745	
Transport	Cr 144	
Deaf centres & sensory support	Cr 152	
Support in mainstream	Cr 222	
Specialist Support & Disability Services	Cr 31	
Pre-school service	Cr 210	Cr 2,134
Behaviour service		Cr 168
Free Early Education - 2 year olds		Cr 870
Free Early Education - 3 & 4 year olds		570
Early Years Support		54
Access & Admissions		10
EDC trading account		15
School Improvement		54
School Standards	Cr 47	
Workforce Development & Governor Services	Cr 21	
SEN funding for academies	Cr 1,000	
Carbon reduction commitments	Cr 353	
Bulge classes		175
Ex-EDC site costs	Cr 59	
	Cr 3,774	

8. Other Strategic Functions - Cr £9k

A minor underspend of £9k is expected on consultancy costs. This budget has been reduced for 2014/15 as part of the Baseline Review savings.

9. Education Commissioning and Business Services- Cr £2k

A few minor post-closure transactions relating to the EDC trading account have resulted in an underspend of £2k.

10. Youth Service - Cr £28k

There is a projected underspend of £28k for the Youth Service, due to an overspend in the youth centre services of £77k relating to summer activities and project expenses, which is offset by a contribution from other departments towards the cost of the summer activities, and an underspend in the running expenses of £105k.

11. Referral and Assessment Childrens Centres - Cr £161k

A total under spend of £161k is projected for the service, mainly due to staff vacancies and further delays in recruitment, plus a contribution from the Tackling Troubled Families grant for management time. This is partly offset by a projected overspend on Crèche Worker costs, some of which will be recharged to the two council run nurseries and other private providers.

	Projected Variations	
	£'000	
Officers' pay	Cr 140	
Tackling Troubled Families Grant	Cr 65	
Crèche workers		101
Recharge to nurseries	Cr 43	
Recharge to private providers	Cr 14	
	Cr 161	

12. Sold Services (net budgets)

Services sold to schools are separately identified in this report to provide clarity in terms of what is being provided. These accounts are shown as memorandum items as the figures are included in the appropriate Service Area in the main report.

Waiver of Financial Regulations:

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. No waivers have been approved since the last report to the Executive.

Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been approved.

Director's Comments

The outturn is broadly in-line with the predictions made in the previous monitoring report, although our savings have accelerated. The significant underspend on DSG will need to be addressed with the guidance of schools' forum and the actions taken to control vacancies to ensure that overspends across the portfolio, such as those seen in the Adult Education Service, could be offset.

FULL YEAR EFFECTS

Service Area	Latest Approved Budget	Variation	FYE	Comment
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
Education Services Grant	Cr 3,282	333	656	The Education Services Grant (previously Local Authority Block LACSEG) is allocated on the basis of pupil numbers, and reduces as schools convert to academies. Based on current projections of 14 academy conversions in 2013/14, ESG will reduce by £656k for 2014/15.
Adult Education	Cr 630	221	221	The current projected overspend for the Adult Education Service is expected to continue into 2014/15. The service has indicated that they will plan for further efficiency savings, however it is likely that at least one of the grant funding streams will be further reduced, as well as a continued decline in tuition fee income.

Education Budget Monitoring Summary January 2014

Division Service Areas	RSG							DSG									
	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Projection	Variation	Last Reported Variation	FYE	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Projection	Variation	Last Reported Variation	FYE					
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000					
Education Division																	
Access	1	1,469	1,147	831	Cr	316	Cr	155	0	14,491	14,487	14,083	Cr	404	Cr	316	0
Adult Education Centres	2	Cr 618	Cr 630	Cr 409		221		155	221	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
School Standards	3	115	168	147	Cr	21		0	0	415	405	358	Cr	47		0	0
SEN and Inclusion	4	4,718	4,751	4,574	Cr	177	Cr	96	0	23,855	23,480	21,346	Cr	2,134	Cr	1,831	0
Workforce Development & Governor Services	5	0	1	Cr 23	Cr	24	Cr	13	0	189	190	110	Cr	80	Cr	9	0
Education Services Grant	6	Cr 3,282	Cr 3,282	Cr 2,949		333		328	656	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schools Budgets	7	Cr 1,431	Cr 1,485	Cr 1,485		0		0	0	Cr 131,773	Cr 124,122	Cr 125,300	Cr	1,178		0	0
Other Strategic Functions	8	148	170	170	Cr	9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Early Years		0	0	0		0		0	0	1,231	1,231	1,231	0	0	0	0	0
Primary Schools		0	0	0		0		0	0	68,808	62,828	62,828	0	0	0	0	0
Secondary Schools		0	0	0		0		0	0	2,793	2,793	2,793	0	0	0	0	0
Special Schools		0	0	0		0		0	0	17,972	16,613	16,613	0	0	0	0	0
Education Commissioning & Business Services	9	0	0	Cr 2	Cr	2		5	0	0	0	15	15	15	15	0	0
School Improvement		0	0	0		0		0	0	0	0	54	54	54	54	0	0
		1,119	840	854		5		224	877	Cr 2,019	Cr 2,095	Cr 5,869	Cr 3,774	Cr 2,087		0	
Children's Social Care																	
Bromley Youth Support Programme - (Youth Services)	10	1,773	1,802	1,774	Cr	28	Cr	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Referral and Assessment Childrens Centres	11	2,086	2,401	2,240	Cr	161	Cr	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		3,859	4,203	4,014	Cr	189	Cr	189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CONTROLLABLE		4,978	5,043	4,868	Cr	184		35	877	Cr 2,019	Cr 2,095	Cr 5,869	Cr 3,774	Cr 2,087		0	
TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE		5,455	5,455	5,455		0		0	0	98	98	98	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES		2,285	2,282	2,282		0		0	0	1,333	1,333	1,333	0	0	0	0	0
PORTFOLIO TOTAL		12,718	12,780	12,605	Cr	184		35	877	Cr 588	Cr 663	Cr 4,437	Cr 3,774	Cr 2,087		0	

BUDGET VARIATIONS - ALLOCATIONS FOR 2013/14

Reconciliation of Final Budget	£'000
Original Budget 2013/14	14,149
Allocation of Localisation & Conditions Pay Awards	69
Short Breaks Post Transfer from Care Services	21
Centralisation of training budgets	Cr 8
Transfer of IT post to Resources	Cr 8
Transfer of Commissioning Post to Care Services	Cr 45
Transfer for data cleansing work to Care Services	Cr 10
Children's Centre Carry Forward from 2012/13	297
Recharge of Nursery costs to Care Services	Cr 254
Latest Approved Budget for 2013/14	<u>14,211</u>

Report No.
ED14046

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **Education Budget Sub-Committee**

Date: **8th April 2014**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

TITLE: COST IMPLICATIONS OF RECHARGES - BEHAVIOUR SERVICE AND PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT ALTERNATIVE PROVISION

Contact Officer: David Bradshaw, Head of Education and Care Services Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director of Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

1. REASON FOR REPORT AND SUMMARY OF BUDGET POSITION

- 1.1 The Education PDS received a report on the 18th March 2014 on the Behaviour Service and Pupil Referral Unit Provision and the potential for the reorganisation of these services (report number ED14023) It was requested by the committee that a report on the cost implications of the recharges of this report be brought back to a future meeting of the Education Budget Sub Committee.
- 1.2 The report shows that there are recharges of £133k for 2013/14 and that these will become a cost to the Council should the decision be made to integrate functions into the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Education PDS Budget Sub-Committee is invited to:

- (i) Consider the financial position of the proposal and recommend savings in the Education Portfolio to offset the cost implications of recharges.**

The Education Portfolio Holder is recommended to:

- (i) Agree any identified savings in the Education Portfolio to offset the cost implications of recharges; and,**
- (ii) Should it not be possible to find savings within the Education Portfolio, to recommend the Executive approve a budget growth request.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Not Applicable:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Up to £133k:
 2. Ongoing costs: Up to £133k:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Education Portfolio budgets
 4. Total current budget for this head: £ net zero as DSG funded
 5. Source of funding: DSG
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 A report was brought to the Education PDS committee on the 18th March 2014 proposing changes to the service delivery of the Behaviour Service and Respite teams and the possibility of them being transferred to the Bromley Alternative Provision Academy (BAPA). BAPA is an Academy sponsored by Bromley College and is independent of the Local Authority. Service benefits were detailed in the report outlining the advantages of moving in this direction.
- 3.2 However, there are financial implications that would arise from this and the Education PDS asked for these to be detailed and brought back to a future meeting of the Education Budget Sub Committee.

