



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: 7 October 2014

To: Members of the
EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA (Chairman)

Councillor Teresa Ball (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Nicholas Bennett J.P., Alan Collins and Judi Ellis

A meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on **THURSDAY 16 OCTOBER 2014 AT 7.00 PM**

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

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 Friday 10th October 2014.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9TH SEPTEMBER 2014 AND MATTERS OUTSTANDING (Pages 3 - 10)

5 OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS REGARDING FAIRER FUNDING FOR 2015/16 (Pages 11 - 30)

6 REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES IN THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO 2014/15 (Pages 31 - 102)

7 FREE SCHOOL MEALS UPDATE (Pages 103 - 106)

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.00pm, Tuesday 6th January 2015
7.00pm, Tuesday 3rd March 2015

10 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

11 FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE LANGLEY PARK SCHOOL FOR BOYS CONTRACT (Pages 107 - 112)

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

12 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO PART 2 (EXEMPT) INFORMATION ITEMS

a ADULT EDUCATION BUDGET PROJECTED OVERSPEND (Pages 113 - 144)

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 9 September 2014

Present:

Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA (Chairman)
Councillor Teresa Ball (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Nicholas Bennett J.P.,
Alan Collins and Judi Ellis

Councillor Stephen Wells, Portfolio Holder for Education

Also Present:

Carol Arnfield, Head of Service, Bromley Adult Education College
David Bradshaw, Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance
James Mullender, Senior Accountant

14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Jane Bailey, Assistant Director: Education.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Judi Ellis declared that her son was the Head Teacher of Biggin Hill Primary School.

16 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions had been received from members of the public.

17 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24TH JUNE 2014 AND MATTERS OUTSTANDING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24th June 2014 be agreed.

18 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER 2014/15

Report FSD14061

On 16th July 2014, the Council's Executive received the 1st quarterly capital

monitoring report for 2014/15 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2014/15 to 2017/18. The 2013/14 Capital Outturn was reported to the Council's Executive on 10th June 2014. The final capital outturn for Education Portfolio schemes was £5,981k compared to a revised budget of £21,542k, approved the Council's Executive in February 2014. After allowing for minor adjustments, a total of £793k was re-phased into 2014/15. The Sub-Committee considered a report outlining the changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Education Portfolio.

In response to a query from a Member regarding funding for school expansion, the Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that capital works in schools across the Borough were delivered through the Basic Need Programme, which was fully funded by the Department for Education's Basic Need Capital Grant and totalled approximately £62m for 2014/15. In addition to new classrooms, the Basic Need Programme could be used to fund a range of improvements to schools where appropriate, including the refurbishment of dining facilities.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP requested that a full update on the current position of education provision across the Borough be provided to the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 30th September 2014. This should include information on bulge classes and expansions, free school provision, the Bromley Trust Alternative Provision Academy and the demand for pupil places at schools across the Borough.

The Portfolio Holder for Education advised Members that the hydrotherapy pool at the Phoenix Children's Resource Centre would require a major refit or to be replaced over the next few years. There was a significant cost implication to replacing the existing hydrotherapy pool, and the Portfolio Holder highlighted that there was a need to ensure that any queries over the lease and the leaseholder's future plans for the Phoenix Children's Resource Centre site were resolved before any substantial investment was agreed. Members emphasised the value of the excellent provision at the Phoenix Children's Resource Centre, and underlined the importance of ensuring that children with special educational needs and disabilities across the Borough continued to be able to access a high quality hydrotherapy provision. The Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance would provide further details on the lease of the Phoenix Children's Resource Centre to Members of the Sub-Committee following the meeting.

The Portfolio Holder for Education noted the £387k Government grant to support the introduction of free school meals for all pupils at Key Stage 1 for the 2014/15 academic year, and requested that an update be provided to the next meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee on how this requirement was being delivered to schools across the Borough.

RESOLVED that the revised Capital Programme agreed by the Executive on 16th July 2014 be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Education for approval.

**19 EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET MONITORING REPORT
2014/15**

Report ED15099

The Sub-Committee considered a report setting out the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio based on expenditure to the end of July 2014. The Schools' Budget, funded from the Dedicated Schools' Grant and specific grants was forecast to be in an underspend position of £1,308k, 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 £369k, assuming that £519k would be drawn from contingency to offset the shortfall in Education Services Grant.

In considering the budget monitoring position for the Education Portfolio, the Chairman highlighted the £90k overspend in the Youth Service. The Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance advised Members that this was due to the delayed implementation of savings, and that a further report would be provided to Members at the next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee.