Behaviour and Respite Services

- 3.3 The cost of the service for 2013/14 is set out in table one below.

Table One

	Secondary Respite	Primary Team	Manager & Admin	Total
	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Budget	2013/14 Budget
	£	£	£	£
Employees	497,010	174,170	126,210	797,390
Running Costs	52,600	14,470	1,750	68,820
Trading Account Income	-346,050	0	0	-346,050
Recharge to SEN	-305,770	0	0	-305,770
Recharge to DSG	0	-194,080	-154,360	-348,440
Controllable Total	-102,210	-5,440	-26,400	-134,050
Non Controllable	890	0	0	890
Recharges	101,320	5,440	26,400	133,160
Grand Total	0	0	0	0

The Service is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). It can be seen from the table that there are £133k of recharges charged to the service. Historically the Council has always used an element of grant funding to offset existing 'core' costs

Recharges

- 3.4 All services provided by the Council will have elements of costs attributable to them for recharges for 'back office' functions not directly linked to the delivery of the services themselves. These costs are called recharges and are allocated against individual service areas according to various 'drivers'. These drivers can include head count, full time equivalent, office space, etc.
- 3.5 Central costs are recharged to show the 'true' cost of running any service and to ensure that when benchmarking costs to other Local Authorities, the correct unit cost is used

- 3.6 The behaviour service/respice service currently has £133k of recharges attributable to the service.
- 3.7 These are made up of the following costs as set out in table two.

Table two

<u>Recharge</u>	<u>Cost £</u>
Support Services	48,350
Admin Buildings	3,900
Computer Charges	51,550
Strategic & Business Support	14,750
Commissioning & Partnerships	14,610
	<u>133,160</u>

Support services: Within support services there will be an element of the Head of Paid Service, Section 151 Officer, Chief Monitoring Officer, finance, HR, Legal, Payroll, Pensions. Services are reviewed annually to ensure they are as efficient as possible. Significant savings have been made in these areas in the last few years

Admin Buildings: Costs of buildings and its maintenance. Savings will only be possible through rental of accommodation to outside organisations or if the asset is able to be sold.

Computer Charges: IT maintenance and the infrastructure. There are opportunities at the margins to save costs but the majority of IT expenditure relates to hardware/systems expenditure which does not reduce.

Strategic & Business Support: recharge of elements of the Strategy Division within ECHS

Commissioning and Partnerships: recharge of elements of the Commissioning Division within ECHS.

Impact

- 3.8 Currently the recharges are paid for by the Dedicated Schools Grant as the service is held centrally. If that were to change and another supplier were to supply the service Bromley would be unable to charge the recharges to DSG as these services would no longer be used by the service. In this case the recharge would therefore revert back to being RSG funded and would become a new pressure on the Council that would either have to be funded from elsewhere or given as growth.
- 3.9 It would be difficult for the divisions providing the services to make savings to realise the £133k. This is part is because of the following:-
- As this is a small part of the organisation potentially going elsewhere the overall impact of the delivery of the recharged services will be small and services will not be able to reduce their costs in the short term.
 - There are statutory duties that will remain and that will still need to be recharged e.g. S151 officer, etc.

- c) The amounts represent small parts of each service. It can be described as 'fingers and toes' of individuals or very small elements of a particular service e.g. payments team
- d) Savings have been made in these areas already and in effect additional savings will be double counting this.
- e) A majority of the recharge is made up of already contracted out services. These may be changed to a degree but many provide a rump of a service where costs will be incurred regardless of size e.g. cost of a server for an IT system would cost the same if there were 100 or 1,000 users.
- f) There are fixed cost elements the services delivered in house and as in c) above these cannot be changed easily. E.g. some accommodation costs of a building whether it is full to capacity or only three quarters full.

3.10 Savings may be realised in the medium term if there was a quantum of size where larger parts of the organisation or a greater number of smaller parts were brought together. Then savings may be realised as greater reductions in activity levels from these services are achieved rather than on an individual basis and some reductions in costs could be made. However this would not realise all of the costs of the recharge because as mentioned above, there are fixed costs and statutory elements that will remain and need to be charged.

3.11 Moreover this is likely to occur with any service that has its costs covered by the DSG, or any other specific grant e.g. Public Health as the services cannot be recharged if they are provided elsewhere and not receiving the recharged services.

3.12 This paper looks at the financial implications only. There are service implications that need to be considered and these have been covered in the earlier paper. Any decision would need to take this into account as well.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 "Building a Better Bromley" refers to the Council's intention to remain amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in Outer London and the importance of greater focus on priorities.

4.2 The "2013/14 Council Tax" report highlighted the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2013/14 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 If the service does get provided by BAPA or any other organisation independent of the Council then there will be at least in the short to medium term an issue with finding the cost of the recharge previously funded by the DSG. This amounts to £133k

5.2 In the first instance this should be found by the service itself and managed within Education. Over the past few years more costs have been transferred to DSG from previously RSG funded services. The room for manoeuvre to find additional RSG savings is shrinking as the RSG funded pot reduces.

5.3 If this is found to be impossible then this needs to be referred to the Executive as it in effect becomes a request for growth which under the regulations will need to be agreed and approved by the Executive.

5.4 This brings up a wider issue of how the organisation deals with recharges as service delivery options are reviewed.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	None

Report No.
ED14050

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday 8 April 2014

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: PUPIL PREMIUM TO HELP DISADVANTAGED PUPILS

Contact Officer: Jane Bailey, Interim Assistant Director: Education
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: jane.bailey@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Executive Director of Education, Care & Health Services

Ward: Borough-wide

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 At a meeting of the Education PDS Committee on 18th March 2014 it was requested that further information be provided about the amounts of pupil premium allocated to each school , an outline as to the ways the funding is utilised, and a comparison made with the performance of children in receipt of pupil premium at each school.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Education Budget Sub-Committee is requested to note the initial findings, and to approve the proposed future actions.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost No Cost Not Applicable: Further Details
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost Non-Recurring Cost Not Applicable: Further Details
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding: DSG
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): n/a
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: n/a
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement:
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 Each school receives a sum of money in respect of children who are in receipt of free school meals, and are required by statute to publish on their website a detailed breakdown of how that funding is spent to improve outcomes for those children.
- 3.2 Senior Leaders in schools, in particular the Head Teacher and Governing body, will be questioned regarding this when inspected by Ofsted, and comment can be made in the final report about the effective use, or otherwise, of funding to have a positive impact on the achievement of this group.
- 3.3 Analysis of data has indicated that in Bromley the gap between the achievement of children not in receipt of pupil premium, and those who are, is a cause for concern and will need to be addressed by schools and the Local Authority School Standards team.
- 3.4 **Appendix 1** details information from all schools, giving comparisons of the amount of funding received, Only four schools have provided no information on their websites, however the quality and detail of the information varies widely, with some schools providing a detailed breakdown of spend against budget, and others simply providing headline information. Several schools have not updated their information since last year, and none provide any detail around the impact of this additional support. General usage of the funding includes additional teaching or support staff and resources such as specialist books and equipment.
- 3.5 The data indicates that in 17 schools less than 60% of pupils in receipt of pupil premium achieve level 4 in reading writing and maths, and the gap between this group and others in 23 schools is above 20%. On initial analysis there would not appear to be any direct correlation between the information provided by the school and the performance of this group of children, neither is it clear that the more money provided the better the outcome,

3.6 Future Plans

- 3.7 When undertaking the categorisation of schools to determine which should be considered to be high priority, data on the performance and progress of children in receipt of pupil premium will be taken into account. Schools will also be reminded of the requirement to publish details of their use of pupil premium. Government has announced plans for pupil premium to be expanded to the Early Years in 2015. It may also therefore be necessary to explore further how best to track the performance of these pupils as they progress through the school phases.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 **It is important to address this issue to avoid schools being found to Require Improvement by Ofsted on the basis of underperformance of children in receipt of pupil premium**

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The funding is determined by the numbers of identified children in this group attending schools and is received as part of their budget from the Dedicated Schools Grant. For 2013/14 Primary Schools received £952 and Secondary Schools £900 per eligible child. For 2014/15 these amounts rise to £1,300 for Primary and £935 for secondary. Academy Schools are paid direct by DfE.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

Analysis and identification of schools where this is an issue will enable more effective deployment of resources within the School Standards service.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Briefing for Education Budget Sub-Committee Tuesday 8 April 2014

CONSULTATION - FAIRER SCHOOLS FUNDING 2015/16

Contact Officer: David Bradshaw, Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: Tel: 020 8313 4807

Chief Officer: Executive Director of Education, Care & Health Services

1. Summary

1.1 The information item outlines the details of the recently released documentation on fairer schools funding released by the DfE and its initial findings.

2. **THE BRIEFING**

2.1 The DfE have recently released an important announcement regarding the next phase of school funding reform for 5 to 16 year olds, which will begin to address the unfairness of the current funding system and provide some help to authorities that are the least fairly funded.

2.2 The DfE are planning to allocate an additional £350m funding to schools in 2015-16 to distribute this funding to local authorities most in need. The DfE will maintain a minimum funding level for every pupil and every school which means that no local authority's and no school's level of funding per pupil will fall as a result of this proposal.

2.3 As Bromley has been one of the lowest funded authorities in London, it has anticipated for a number of years that we would benefit from the proposed funding changes and the consultation document supports this. Appendix B of the consultation document shows indicative minimum funding levels under the new proposals which shows that Bromley could benefit from an increase of around £19m additional funding, being the highest increase in percentage terms.

2.4 It is important to note that the DfE clearly states that these proposals do not represent implementation of a national funding formula, but will put the government in a stronger position to implement a national funding formula when the time is right. It is also important to note that this proposal relates to 2015-16 only – beyond then the allocation of funding between local authorities will be a matter for the next spending review.

2.5 The full consultation document and response form can be access at the following link and is also attached at appendices 1 - 5:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/fairer-schools-funding-2015-to-2016>

2.6 The amount of additional funding that LAs could receive has been calculated by setting a minimum funding level for each of the funding elements as follows:

- Basic per pupil amount – Primary: £2,845; KS3: £3,951; KS4: £4,529
- Deprivation – between £893 and £1,974
- Looked after children - £1,009
- Low prior attainment – primary: £878 ; secondary : £1,961
- EAL – primary: £505 ; secondary : £1,216
- Lump sum – primary: £117,082 ; secondary: £128,189
- Additional sparsity sum for small schools – up to £53,988
- An area cost adjustment to increase minimum funding levels in areas with higher labour market costs e.g. London Weighting – full details of the rationale behind this calculation can be seen at Appendix C of the consultation document

2.7 These figures have been used to calculate the indicative funding levels for local authorities – an example of this can be seen at paragraph 1.2.1 of the main fair funding consultation. A breakdown of the exact calculation for each LA has been requested and is expected to be issued shortly.

2.8 It is important to note that these funding levels have been used to calculate the LA overall funding and may not be the amounts that will be used in the funding formula for individual schools for 2015-16. At this stage the consultation should be viewed from an overall LA perspective as opposed to individual school level as it is not feasible to do any detailed modelling at this stage.

2.9 A meeting of the Schools Forum will be held in April and this information will be shared. It will allow Schools Forum Members to contribute to a proposed joint consultation response. It is also hoped that the additional meeting will also allow Forum members to contribute to the forward planning of any detailed modelling to be carried out during the summer term.



Department
for Education

Launch date 13 March 2014
Respond by 30 April 2014
Ref: Department for Education

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

This consultation sets out the Department for Education's proposal to allocate an additional £350m in 2015-16, to increase the per-pupil budgets for the least fairly funded local areas. Our proposal will mean that in 2015-16, every local area will attract a minimum level of funding for each of its pupils and schools, making the distribution of funding to local areas fairer whilst ensuring that no area receives a cut to its per-pupil budget. This consultation invites views on how to set these minimum funding levels, and how we will distribute the additional £350 million funding.

We are inviting views on whether small changes to the operation of the sparsity factor would be helpful.

To Maintained schools; academies; local authorities; governors; bursars; parents; schools forums; trade union organisations

Issued 13 March 2014

Enquiries To If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact the Department on 0370 000 2288

e-mail: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

Contact Details

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's '[Contact Us](#)' page.

1 Introduction

1.1 Making school funding fairer

There is widespread recognition that the current school funding system is unfair and out of date. We are committed to addressing this so that, across the country, schools have a fair funding allocation that equips them to provide a world-class education.

Since we first consulted in 2011 on how to improve the school funding system, we have introduced a number of important changes to how local authorities distribute funding to schools. These changes have already led to a more transparent funding system with more money being allocated based on the needs of pupils. In 2013-14, local authorities allocated almost 90% of funding based on the needs of pupils, compared with 71% in 2012-13.

We are now determined to provide additional funding to the least fairly funded local authorities in 2015-16. After we have met our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15, we have decided to add a further £350m to fund schools in the least fairly funded authorities. This will be the first time in a decade that funding has been allocated to local areas on the basis of the actual characteristics of their pupils and schools, rather than simply their historic levels of spending. **No local authority or school will receive less funding as a result of this proposal.**

Although these proposals do not represent implementation of a national funding formula, this is the biggest step towards fairer funding for schools in a decade. The proposals we are announcing today put us in a much better position to implement a national funding formula when the time is right. This will be when the government has set spending plans over a longer period of time, allowing us to give schools and local authorities more certainty about how the formula will affect them over a number of years.

This proposal relates to 2015-16. Beyond 2015-16, the allocation of funding between local authorities will be a matter for the next spending review.

1.2 Allocating the additional funding fairly

1.2.1 We have carefully considered how we can allocate the £350m as fairly as possible – in a way that reflects the needs of pupils and schools. We are determined to avoid allocating it in a way that could perpetuate the flaws and inconsistencies of the current system, which we have been progressively reforming.

We propose to allocate the additional funding by setting minimum funding levels that a local authority should attract for its pupils and schools in 2015-16. If a local authority already attracts at least these minimum funding levels, then we will not make any change to the amount of funding per pupil that it receives. If a local authority attracts less than these minimum funding levels for the pupils and schools in its area, we will increase its budget so that it meets those levels.

We propose setting a minimum funding level for five pupil characteristics:

- a per-pupil amount ('age weighted pupil unit');
- pupils who are from deprived backgrounds;
- pupils who have been looked after¹, for example in foster care;
- pupils with low attainment before starting at either their primary or secondary school;
- pupils who speak English as an additional language.