The Chairman was concerned to note the overspend of £299k in the Bromley Adult Education College budget. The Head of Service, Bromley Adult Education College confirmed that there had been an annual cut in grant funding for the Adult Education Service since 2010/11, and that there were difficulties in budgeting for the service due to the difference in the financial and academic year, as the annual budget for the Adult Education Service was agreed before the Skills Funding Agency funding was confirmed and therefore had to be developed based on historic figures. Non-accredited courses were generally not run unless they generated at least £120 per hour to cover the course costs and overheads, however there were some instances where courses did not generate at least £120 per hour but cancelling the course would realise a bigger loss.

Work was being undertaken to target the overspend in the Bromley Adult Education College budget. This included a 'health check' undertaken by Liberata during Summer 2014 to consider a range of potential efficiency measures, work to identify the contribution other services based at the Widmore Centre should make to the cost of overheads, and a possible reorganisation of the Adult Education Service to be focused on courses which met Government priorities or those which generated an appropriate level of income. The results of the 'health check' would be reported later in 2014, and a consultation paper on the future operation of the three Bromley Adult Education College nurseries would also be published shortly.

In response to a query from a Member, the Head of Service, Bromley Adult Education College confirmed that current Government priorities for adult education were based around support into employment, upskilling in English and Mathematics and English for speakers of other languages. The cost of delivering these courses was fully funded by the Government. Community learning included the delivery of free family learning in schools, and non-accredited courses, such as cookery, art and leisure activities for which a fee was charged.

A Member suggested that more work be undertaken to generate income for the College by building on the existing canteen provision, introducing parking charges and actively promoting the room booking facility, and requested that this be included in the review of fees and charges report to be considered at the next meeting of Education Budget Sub Committee.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP emphasised the need for the budget of the Bromley Adult Education College to be balanced by the end of the financial year, and requested that a report be provided to the next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee outlining the proposals in place to target the overspend as well as work undertaken around the potential future commissioning of the service.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The latest 2014/15 budget projection for the Education Portfolio be noted;**
- 2) The Education Portfolio Budget Monitoring Report 2014/15 be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Education for approval.**

20 SPENDING BY PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND SPECIAL MAINTAINED SCHOOLS IN 2013/14

Report ED15104

The Sub-Committee considered a report setting out all revenue and capital balances held by Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools as at 31st March 2014, and providing a comparison to the balances held at the same time in the previous year.

In considering the revenue and capital balances held by Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools as at 31st March 2014, the Chairman noted that Clare House Primary School had a deficit of -7%. This was an historic deficit from 2012/13 and the school had been working closely with the Local Authority to agree a deficit recovery plan. The school was currently expanding to two forms of entry which would support it to become more financially viable and it was expected that the deficit would be fully repaid in 2014/15. Chelsfield Primary School had an uncommitted revenue surplus of 23% but planned expenditure was expected to reduce this to around 1%.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance confirmed that the Schools' Finance Support Team worked with schools identified as having a deficit to support them in maintaining their deficits at a reasonable level up to the point of closure. The Schools' Finance Support Team also worked with schools with high balances to ensure that they were being used effectively for the education of current pupils and that they were not being retained to protect against any funding reduction in future years.

The Chairman requested that a report be provided to a future meeting of

Education Budget Sub-Committee on the progress of management action taken by schools highlighted as having a significant budget deficit or surplus. A Member also noted the need for Local Authority Governors of schools with a deficit to be more aware of the salary structure of staff and suggested that this be included in a future Local Authority Governor Forum.

RESOLVED that the financial position of Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools at the end of the 2013/4 financial year be noted.

21 IMPACT OF ALL SCHOOLS CONVERTING TO ACADEMY STATUS ON THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO BUDGET

Report ED15103

The Sub-Committee considered a report reviewing the impact of Local Authority Maintained schools converting to academy status on the Education Portfolio budget.

Following conversion to academy status, a number of specific roles and responsibilities transferred from the Local Authority to academy schools including improving school attendance, preparing financial accounts and asset management. To support this, new funding arrangements were introduced by the Government for 2013/14 which top-sliced an amount from all Local Authorities based on pupil numbers at £132 per pupil. The Government then introduced the Education Services Grant which was provided to Local Authorities and comprised £15 per pupil (for all pupils, regardless of whether they were in Local Authority Maintained or academy schools), to cover statutory duties, and £116 per pupil (now £113), for each pupil in a Local Authority Maintained School. This methodology disadvantaged the London Borough of Bromley as the top-sliced amount of £132 per pupil was significantly higher than the actual Borough spend of approximately £87 per pupil with a resultant loss of around £3.3m funding to the Local Authority.

The Education Services Grant was not ring-fenced and covered a range of services including School Improvement, statutory and regulatory duties, Education Welfare Service, central support services (mainly music services), asset management and monitoring national curriculum assessment. As more schools converted to academy status, the level of Education Services Grant continued to reduce and this loss of grant would be further accelerated by a recently announced reduction in the level of Education Services Grant from £113 to £87 per pupil, for each pupil in a Local Authority Maintained School, although the £15 per pupil (for all pupils, regardless of whether they were in Local Authority Maintained or academy schools), to cover statutory duties would be maintained. Once all schools in the Borough had converted to academy status, the Education Services Grant allocation would remain static at £727k (assuming pupil numbers remained the same).