In addition, we propose setting a minimum funding level for two school characteristics currently used by local authorities to allocate money to schools:

- a minimum funding level for each school on top of its per-pupil funding ('lump sum'); and
- a minimum funding level for small schools that are essential to serving rural areas ('sparsity sum')².

¹ For 2015-16, a single indicator will be provided, covering all pupils who have been looked after for one day or more on the 31 March 2014. This is the same measure as was set out in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

² The sparsity factor is one of a number of permitted factors that local authorities can use in their local funding formula. This formula factor allows local authorities to allocate additional funding to small schools that are essential to serving small rural communities.

We propose setting our minimum funding levels based on the average amounts³ that local authorities allocate to these characteristics in their local formulae at present. We propose to apply the minimum funding level for the basic per-pupil amount ('age-weighted pupil unit') at the average that local authorities currently allocate through this factor. In doing this, we will use roughly 75% of the £350m of additional funding⁴. We then propose to apply the minimum funding levels for the other characteristics using the rest of the additional funding (roughly 25%). This will mean that we can set each of the other minimum funding levels close to the level of its current local authority average⁵.

We propose to raise the minimum funding levels for local authorities in areas with higher salaries in line with a 'hybrid area cost adjustment'. This takes account of both teacher salary and general labour market data. We set out this approach in detail at Annex C.

Indicative minimum funding levels, based on the data currently available, are as follows. These are subject to revision when we have final confirmation of local authorities' local funding formulae for 2014-15.

Indicative minimum funding levels

- A basic per pupil amount – primary: £2,845; key stage 3: £3,951; key stage 4; £4,529
- Deprivation – between £893 and £1,974 – full breakdown in Annex A
- Looked after children – £1,009
- Low prior attainment – primary: £878; secondary: £1,961
- English as an additional language – primary: £505; secondary: £1,216
- A lump sum for every school – primary: £117,082; secondary: £128,189
- Additional sparsity sum for small schools vital to serving rural communities – up to £53,988
- An area cost adjustment to increase minimum funding levels in areas

³ In order to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document, we have used the published final 2013-14 pro forma data to calculate the average per pupil amounts – with the exception of the lump sum and sparsity sum, where we have used provisional 2014-15 school funding data. To calculate the average per pupil amounts for a particular characteristic, we have only included local authorities that allocated funding for the characteristic in question and the average amounts are calculated as a pupil-weighted average. When final 2014-15 pro forma data is available, we will review the minimum funding levels.

⁴ In using the final 2014-15 data this proportion may change. For example, if the average age weighted pupil unit is higher in 2014-15 than in 2013-14, this proportion will increase.

⁵ Each of the indicative minimum funding levels, with the exception of the minimum funding level for the basic per pupil amount, has been scaled back from the current local authority average proportionately to use the remaining share of the total available funding (roughly 25%). October 2014 census data will be used to calculate each of the minimum funding levels before Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding is confirmed for 2015-16.

with higher labour market costs.

In order to calculate whether a local authority will attract additional funding to reach the minimum funding levels, we will first look at the amount each local authority would be due to receive in 2015-16 (Schools Block Unit Funding only), given our commitment to fund all local authorities at the same cash level per pupil as in 2014-15. We will then apply the minimum funding levels to calculate a new total. This will be done by:

- i. multiplying each of the minimum funding levels by the relevant number of eligible pupils or schools in the local authority⁶;
- ii. summing each of the totals in (i) to create a new funding amount for the local authority;
- iii. applying the area cost adjustment to the total in (ii);
- iv. if this total is more than the local authority's per pupil cash level in 2014-15, we will increase the local authority's funding to reach this new level;
- v. if not, the level of funding remains the same.

⁶ At the time DSG allocations are confirmed, the department will use October 2014 census data. The exemplification in this document uses October 2013 data.

A worked example of our proposed approach is set out below.

Worked Example: Authority X

The following example demonstrates how the minimum funding levels would be applied in imaginary authority X, which has 100,000 pupils. This authority only has KS3 pupils and every deprived pupil also lives in an IDACI 6 area.

i. Total funding 2014-15 £400,000,000

There are 100,000 pupils in authority X and in 2014-15 this authority will receive £400m with each pupil attracting £4,000.

ii. Apply each of the minimum funding levels:

- KS3 AWPU MFL x [100,000 pupils in LA] =£3,951 x 100,000 =£395,100,000
- Deprivation MFL x [5,000 deprived pupils] =£1,974 x 5,000 =£9,870,000
- LAC MFL x [250 LAC pupils] =£1,009 x 250 =£252,250
- LPA MFL x [5000 LPA pupils] =£1,961 x 5,000 =£9,805,000
- EAL MFL x [250 EAL pupils] =£1,216 x 250 =£304,000
- Lump sum MFL x [100 schools] =£128,189 x 100 schools =£12,818,900
- Sparsity MFL⁷ x [10 schools with 300 pupils] =£26,994 x 10 =£269,940

iii. New MFL total

- The sum of each MFL calculation above is =£428,420,090.
- Authority x attracts an ACA adjustment factor of 1.1.
- The adjusted MFL total would be £428,420,090 x 1.1 =£471,262,099
- Divided by the number of pupils in the local authority =£4,713 per pupil

Authority X would receive the higher total budget of £471,262,099 and the higher per pupil amount of £4,713, because their current funding and per pupil amount is less than these new totals.

⁷ In this example, each school attracts 50% of the sparsity MFL. This is because the sparsity amount is a tapered sum. With 300 pupils, the secondary schools attract 50% of the MFL. More information on how the tapering works can be found in the operational guidance for 2014-15.

The table at Annex B lists the 62 local authorities that currently attract less than the indicative minimum funding levels for their pupils and schools. The table indicates the new level of funding per pupil for 2015-16⁸ that would result from these indicative minimum funding levels. **Every other local authority will see its per pupil funding maintained in cash terms, consistent with funding decisions since the start of this Parliament. No school or local authority will lose money as a result of this proposal.**

Note that in most cases, we have used published 2013-14 local authority pro-forma data to calculate the indicative minimum funding levels shown in this document. When final 2014-15 data is available we will review the minimum funding levels and **it is possible some local allocations may vary in order to fit within the envelope of funding we have available.** For example, if the average AWPU turns out to be higher in 2014-15, a greater proportion of the £350m funding would be allocated through the AWPU minimum funding level, meaning a smaller proportion of the overall pot would be allocated through the remaining factors.

1.3 The role of local authority in 2015-16

1.3.1 Our proposal uses seven of the characteristics used in local formulae, but we are not proposing that local authorities should be required to use those seven factors in their local formulae in 2015-16 (with the exception of the basic per pupil amount and the deprivation factor, which are mandatory). Nor are we proposing that local authorities choosing to use any of these seven factors should be required to weight that factor at or above the minimum funding level. It will remain for the local authority to decide how best to apply its local formulae to meet its circumstances.

We are not proposing any changes for 2015-16 to the way in which local authorities can allocate funding to schools – except, possibly, minor changes to the sparsity factor. When we introduced the sparsity factor for 2014-15, we said that we would review how useful local authorities had found this factor. We would like to seek views on this through this consultation, particularly to understand if any changes would be helpful for 2015-16. We have set out a number of questions on the sparsity factor as part of the consultation response

⁸ Any additional funding allocated would be applied only to the schools block within local authorities' DSG allocations. Local authorities will continue to be free to move funding between their schools, high needs and early years blocks in 2015-16 provided they comply with the requirements of our Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG).

form provided alongside this document.

We will retain the Minimum Funding Guarantee, which has been in place over many years and which dictates that for the vast majority of schools, funding per pupil cannot drop by more than 1.5% per year⁹.

2 Annex A: Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16

- 2.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex A, the Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16.

3 Annex B: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

- 3.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex B, the Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16.

4 Annex C: Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

- 4.1 Please click [here](#) to download Annex C, the Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

5 Consultation

- 5.1 To respond to our proposals go to www.education.gov.uk/consultations. The consultation closes on 30 April 2014.

⁹ Some funding is excluded from the calculation of the Minimum Funding Guarantee. Details of this are in '2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities.'

6 How To Respond

6.1 Consultation responses can be completed online
www.education.gov.uk/consultations.

by emailing: SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

or send by post to:

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for
Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, Darlington, DL3 9BG

7 Additional Copies

7.1 Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from the
Department for Education e-consultation website at:
www.education.gov.uk/consultations

8 Plans for making results public

8.1 The results of the consultation and the department's response will be published
on the DfE e-consultation website in summer 2014.

Annex A: Indicative minimum funding levels for 2015-16

1. The table below provides more information about each of the indicative minimum funding levels. These may change when we have final confirmation of local authorities' 2014-15 local funding formulae.

		Minimum funding levels		
		Primary	Secondary	
Age-weighted pupil unit		£2,845	Key stage 3: £3,951 Key stage 4: £4,529	
Pupils who have been eligible for free school meals in the past six years		£893	£1,080	For a pupil who is both eligible for free school meals and lives in an IDACI band 1 to 6 area, the local authority would attract both the FSM and relevant IDACI band minimum funding levels.
Pupils who live in an area that is in one of the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) bands	IDACI 1	£237	£321	
	IDACI 2	£290	£423	
	IDACI 3	£387	£530	
	IDACI 4	£453	£596	
	IDACI 5	£511	£659	
	IDACI 6	£741	£894	
Looked after children		£1,009	£1,009	The same measure would be used as is currently set out in the 2014-15 school funding arrangements. The minimum funding level would apply to the children reported to the Department, through the annual children looked after return and who are looked after children, for one day or more at the census point.
Pupils with low prior attainment		£878	£1,961	For the primary measure, this would apply to pupils who did not reach the expected level of development on the new Early Years Foundation Stage Profile or who achieved fewer than 78 points on the old EYFSP. For secondary pupils the minimum funding level applies to pupils not reaching L4 at KS2 in either English or maths.
English as an additional language		£505	£1,216	This minimum funding level would apply to pupils with EAL who entered the English state school system in the past three years.
Lump sum		£117,082	£128,189	Middle schools would attract a minimum lump sum weighted by their ratio of primary to secondary year groups in the school. All-through schools would attract the secondary amount.
Sparsity sum		£53,988	£53,988	A taper would apply, whereby the size of the sum is in inverse proportion to the size of the school. The criteria for attracting the minimum funding level would be the same as the criteria for the sparsity factor in local formulas. Details of this are in '2014-15 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities'.

This page is left intentionally blank

Annex B: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

1. Figure B1 below lists the 62 authorities that would receive additional funding under our indicative minimum funding levels, assuming 2014-15 pupil numbers^{1,2}. The minimum funding levels may change when we have final confirmation of LA's 2014-15 local funding formulae.

Figure B1: Indicative changes to local authority funding in 2015-16

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Bromley	£4,082	£169.6m	£4,543	£188.7m	11.3%	£19.1m
Cambridgeshire	£3,950	£294.3m	£4,225	£314.8m	7.0%	£20.5m
Brent	£5,066	£190.7m	£5,416	£203.9m	6.9%	£13.2m
Sutton	£4,360	£124.7m	£4,637	£132.6m	6.4%	£7.9m
Northumberland	£4,244	£166.2m	£4,513	£176.8m	6.4%	£10.6m
South Gloucestershire	£3,969	£137.5m	£4,217	£146.1m	6.3%	£8.6m
Shropshire	£4,113	£143.6m	£4,368	£152.5m	6.2%	£8.9m
Merton	£4,534	£98.6m	£4,812	£104.7m	6.1%	£6.0m
Croydon	£4,559	£208.6m	£4,830	£220.9m	5.9%	£12.4m
Bournemouth	£4,154	£79.2m	£4,393	£83.8m	5.8%	£4.6m
Buckinghamshire	£4,040	£275.4m	£4,263	£290.5m	5.5%	£15.2m
Cheshire West and Chester	£4,129	£173.6m	£4,352	£183.0m	5.4%	£9.4m
Leicestershire	£3,995	£339.7m	£4,197	£356.9m	5.1%	£17.2m
Warwickshire	£4,079	£281.3m	£4,267	£294.3m	4.6%	£13.0m
Devon	£4,156	£358.1m	£4,345	£374.3m	4.5%	£16.2m
Surrey	£4,096	£548.8m	£4,282	£573.5m	4.5%	£24.8m
Bury	£4,230	£111.1m	£4,418	£116.1m	4.5%	£5.0m
Norfolk	£4,334	£432.9m	£4,494	£448.9m	3.7%	£16.0m
North Lincolnshire	£4,316	£95.0m	£4,469	£98.4m	3.5%	£3.4m
Westminster	£5,663	£88.2m	£5,862	£91.3m	3.5%	£3.1m

¹ The figures in the table above have been calculated on the basis of 2014-15 pupil numbers (using the October 2013 school census). For 2015-16 we intend to use data from the October 2014 school census.

² The methodology for calculating the indicative funding, as a total and per pupil, is set out in the worked example on page 6.

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Derbyshire	£4,245	£405.0m	£4,392	£418.9m	3.4%	£14.0m
Poole	£4,007	£68.3m	£4,142	£70.6m	3.4%	£2.3m
Redbridge	£4,668	£199.7m	£4,823	£206.3m	3.3%	£6.6m
Rutland	£4,087	£20.9m	£4,214	£21.5m	3.1%	£0.6m
Gloucestershire	£4,203	£316.0m	£4,331	£325.6m	3.0%	£9.6m
Herefordshire	£4,306	£90.9m	£4,430	£93.5m	2.9%	£2.6m
Stoke-on-Trent	£4,507	£145.1m	£4,634	£149.2m	2.8%	£4.1m
Windsor and Maidenhead	£4,325	£77.5m	£4,440	£79.5m	2.7%	£2.1m
Central Bedfordshire	£4,144	£145.7m	£4,253	£149.5m	2.6%	£3.8m
Cheshire East	£4,077	£186.7m	£4,180	£191.4m	2.5%	£4.7m
Cumbria	£4,449	£269.2m	£4,560	£275.9m	2.5%	£6.7m
Suffolk	£4,241	£370.1m	£4,347	£379.3m	2.5%	£9.2m
Swindon	£4,102	£117.7m	£4,203	£120.5m	2.5%	£2.9m
Salford	£4,551	£131.2m	£4,658	£134.3m	2.3%	£3.1m
Bracknell Forest	£4,187	£62.6m	£4,284	£64.1m	2.3%	£1.4m
North Yorkshire	£4,338	£316.5m	£4,435	£323.7m	2.2%	£7.1m
Wiltshire	£4,213	£249.1m	£4,305	£254.5m	2.2%	£5.4m
Reading	£4,454	£71.1m	£4,547	£72.6m	2.1%	£1.5m
Northamptonshire	£4,189	£395.2m	£4,265	£402.4m	1.8%	£7.2m
Worcestershire	£4,231	£291.5m	£4,302	£296.4m	1.7%	£4.9m
Blackpool	£4,459	£80.2m	£4,530	£81.4m	1.6%	£1.3m
Durham	£4,573	£281.1m	£4,643	£285.4m	1.5%	£4.3m
Cornwall	£4,397	£285.0m	£4,451	£288.5m	1.2%	£3.5m
Telford and Wrekin	£4,367	£97.0m	£4,419	£98.1m	1.2%	£1.1m
Medway	£4,352	£161.1m	£4,402	£163.0m	1.2%	£1.9m
Hertfordshire	£4,320	£670.3m	£4,365	£677.3m	1.0%	£6.9m
Somerset	£4,278	£273.2m	£4,320	£275.9m	1.0%	£2.7m
Lincolnshire	£4,329	£392.0m	£4,370	£395.7m	0.9%	£3.7m
Dorset	£4,167	£202.3m	£4,204	£204.1m	0.9%	£1.8m
Peterborough	£4,490	£124.7m	£4,513	£125.3m	0.5%	£0.6m
Barnsley	£4,459	£126.7m	£4,478	£127.3m	0.4%	£0.5m
Bedford	£4,466	£101.0m	£4,484	£101.4m	0.4%	£0.4m