In considering the impact of Local Authority Maintained schools converting to academy status on the Education Portfolio budget, the Chairman queried which

other Local Authorities had been similarly disadvantaged by the new funding formula, and the Head of Education, Care and Health Services Finance agreed to circulate a briefing to Members of the Sub-Committee following the meeting.

A Member noted the importance of ensuring that sufficient resources continued to be available to schools for key safeguarding functions, such as Human Resources and Finance to ensure that schools received an appropriate level of support.

RESOLVED that Members' comments on the impact of all schools converting to academy status on the Education Portfolio budget be noted.

22 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

23 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee would be held at 7.00pm on Thursday 16th October 2014.

The Meeting ended at 7.57 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
8th April 2014				
39 Pupil Premium to help Disadvantaged Pupils	That more detailed information on the use of Pupil Premium by schools be provided to a future meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee when available.	A report outlining the use of Pupil Premium by schools would be provided to a future meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee.	Assistant Director: Education	January 2015
9th September 2014				
20 Spending by Primary, Secondary and Special Maintained Schools in 2013/14	That the progress of management action taken by schools identified as having significant revenue or capital deficits be provided to a future meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee when available.	A report outlining the progress of management action taken by schools identified as having significant revenue or capital deficits would be provided to a future meeting of Education Budget Sub-Committee	Assistant Director: Education	TBC

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
EDU15109

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EDUCATION BUDGET SUB- COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 16 October 2014

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOLS REGARDING FAIRER FUNDING FOR 2015/16

Contact Officer: Amanda Russell, Head of Schools Finance Support
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: Amanda.Russell@bromley.gov.uk

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

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.2 The report provides details of the outcome of consultation with schools, and the changes to the proposed funding distributions following the release of Department for Education final funding allocation for 2015/16.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 The Education Budget Sub Committee is requested to consider the consultation responses and the proposed distributions methodology.

2.2 The Portfolio Holder for Education is requested to agree the proposed distributions methodology as supported by the Executive Director for Education, Care and Health Services and the Schools Forum.

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: Dedicated Schools Grant
 4. Total current budget for this head: £228m
 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: 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? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 At its meeting in June 2014, the Schools Forum considered a report outlining the proposed allocation of the additional funding coming to Bromley in 2015/16 as part of the Fairer Funding review. The Schools Forum considered a number of options put forward by the LA and the Schools Forum Working group, and there was a further option tabled by a member of the Forum. It was agreed that the LA would go out to consultation with one option from the initial proposals and the further option.
- 3.2 The consultation document was issued to all schools, and also sent to all Chairs of Governors. A detailed analysis of the consultation responses is attached at Appendix 1. This shows a clear divide between the views of primary and secondary schools. There are no responses from special schools as this review does not impact on their funding.
- 3.3 On the 17th July the Department for Education issued updated information regarding the Fairer Funding proposals which included an increase in the overall amount of funding allocated to Bromley and changes to the Minimum Funding Levels which provide the underlying basis for this funding. Full details of this information can be found at the attached link.

[Fairer schools funding: arrangements for 2015 to 2016](#)

Also attached at Appendix 1 is the calculation of the Schools Block Unit of Funding (SBUF) which details the amount of funding that Bromley will receive on a per pupil basis for 2015/16. This figure has now been finalised at £4,552.73, however the pupil numbers used in the overall calculation detailed here will be updated to reflect the October 2014 census number of the final allocation. This sheet also shows the revised Minimum Funding Levels that have been used within this calculation.

- 3.4 The original additional allocation of funding notified to Bromley was £19.1m – details of how this was calculated was detailed in the previous report. The final allocation is now confirmed at £19.5 m – this can be seen at Annex B of the main document accessed from the link above. The main reason for the increase in funding is that the new calculation used 13/14 pupil numbers (ie based on October 2013), whereas the original calculation was based on 12/13 pupil number (ie based on October 2012 census). However there are also some changes to the Minimum Funding Levels – this can be seen in detail on Appendix 1 – MFL Comparisons. Most of the changes are fairly minimal apart from two exceptions:
- Primary Prior Attainment – this has reduced from £877 to £669 per pupil. This is because the original calculations used 73 points as the measure of low attainment whereas the final allocation is based on 78 points.
 - Secondary Prior Attainment – This has reduced from £1,960 to £940 per pupil. This is because the original figures were based on 2012/13 data where the measure of data was pupils not attaining in English and Maths. The revised data reflects the change to English or Maths which came in from 2013/14. This resulted in a big increase in the numbers of eligible pupils, as a result of this per pupil funding went down (nb Bromley funding decreased from £2,500 to £1,000 per pupil).
- 3.5 Unfortunately because this information was not released until the 17th July, it was too late to update the consultation data which was sent out on 4th July, with a closing date for responses by 25th July. Appendix 2 shows a full analysis of all the responses received including comments from individual schools. However, as every consultation response received favours the one of the two options consulted upon which most benefits the sector (primary or secondary) or the individual school which the responders represent, it is probably fair to assume that any fresh consultation would have followed the same pattern of response.