Local Authority	Actual 2014-15 funding		Indicative funding under minimum funding levels proposal		Indicative increase in funding under minimum funding levels proposal	
	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Funding per pupil	Total funding	Percentage	Total
Plymouth	£4,364	£140.1m	£4,380	£140.6m	0.4%	£0.5m
Isle of Wight	£4,489	£69.6m	£4,504	£69.9m	0.3%	£0.2m
East Riding of Yorkshire	£4,258	£177.9m	£4,271	£178.5m	0.3%	£0.5m
West Berkshire	£4,359	£95.2m	£4,372	£95.5m	0.3%	£0.3m
Walsall	£4,643	£183.3m	£4,655	£183.8m	0.3%	£0.5m
Milton Keynes	£4,440	£167.3m	£4,448	£167.6m	0.2%	£0.3m
Oxfordshire	£4,274	£333.1m	£4,281	£333.6m	0.1%	£0.5m
Barnet	£4,988	£214.3m	£4,994	£214.5m	0.1%	£0.2m
Hillingdon	£4,820	£187.0m	£4,824	£187.2m	0.1%	£0.2m
Derby	£4,544	£154.4m	£4,546	£154.4m	0.0%	£0.1m

This page is left intentionally blank

Annex C: Area Cost Adjustment (ACA)

1. This annex provides a detailed explanation of how we have developed the area cost adjustment that we are proposing is used to ensure that the allocation of additional funding reflects differences in area labour market costs.

2. The hybrid area cost adjustment would be applied to each minimum funding level so that in each local authority area, the minimum funding level reflects any disproportionate differences in labour market costs.

A Hybrid ACA – how does this work?

3. The hybrid ACA has a teachers' pay element and a non-teaching staff element and we describe how both have been calculated below. Both elements are combined to provide an overall adjustment for each local authority and we describe how we do this and how the adjustment has been calculated for an example authority.

Teachers' pay element

4. There are four regional pay bands for teachers: Inner London, Outer London, the Fringe and the Rest of England. We do not think it is right to use the average pay for each of these four pay band areas, because in each, average teacher pay will be influenced by the way in which the local authorities in those areas are currently funded. So we have used the following method:

- From the most recent published School Workforce Census (autumn 2012), we have looked at each teacher's¹ basic pay² and calculated how far that teacher was up the pay ranges for their regional pay band. For example, a classroom teacher in the Rest of England with basic pay of £21,588 in autumn 2012 is at the bottom of the main pay range for the Rest of England, which extends from £21,588 to £31,552.
- We then calculated what the same teacher's pay would be if he or she were in an equivalent position on the pay ranges for the other pay bands. For example if that teacher were at the bottom of the main pay range in Inner London (which runs from £27,000 to £36,387) they would have a basic salary of £27,000.
- We have repeated this for every teacher and every regional pay band.
- For each regional pay band, we calculated the notional average basic pay as if all teachers in England were in that pay band. For example, to calculate the average

¹ All grades of teachers were included in the calculation, including the leadership group.

² 'Basic pay' refers to the pay spines and pay scales defined in the [School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 2012](#) (which was in force at the time when the data was collected). Basic pay excludes items such as allowances for additional responsibilities.

pay in Inner London, we included not only the teachers in Inner London, but also teachers elsewhere, with their pay converted to Inner London rates. In this example, a classroom teacher in the Rest of England whose basic pay is £21,588 would be treated as having a notional basic salary of £27,000, purely for the purpose of calculating the Inner London average. The notional average basic pay for Inner London comes out at £41,388 and for the Rest of England £34,790. These notional amounts are purely for the ACA calculation and are not the actual regional averages.

- The adjustment for Inner London is the ratio of the two, 1.1897.

5. The average basic pay for each band, and the adjustment factors, are shown in figure C1 below.

Figure C1: Notional average basic pay and adjustment factors for teachers' regional pay bands.

	Inner London	Outer London	Fringe	Rest of England
Notional average basic pay for ACA calculation	£41,388	£38,256	£35,827	£34,790
Adjustment factor	1.1897	1.0996	1.0298	1.0000

Non-teaching staff element

6. The non-teaching staff element of the ACA is based on the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) labour cost adjustment (LCA), a general labour market (GLM) measure that is used to allocate funds to local authorities.

7. DCLG's LCA is based on regression analysis³ of pay data from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings⁴. The regression controls for variables such as age, gender, occupation, industry and public/private sector. The output is LCAs for 55 areas of England⁵.

8. DCLG has set a lower limit, to reflect the fact that national pay scales for public sector employees will not completely reflect the local labour market. The effect of the lower limit is that the 23 'cheapest' areas have their LCAs raised to the value of the threshold area, West Sussex Non-Fringe.

³ Further information on [DCLG's LCA methodology](#) can be found on the CLG website.

⁴ Further information on the [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings](#) can be found on the Office for National Statistics website.

⁵ Some local authorities fall into more than one ACA area. For example, Kent is divided into Fringe and Non-Fringe ACA areas. In these cases, a weighted average ACA for the local authorities could be calculated on the basis of the number of pupils in each area.

9. Some local authorities fall into more than one ACA area. For example, Kent is divided into Fringe and Non-Fringe ACA areas. In these cases, a weighted average ACA for the local authorities could be calculated on the basis of the number of pupils in each area.

Hybrid ACA

10. We have used recently published data on local authority expenditure on education (section 251⁶) to calculate the proportion of total school funding that was spent on (1) expenses related to employing **teachers** (the teacher proportion – 54.4%) and (2) expenses relating to employing **non-teaching staff** (the non-teaching staff proportion – 27.4%). The remaining 18.2% of expenditure was on non-staff costs. These splits have been calculated by apportioning the cost lines according to figure C2 on the following page.

⁶ The most recent [Section 251 data](#) (Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009) can be found on the Department's website.

Figure C2: Assumed apportionment of spending between teachers, non-teaching staff and non-pay

Spending by schools	Teachers	Non-teaching staff	Non-Pay	Excluded	Total	References to notes below
Teaching staff (E01)	100%				100%	
Supply teaching staff (E02)	100%				100%	
Education support staff (E03)		100%			100%	
Premises staff (E04)		100%			100%	
Administrative & clerical staff (E05)		100%			100%	
Catering Staff (E06)		100%			100%	
Cost of other staff (E07)		100%			100%	
Indirect employee expenses (E08)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Development and training (E09)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Supply teacher insurance (E10)	100%				100%	
Staff related insurance (E11)	69%	31%			100%	Note 1
Building maintenance and improvement (E12)		35%	65%		100%	Note 2
Grounds maintenance and improvement (E13)		35%	65%		100%	Note 2
Cleaning and caretaking (E14)		65%	35%		100%	Note 2
Water and sewerage (E15)			100%		100%	
Energy (E16)			100%		100%	
Rates (E17)			100%		100%	
Other occupation costs (E18)			100%		100%	
Learning resources (not ICT) (E19)			100%		100%	
ICT learning resources (E20)			100%		100%	
Examination fees (E21)			100%		100%	
Administrative supplies (E22)			100%		100%	
Other insurance premiums (E23)			100%		100%	
Special facilities (E24)			100%		100%	
Catering supplies (E25)			100%		100%	
Agency supply teaching staff (E26)	100%				100%	
Bought-in professional services - curriculum (E27)		40%	60%		100%	Note 2
Bought-in professional services - other (E28)		40%	60%		100%	Note 2
Loan interest (E29)			100%		100%	
Community focused extended school staff (E31)				100%	100%	Note 3
Community focused extended school costs (E32)				100%	100%	Note 3

Notes

1. Divided between teachers and other staff in the same proportions as E01, E02, E03, E04, E05, E06 and E07 combined.
2. Based on assumptions derived from a sample of company accounts of firms contracted by local authorities to supply these services.
3. Excluded, as not part of the school budget.

11. Figure C2 produces a ratio of Teachers' Pay to Other Pay and Non-Pay expenditure of 54%:27%:18%⁷. In other words, of the expenditure on labour, 66% was spent on teachers and 34% was spent on non-teaching staff. Therefore, for a combined ACA the teacher pay band data will take a weighting of 66% and the general labour market (GLM) will carry a 34% weighting.

12. This approach provides a solution to the geography mismatch between the GLM geographies and the teachers' regional pay bands, as those authorities who are in Outer London but who pay their teachers at Inner London rates have this reflected in the teachers' pay section of the ACA. The hybrid ACA for each local authority, based on the combination of the teaching and non-teaching staff pay data, in the ratios described above, is shown in figure C3.

Example calculation

13. Ealing is in the Inner London teacher pay band, and it has a Labour Cost Adjustment of 1.1671 for non-teaching staff. The ACA for Ealing is calculated as follows:

Example – The area cost adjustment for Ealing

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ACA} &= 1 + \text{teacher proportion} * (\text{teacher cost adjustment} - 1) \\ &\quad + \text{non-teaching staff proportion} * (\text{LCA} - 1) \\ &= 1 + 54.4\% * (1.1897 - 1) + 27.4\% * (1.1671 - 1) \\ &= 1.1489 \end{aligned}$$

Area cost adjustment figures by local authority

14. Figure C3 provides the adjustments we are proposing for each local authority. Using the methodology above, the ACA for a local authority area is greater than 1 if either the teacher pay element or the non-teaching staff pay element of the hybrid ACA is greater than 1. The teacher pay element is greater than 1 if all or part of the local authority is in the Fringe, Outer London or Inner London teachers' pay bands. The non-teaching staff pay element is greater than 1 if the GLM labour costs are greater than a

⁷ More precisely, the proportions are 54.4% : 27.4% : 18.2%.

lower limit that has been set by the Department for Communities and Local Government to be equivalent to the West-Sussex Non-Fringe GLM labour cost adjustment⁸.

15. Authorities that are partly in the Fringe teachers' pay band and partly in the Rest of England teachers' pay band appear twice in figure C3, as 'Fringe' and 'Non-Fringe'.

Table of area cost adjustment by local authority

Figure C3: Area cost adjustment by local authority

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Barking and Dagenham	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Barnet	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Barnsley	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bath and North East Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
Bedford	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Bexley	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Birmingham	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Blackburn with Darwen	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Blackpool	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bolton	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Bournemouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Bracknell Forest	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Bradford	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Brent	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
Brighton and Hove	Rest	1.0000	1.0061	1.0017
Bristol, City of	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
Bromley	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Buckinghamshire Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1114	1.0467
Buckinghamshire Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.1036	1.0284
Bury	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Calderdale	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Cambridgeshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0464	1.0127
Camden	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Central Bedfordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Cheshire East	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Cheshire West and Chester	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
City of London	IL	1.1897	1.5771	1.2613
Cornwall	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

⁸Further information on the methodology for [DCLG's area cost adjustment](#) can be found on the DCLG website.

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
County Durham	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Coventry	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Croydon	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Cumbria	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Darlington	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Derby	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Derbyshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Devon	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Doncaster	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Dorset	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Dudley	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Ealing	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
East Riding of Yorkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
East Sussex	Rest	1.0000	1.0061	1.0017
Enfield	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Essex Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.0783	1.0377
Essex non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0128	1.0035
Gateshead	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Gloucestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0227	1.0062
Greenwich	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Hackney	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Halton	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Hammersmith and Fulham	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Hampshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Haringey	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Harrow	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Hartlepool	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Havering	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Herefordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Hertfordshire Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1114	1.0467
Hertfordshire Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Hillingdon	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Hounslow	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Isle of Wight	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Isles of Scilly	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Islington	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Kensington and Chelsea	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Kent Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.0783	1.0377
Kent non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0026	1.0007
Kingston upon Hull, City of	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Kingston upon Thames	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Kirklees	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Knowsley	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Lambeth	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Lancashire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Leeds	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Leicester	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Leicestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Lewisham	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Liverpool	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Luton	Rest	1.0000	1.0566	1.0155
Manchester	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Medway	Rest	1.0000	1.0026	1.0007
Merton	IL	1.1897	1.1671	1.1489
Middlesbrough	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Milton Keynes	Rest	1.0000	1.1036	1.0284
Newcastle upon Tyne	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Newham	IL	1.1897	1.1081	1.1328
Norfolk	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North East Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Lincolnshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
North Tyneside	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
North Yorkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Northamptonshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0119	1.0033
Northumberland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Nottingham	Rest	1.0000	1.0100	1.0027
Nottinghamshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0100	1.0027
Oldham	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Oxfordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0802	1.0220
Peterborough	Rest	1.0000	1.0464	1.0127
Plymouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Poole	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Portsmouth	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Reading	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344
Redbridge	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Redcar and Cleveland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Richmond upon Thames	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Rochdale	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Rotherham	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Rutland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Salford	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Sandwell	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Sefton	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Sheffield	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Shropshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Slough	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Solihull	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Somerset	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
South Gloucestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0528	1.0145
South Tyneside	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Southampton	Rest	1.0000	1.0512	1.0140
Southend-on-Sea	Rest	1.0000	1.0128	1.0035
Southwark	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
St. Helens	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Staffordshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Stockport	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Stockton-on-Tees	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Stoke-on-Trent	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Suffolk	Rest	1.0000	1.0001	1.0000
Sunderland	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Surrey	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Sutton	OL	1.0996	1.1671	1.1000
Swindon	Rest	1.0000	1.0259	1.0071
Tameside	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Telford and Wrekin	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Thurrock	Rest	1.0000	1.0783	1.0215
Torbay	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Tower Hamlets	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Trafford	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Wakefield	Rest	1.0000	1.0006	1.0002
Walsall	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Waltham Forest	OL	1.0996	1.1081	1.0838
Wandsworth	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Warrington	Rest	1.0000	1.0131	1.0036
Warwickshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0253	1.0069
West Berkshire	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344
West Sussex Fringe	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
West Sussex Non-Fringe	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Westminster	IL	1.1897	1.3034	1.1863
Wigan	Rest	1.0000	1.0197	1.0054
Wiltshire	Rest	1.0000	1.0259	1.0071
Windsor and Maidenhead	Fringe	1.0298	1.1484	1.0569
Wirral	Rest	1.0000	1.0040	1.0011
Wokingham	Rest	1.0000	1.1255	1.0344

Local Authority	Teachers' regional pay band	Teacher cost adjustment	Non-teaching staff element (LCA)	Hybrid ACA
Wolverhampton	Rest	1.0000	1.0122	1.0033
Worcestershire	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
York	Rest	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000



Department
for Education

Consultation Response Form

Consultation closing date: 30 April 2014
Your comments must reach us by that date

Fairer schools funding in 2015-16

If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	

Name:	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Organisation (if applicable):	
Address:	

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](#) page.