3.6 The two models that were consulted on originally have both been remodelled using the new figures. Full details of this can be seen at Appendix 3, which shows the original figures for options one and two, and the revised figures for each option. However the underlying principles remain the same for each option, as detailed below:

- Option 1 – all schools funded at the higher level of either current Bromley funding or new DfE Minimum Funding Level – where there is not sufficient additional funding to support this, the lump sum has been adjusted for all schools.
- Option 2 – following the principles put forward at the previous meeting, the additional funding has been split 60:40 between primary and secondary schools, and the per pupil figure of £471 has been added to the AWPU value for all Key Stages. However, as this does not bring the Primary AWPU upto the DfE Minimum Funding Level, deprivation funding has been adjusted down to the DfE MFL.

Appendix 4 replicates the table that was presented to the Forum at the last meeting in support of Option 2.

3.7 Full details of the individual funding levels can be seen in the table at Appendix 1. This table also shows the funding levels for other neighbouring Local Authorities as a comparison. The impact of the remodelling is that more funding is directed towards primary schools, more so in revised option 1 than 2. This is due mainly to the impact of the changes to the DfE MFLs for Prior Attainment.

3.8 LA Officers have met with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Forum who make up the Sub Group to discuss these issues at length and to agree the revised options to be put forward at the next meeting. All parties agreed that although it would have been good if the revised options could have been sent out to all schools as part of a new consultation, the time constraints imposed by DfE meant that this was not possible.

3.9 The revised options have also been presented to Terry Parkin, Executive Director of ECHS and his senior management team. After some discussion, the SMT agreed to support Option 1 as they felt it provided an opportunity to recognise and to address the underfunding of all schools within Bromley, but with particular focus on Primary schools.

3.10 The Schools Forum discussed this issue at their meeting on the 25th September and after being put to a vote it was agreed that the Forum would support Option 1. The Education Budget Sub Committee is therefore asked to confirm that Option 1 will form the basis of the Funding allocation for 2015/16.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy, Legal and Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

CONSULTATION ON FAIRER FUNDING 2015-16 - ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

48 Responses

Primary 34 proforma in favour of Option 1
 1 proforma in favour of Option 2
 1 Letter in favour of neither
 1 letter from Chair of Primary and Special HT Forum

Secondary 10 proforma in favour of Option 2
 2 letters from Secondary HTs

1 proforma from a Secondary and Primary school MAT in favour of option 2

Supporting Comments

Primary:

Comment 1

It is within the spirit of the fair funding consultation to ensure that funding is equitably distributed in this fashion.

At present primary children receive £3574 each through the formula and secondary school pupils receive £4873. Primary pupils receive 73% of the per pupil funding that secondary schools receive. The DfE minimum funding per child was set at £4543 in the consultation. Primary school students receive £889 less than this minimum and secondary school receive £330 more.

This is obviously an inequitable situation which clearly needs to be addressed. It is clear in the tone and content of the DfE consultation that the additional funding for underfunded boroughs should also address inequities across borough funding.

In example 1 primary schools receive £4129 per child and secondary schools £5194. This would mean the primary pupils receive 79% of the funding per child that secondary schools receive. Primary schools are still underfunded in comparison to

secondary schools and there is still inequity but it has been addressed to a certain extent. Primary schools will also receive a per pupil amount below the DfE minimum, by £322. Secondary school pupils receive £651 above the minimum.

There is no argument, therefore for distributing more of the money to secondary schools.

There is an argument to distribute more of the money to primary schools to raise the per pupil average to the DfE minimum, or at least closer to this. This option has not been consulted on.

It also needs to be acknowledged that underfunding primary schools has a profound effect on attainment for all children. In a report published recently on the so called “London Effect”, that children in London attain higher than similar children elsewhere and that disadvantaged children in London attain higher than all children elsewhere, showed that this was mainly an effect of higher quality outcomes in primary schools. This is due to high levels of funding in inner city primary schools. If we continue to underfund primary schools in Bromley children in Bromley will continue not to benefit from the “London Effect” and we will continue to have underperforming children in Bromley.

In example 2 primary pupils receive £ 4121 per pupil and secondary pupils £5328, primary pupils receive 77% of the funding of secondary pupils; around the same as currently. Primary pupils will receive £422 less than the DfE minimum and secondary pupils £785 more than the DfE minimum per pupil. This has compounded the inequity in funding.