Please mark the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> Maintained school	<input type="checkbox"/> Academy	<input type="checkbox"/> Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/> Governor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bursar	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent
<input type="checkbox"/> Schools forum	<input type="checkbox"/> Trade union organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Please Specify:

1 Do you agree that the existing distribution of schools funding is unfair?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

2 Do you agree with our proposed choice of characteristics to which to attach minimum funding levels?

Yes No Not Sure

Comments:

Given our proposal to set minimum funding levels such that we can afford to fund all local authorities at those levels or above in 2015-16, do you agree with the proposed values of the minimum funding levels?

3 a) Age Weighted Pupil Unit

Yes No Not Sure

3 b) Deprivation

Yes No Not Sure

3 c) Looked-after children

Yes No Not Sure

3 d) English as an additional language

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

3 e) Low prior attainment

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

3 f) Lump sum

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

3 g) Sparsity

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Sure
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

4 Do you agree that labour market cost differences should be taken into account as we allocate the £350m?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

5 Do you agree this should be calculated using the hybrid approach we have set out?

Agree

Disagree

Not sure

Comments:

6 If you do not agree that we should use a hybrid approach, what would you prefer we used?

<input type="checkbox"/> Use teacher pay bands only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use a general labour market measure only	<input type="checkbox"/> Use an alternative method
---	---	--

Comments:

Sparsity Review

7 We introduced a sparsity factor for the first time in 2015-16. How helpful has this factor been in ensuring that sufficient funding is targeted at small schools serving sparsely populated areas?

<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

8 Do you think it would be useful to revise the criteria for the sparsity factor to take into account the average number of pupils in each year group, rather than the number of pupils in the school? If so, how?

<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comments:

9 Are there any other changes you would like to suggest to improve the operation of this factor, and why?

Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply.	
E-mail address for acknowledgement:	

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
- departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Aileen Shaw, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 30 April 2014

Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, DARLINGTON DL3 9BG

Send by e-mail to:
SchoolFunding.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Briefing for Education Budget Sub-Committee Tuesday 8 April 2014

ATTAINMENT FIGURES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES THAT ARE SIMILAR TO BROMLEY

Contact Officer: Jane Bailey, Interim Assistant Director: Education
Tel: 020 8313 4146 E-mail: Tel: 020 8313 4146

Chief Officer: Executive Director of Education, Care & Health Services

1. Summary

- 1.1 A report was presented to Education PDS on 18th March providing details of the levels of attainment in Bromley schools. At that meeting it was requested that comparison data is also provided in relation to Bromley's Statistical neighbours. This is attached at **(Appendix 1)**

2. THE BRIEFING

- 2.1 Generally Bromley performs well against its statistical neighbours. Areas worthy of particular note are as follows:-

Early years Foundation Stage (age 4-5) – Bromley had the **highest** attainment with **60%** of children achieving a good level of development. The lowest in the group was **45%**

Key stage 4 – Bromley had the **highest** number of children attaining 5+ A*-C GCSE's, the lowest being **79%**

In **16** of the reported measures Bromley was in the **top three**, and within the **top five** overall.

- 2.2 Whilst it is encouraging that Bromley performs well in comparison with its statistical neighbours, analysis of attainment data in isolation can mask other challenges faced by Bromley schools. These were detailed in the report of 18th March which particularly noted discrepancies in the performance of children in receipt of pupil premium, which remains a focus for Bromley schools.
- 2.3 At present data providing this information for statistical neighbours is not readily which means direct comparison on this basis is not possible.

This page is left intentionally blank

Statistical neighbours, ordered by 'Closeness' to Bromley (i.e. Hertfordshire is our closest statistical neighbour)
(National results in brackets)

2013 FOUNDATION STAGE - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Percentage of children achieving good level of development*	60	59	59	39	52	45	56	53	50	57	48	50	49

* GLD is where a pupil achieves at least expected in the prime areas of learning (communication and language, physical development, personal social and emotional development) and in mathematics and literacy

2013 PHONICS - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Year 1 Achieved the Standard	75	71	76	78	71	70	69	73	65	71	71	72	69
End of Year 2 Achieved the Standard	88	79	89	89	86	86	83	92	83	87	87	85	85

2013 KEY STAGE 1 - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

% Level 2+	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Reading	91	91	91	91	90	92	92	93	90	92	91	90	89
Writing	87	87	88	87	86	89	89	89	87	89	88	86	85
Mathematics	92	93	93	94	92	94	94	94	93	94	94	92	91

% Level 3	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Reading	33	36	34	36	32	32	33	41	27	39	36	30	29
Writing	18	21	16	20	15	19	14	23	16	17	21	16	15
Mathematics	28	30	28	31	24	27	25	33	23	29	29	25	23

2013 KEY STAGE 2 - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

% Level 4+	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Grammar	79	79	83	81	79	70	74	82	71	75	77	78	74
Reading	89	89	91	91	88	83	88	92	86	88	88	86	85
Writing	86	87	88	86	85	84	87	88	82	84	85	84	83
Mathematics	88	87	91	90	88	84	85	89	83	87	86	86	85

%Level 5	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Grammar	55	55	60	58	50	43	47	56	44	49	52	54	47
Reading	52	52	55	54	48	40	48	52	45	50	52	45	44
Writing	35	38	38	37	33	28	29	36	28	30	35	32	30
Mathematics	50	46	54	52	46	37	41	49	37	44	42	46	41

% making 2 levels progress	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
Reading	90	89	92	91	89	82	90	88	87	87	88	90	88
Writing	92	92	93	94	92	89	94	91	89	90	91	93	91
Mathematics	91	89	93	91	91	85	87	89	83	87	87	90	88

2013 KEY STAGE 4 - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS*

	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
% 5+ A* to C	93	84	89	92	85	80	90	90	79	79	82	85	83
% 5+ A*-C inc En and Ma	74	66	71	77	66	60	55	67	60	60	64	66	61
English Baccalaureate	32	32	36	44	29	18	20	26	21	25	29	30	23

% making 3 levels progress	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
English	82	72	75	83	71	70	70	75	71	69	70	77	70
Mathematics	81	76	80	84	76	72	64	71	71	72	72	78	71

* Maintained Schools and Academies only - All Pupils

2006-2013 Level 3 Qualifications (GCE A Level or equivalent) - STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS *

Average Point Score / Candidate	Bromley	Hertfordshire	Trafford	Sutton	Stockport	Bedford Borough	Bracknell Forest	Solihull	West Sussex	Hampshire	Bath & North East Somerset	Outer London	National
2006	714.5	695.3	825.0	816.2	690.5	n/a	633.2	625.2	679.0	766.3	671.3	n/a	721.5
2007	717.4	713.6	817.2	829.1	701.9	n/a	671.7	648.5	685.0	783.0	684.5	n/a	731.1
2008	715.2	732.4	859.8	837.5	741.9	n/a	684.3	670.5	693.0	796.4	712.9	704.2	739.8
2009	718.6	730.9	832.0	865.5	736.6	697.5	700.4	662.4	697.0	787.0	694.5	709.5	739.1
2010	733.3	741.9	853.2	863.8	745.9	687.1	689.7	682.0	707.5	794.2	700.6	722.4	726.5
2011	724.7	734.2	848.3	873.3	727.6	691.4	715.9	680.0	672.6	760.8	747.6	721.5	733.1
2012	738.2	722.8	832.2	832.4	757.5	679.7	660.0	687.9	667.3	766.1	694.6	717.6	733.0
2013	744.9	714.0	825.0	834.5	765.6	672.8	639.2	656.8	671.7	764.1	670.3	705.4	724.3

* Includes All schools and FE Sector Colleges

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is left intentionally blank