The name of the consultation is Fair Funding, this suggestion does not enable fair funding across Bromley schools and cannot and should not be accepted in the spirit of the DfE consultation.

Comment 2

If ‘fair funding’ is the basis for this redistribution, then this benefits our school – for now. The phrase ‘fair funding’ indicates an opportunity to rectify the historic inequity of funding for Beomley borough primary schools, in comparison with Bromley secondary schools and other borough’s primaries. The historic low level of funding for Bromley primaries has always made planning and delivery of day-to-day and one-off big projects incredibly difficult. The additional funding would help us tackle the tail of underachievement in outer London schools, when compared with more successful and higher funded inner London schools. Option 1 appears fairer than option 2, which is not equitable, as Primary schools would be further disadvantaged by the weighting of funds towards secondary schools.

Comment 3

As option 1 is the only remaining option from the original proposals, and that it is in the spirit of the original consultation which is to reduce the underfunding of primary schools.

Option 2 would only be logical if Bromley scrapped their funding formula and split the whole pot using only pupil numbers. In this option Secondary schools appear to keep any over funding eg FSM while primaries have theirs reduced.

Comment 4

It is time to address the chronic underfunding of Primary Schools in Bromley. If this option (1) is adopted it will go some way to redress the historic funding imbalance between primary and secondary schools in Bromley. If this opportunity is missed the LA will not have honoured the spirit of the new legislation in terms of providing a reasonable minimum level of funding for all its schools,

Comment 5

This funding was provided to enable the inequality of funding in Bromley Schools to be addressed. Bromley Primary Schools have been significantly underfunded for many years. The ability to provide additional resources to pupils even when schools are working collaboratively is minimal at this funding level. An increasing number of schools are in category and need additional funding to support the raising of attainment. Better funding of primary schools will impact on pupils attainment and therefore make them better prepared for secondary education.

The funding profiles in both options will only bring Bromley Primaries to the minimum expected by DfE it will not be sufficient to address the years of underfunding of Bromley Primary schools. A further option is required to redistribute the overfunding in KS 3 in both Option 1 and 2. The £159 above the minimum could be reallocated to address the loss of schools in Option 1.

This option would be an unfair distribution of funding, with secondary schools receiving AWPU significantly above the DfE minimum funding level and primaries at the bare minimum. This would be an unfair distribution of funding and would be a continuation of the inequality of funding at secondary and primary level. In neither option do any secondaries lose funding. However in both options there are primaries who will.

Comment 6

Will enhance our budget in areas most needed – deprivation and FSM6

Comment 7

With either option it seems the minimum funding guarantee will disappear?

Comment 8

As a school we are opting for option 1 because under this formula we will receive extra funding which will benefit our pupils who primarily come from deprived backgrounds and require a significant amount of additional intervention in order to achieve national and LA outcomes. Option 2 implies from the spreadsheet that our school will receive no additional funding so this will not be an option for us.

Historically funding of primary and secondary schools has been weighted heavily in favour of KS 3 and KS 4 pupils. However this doesn't mean that this should continue in the future as the correct funding model should enable all pupils to be funded equally through the AWPU.

Comment 9

The only option is stated in the title of the consultation. There is now the opportunity to make funding more equitable. Primary schools have been underfunded for too long. 60% of Bromley schools are in the Primary phase but only attract 54% of the funding. A huge number of primary schools are in category and need additional funding to support the raising of attainment. Better funding of primary schools will impact on pupils attainment and therefore make them better prepared for secondary education. One form of entry schools are often in the middle of estates in areas of high deprivation. We need to raise the attainment of working class pupils and continuing to underfund these children will not break the current cycle and under performance will be allowed to continue.

Option 2 would be an unfair distribution of funding. Under this option 78% or 58 out of 74 primary schools would be worse off. 100% of secondary schools would be better off. All but two of the primary schools in category would be worse off. 10 of the 14 Primary schools that gain under this option are small or faith schools. The majority of primary schools in areas of high deprivation would be worse off.

Comment 10

I believe that this option gives more to the Primary phase. This is fairer because the underfunding has historically had a greater effect on the Primary phase due to the difference in the banding per pupil being so much lower than in the secondary phase. How can it be that a child suddenly becomes worth over £1000 more when moving from year 6 to year 7? To go for option 2 would actually compound the iniquity. It should also be noted that even with this money, Bromley is still funding below the government's recommended baseline figure per pupil which is, I believe, about £4400.

I understand the desire of the secondary representatives of the forum to get an appropriate "cut" of this funding. I would do the same, but to make the split 60:40 of this "extra" money would only further imbalance the current situation, as there are more children in primary than secondary education.

Comment 11

Primary schools in Bromley are underfunded and here is an opportunity to address this issue. The achievement of white working class pupils has become a concern in government. At a recent conference organised by Lambeth LA it was highlighted that white working class pupils in London are clearly becoming the children left behind in a fast moving education system. Pupils from ethnic minority groups are dominating tables of achievement because they are funded well and supported in their

education. When Lambeth described itself as an area of disadvantage I felt that was an out of date label and one which sat better upon the borough of Bromley where schools try to make inadequate budgets from the 20th century fit a 21st century education system. Schools in Bromley are falling behind and it is a disgrace that we cannot offer children the same advantages that other groups of pupils enjoy. This is an opportunity to begin to redress the balance between primary and secondary school underfunding. Do not squander the educational achievement of primary school children who deserve the best education in Bromley rather than one that is merely good enough because funding allows nothing better.

Comment 12

Option 1 is our preferred option. We know the benefits of early intervention and this additional income would enable all schools to target children and families earlier.

Comment 13

Although in this instance option 2 favours our school, it disadvantages the primary sector compared to the secondary. The primary sector has been underfunded for many years and this needs to be redressed.

Comment 14

Agree with the LA that this looks the fairer option.

Comment 15

The objective of the fair funding consultation is to ensure that funding is equitably distributed. We strongly believe that option 1 is a more fair formula of allocation of funding. Under option 2 primary schools will be underfunded in comparison to secondary schools. Primary schools will receive a per pupil amount under the DfE minimum and secondary schools will receive a per pupil amount above the DfE minimum. This is an inequitable situation that clearly needs to be addressed. Underfunding in primary schools has a profound effect on attainment for all children and research suggests that higher funding in primary schools leads to higher pupil achievement at secondary level. There is an argument for distributing more money to primary schools to raise pupil average to the DfE minimum and to raise pupil attainment prior to transitioning to secondary school.

Option 1 follows most closely the funding levels which are suggested by the DfE and would therefore, on implementation of the national funding formula, be most likely to cause the least “turbulence” in overall funding levels. Furthermore, it appears to be especially beneficial for the most disadvantaged pupils and for those with low qualified parents.

Further to the points raised regarding Option 1 above, we feel that Option 2 is not a viable option. The name of the consultation is “Fair Funding” and in our opinion Option 2 does not enable fair funding across Bromley schools and cannot and should not be accepted.

Comment 16

The imbalance in funding that has existed for years between Bromley Primary Schools and their Secondary School partners has led to significant differences in staffing levels and quality of resources and this has to be reversed. What Bromley Primaries have achieved with low funding levels is hugely impressive but it is time that they were better supported to achieve even more. The gap in funding, when clearly so much more could be achieved if pupils at a younger age were to benefit from better facilities and resources, as well as lower staff:pupil ratios, must be reduced over the coming few years. Secondary schools might actually find they also benefit from such a move, as pupils come to them having already benefitted from better financial support.

Comment 17

Option 1 is the fairer option as no particular schools or groups of pupils appear to be disadvantaged. It is important that primaries maintain their current levels of FSM6 and EAL funding to ensure that their most vulnerable pupils are 'secondary ready'. Additionally this option goes some way to addressing the historical level of underfunding to primary schools in Bromley and therefore upholds the spirit of the purpose of the additional funding.

Option 2 provides very large increases for all secondary schools above Option 1, but substantially lessened amounts for all but a handful of primaries. Historically it is the primary schools that have been chronically underfunded so this option seems neither fair nor proportional. Reducing the deprivation and EAL funding to primary schools seems contrary to all we know about the huge gains that can be made through early intervention to support particular groups of pupils.

Comment 18

I am not voting for either option 1 or 2 Why? Because I believe it would be morally wrong for me to vote when neither option is fair for all pupils/students in Bromley.

This is highlighted by the fact that voting has polarized primaries and secondaries.

Finding a funding option that is fair and inclusive for all is immensely complex and I appreciate the hard work that the School's Forum have put into developing these 2 models. However it is clear that neither works equitably for all pupils/students and the upshot of the voting has been that each phase has become divided and entrenched.

Let's forget about the politics and the divisive language and move on. I propose that we ask the School's Forum to go back to the drawing board and work out a new option with support from an intermediary if needed and drawing on the experience of other boroughs where successful solutions have been developed.

The bottom line is that we all want to provide the very best education for our

pupils/students and I firmly believe that by working together with our immense shared experience and professionalism we can find a solution that will be fair to all.

Secondary:

Comment 1

Option 2 represents a more realistic and appropriate distribution of £19.1m. It addresses the intention of the additional money ie individual students, as a priority over and above formula distribution. It is not about primary versus secondary but about a fair distribution for all children and schools.

Comment 2

Option 2 is a far more appropriate method to take the schools funding formula forward.

Comment 3

The larger AWPU figure for KS4 reflects the vast number of changes that schools have to make and that it will be necessary to increase the number of teaching staff. We accept that taking the opportunity to provide more for primary schools by adjusting the funding ratio (currently 1:1.36) is desirable but believe model 1 goes too far, particularly as the models propose an equal base sum for primary and secondary whereas the existing favours secondary by 10%.

Option 1 gives an increase of 15 % in primary and 6% in secondary but option 2 gives 13% to primary and 9% to secondary which is a more reasonable balance. The school accepts the use of FSM at the current stage but strongly advocates a move to the alternative IDACI which gives a more accurate guide to deprivation within each school community. FSM is accurate over the whole of an authority or PAN London but is not accurate on an individual school basis.

Comment 4

Option 2 takes a wholistic view of the funding schools receive. It is a fairer distribution of the funding that takes account of factors other than AWPU. Given also the cut in Sixth Form funding Secondary Schools need to be treated fairly if they are to meet the needs of their large school populations.

Comment 5

Option 2 is clearly favourable for secondary schools and would expect all other secondary schools to vote in favour of this option. However, as there are only 14 primary schools who are better off with this option and only 17 secondary schools , making a total of 31 who would benefit from Option 2, as opposed to 61 schools who would prefer Option 1, we would assume that unless there is some sort of proportional representation (as secondary schools represent a far greater number of students than primary schools) there is little point in voting this way.

Comment 6

We feel this is a rather awkward exercise. As a secondary school with little funding we could not opt for Option 1 which obviously benefits primary schools.

Comment 7

Will ensure that Funding is received in areas most needed KS3 and KS4.

Calculation of Schools Block Units of Funding for 2015-16

Bromley

Factor	Unit value	Pupil numbers (Note 1) or number of schools	Funding before area cost adjustment (ACA)	
Age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU) - primary	£2,880.41	25,145	£72,427,799.56	
AWPU - key stage 3	£3,949.51	10,165	£40,146,749.47	
AWPU - key stage 4	£4,501.80	6,549	£29,482,280.18	
FSM 6 - primary	£882.39	5,375	£4,742,708.97	
FSM 6 - secondary	£1,051.70	3,681	£3,871,694.08	
IDACI 1 - primary	£209.14	1,289	£269,500.22	
IDACI 2 - primary	£260.19	871	£226,597.23	
IDACI 3 - primary	£346.79	2,417	£838,286.83	
IDACI 4 - primary	£421.67	2,457	£1,035,883.62	
IDACI 5 - primary	£476.84	1,514	£721,884.85	
IDACI 6 - primary	£691.15	37	£25,627.63	
IDACI 1 - secondary	£289.06	753	£217,775.11	
IDACI 2 - secondary	£378.88	709	£268,782.20	
IDACI 3 - secondary	£470.32	1,596	£750,597.27	
IDACI 4 - secondary	£554.08	1,811	£1,003,505.00	
IDACI 5 - secondary	£614.08	984	£604,520.29	
IDACI 6 - secondary	£818.79	41	£33,615.74	
Looked-after children	£1,003.80	150	£150,588.60	
Low prior attainment - primary 78	£669.38	6,511	£4,358,102.62	
Low prior attainment - secondary	£940.07	3,104	£2,917,947.18	
English as an additional language 3 - primary	£465.70	1,919	£893,860.61	
English as an additional language 3 - secondary	£1,129.65	230	£260,251.11	
Lump sum - primary	£115,797.02	74	£8,568,979.65	
Lump sum - secondary	£125,155.40	17	£2,127,641.74	
Lump sum - middle schools		0	£0.00	
Sparsity - primary	£44,635.47	0	£0.00	
Sparsity - secondary	£66,656.37	0	£0.00	
Total before area cost adjustment (ACA)			£175,945,179.77	
ACA				1.083138
Funding including ACA (using 2014-15 pupil numbers) (Note 1)				£190,572,851.84
Total number of 2014-15 pupils (Note 1)				41,859
A. Per-pupil amount after applying minimum funding levels				£4,552.73
B. Actual 2014-15 schools block unit of funding under dedicated schools grant				£4,082.33
2015-16 funding per pupil (the greater of A and B above) (Notes 2 and 3)				£4,552.73

Notes

- 2014-15 pupil numbers are taken from the October 2013 school census and were included in the prepopulated authority proforma tool (APT) sent to local authorities.
- This is before adjustment for carbon reduction commitment.
- This is the final 2015-16 schools block funding per pupil. It will not be amended when 2015-16 pupil numbers are published.

This page is left intentionally blank

School	14/15 Funding adjusted through :-	Original models				New Funding			
		Option 1		Option 2		Option 1		Option 2	
		lump sum	diff	EAL/Deprivat ion		lump sum	Difference	deprivation	
Alexandra Infant School	730,851	820,041	89,190	817,906	87,055	836,688	105,837	828,809	97,959
Alexandra Junior School	921,258	1,088,438	167,180	1,056,966	135,708	1,111,874	190,616	1,070,799	149,541
Balgowan Primary School	1,943,811	2,227,656	283,845	2,203,347	259,537	2,288,571	344,760	2,237,575	293,764
Bickley Primary	1,293,925	1,521,643	227,718	1,506,427	212,502	1,557,820	271,048	1,527,289	240,517
Biggin Hill Primary	1,285,492	1,507,662	222,170	1,489,503	204,011	1,544,583	259,091	1,503,580	218,088
Blenheim Primary School	912,786	1,006,498	93,712	954,616	41,831	1,025,284	116,923	968,239	59,879
Bromley Road Infant School	1,009,294	1,237,133	227,839	1,174,958	165,664	1,261,127	257,143	1,210,050	206,066
Burnt Ash Primary School	1,677,576	1,898,526	220,950	1,799,386	121,810	1,935,261	266,013	1,827,816	158,568
Castlecombe Primary School	928,930	1,037,640	108,710	993,074	64,144	1,057,263	128,333	1,004,890	75,960
Chelsfield Primary School	462,520	498,640	36,120	503,254	40,734	507,196	46,494	506,196	45,494
Chislehurst (CofE) Primary	703,583	814,733	111,150	830,259	126,676	834,728	134,933	838,567	138,773
Churchfields Primary School	1,241,321	1,417,741	176,420	1,381,904	140,583	1,447,687	212,627	1,401,538	166,478
Clare House Primary School	922,961	1,079,717	156,756	1,074,578	151,616	1,105,106	187,095	1,094,632	176,620
Crofton Infant School	1,724,136	1,960,905	236,770	1,933,253	209,118	2,011,032	286,897	1,967,495	243,360
CROFTON JUNIOR SCHOOL	2,099,882	2,408,977	309,095	2,360,252	260,370	2,474,635	374,753	2,391,892	292,010
Cudham CE Primary School	512,342	513,737	1,395	522,071	9,729	520,371	9,905	525,881	15,415
Darrick Wood Infant School	939,569	1,104,630	165,061	1,099,078	159,509	1,129,926	190,357	1,118,924	179,355
Darrick Wood Junior School	1,260,987	1,474,617	213,630	1,455,704	194,717	1,510,236	256,398	1,472,863	219,025
Dorset Road Infant School	402,181	421,385	19,204	427,245	25,064	427,895	27,095	432,093	31,293
Downe Primary School	424,066	458,356	34,290	472,286	48,220	466,633	44,200	475,291	52,858
Edgebury Primary School	795,865	913,115	117,250	916,255	120,390	934,040	142,302	925,540	133,802
FARNBOROUGH PRIMARY SCI	794,125	910,765	116,640	906,906	112,780	931,597	137,472	917,746	123,620
Gray's Farm Primary Academy	1,512,161	1,870,857	358,696	1,788,556	276,395	1,907,127	394,966	1,807,729	295,568
Green Street Green Primary	1,219,595	1,560,892	341,296	1,553,021	333,426	1,615,284	395,689	1,587,112	367,516
Harris Primary Academy Cryst	1,303,858	1,452,930	149,073	1,358,683	54,826	1,479,435	175,578	1,397,184	93,327
Harris Primary Academy Kent	1,694,464	1,942,875	248,411	1,804,917	110,454	1,979,052	284,588	1,846,173	151,709
Hawes Down Infant School	769,732	899,931	130,199	909,404	139,672	919,554	153,598	919,576	153,619
Hawes Down Junior School	853,515	990,284	136,770	997,867	144,353	1,014,185	165,295	1,008,068	159,177
Hayes Primary School	1,964,095	2,320,853	356,758	2,288,038	323,943	2,381,210	417,115	2,327,530	363,435
Highfield Infants' School	873,075	1,039,028	165,953	1,038,354	165,279	1,064,138	191,063	1,064,152	191,077
Highfield Junior School	1,114,511	1,320,718	206,207	1,320,195	205,684	1,356,337	241,826	1,339,174	224,663
Hillside Primary School	1,367,189	1,615,349	248,159	1,504,204	137,015	1,646,132	278,942	1,522,052	154,862
Holy Innocents Catholic Prim	764,615	875,765	111,150	880,518	115,903	895,760	135,063	890,372	129,675
James Dixon Primary School	1,603,265	1,805,305	202,040	1,678,369	75,104	1,839,157	243,820	1,723,641	128,303
Keston C.E. Primary School	872,074	1,030,705	158,631	1,035,817	163,743	1,053,955	186,402	1,046,842	179,290
Leesons Primary School	1,023,408	1,067,557	44,149	1,023,408	0	1,087,273	68,475	1,028,839	10,041
Manor Oak Primary School	876,246	903,212	26,966	876,246	0	919,301	43,055	876,246	0
Marian Vian Primary School	1,965,270	2,322,442	357,172	2,276,241	310,971	2,380,381	426,755	2,305,968	352,342
Mead Road Infant School	436,873	494,423	57,550	500,597	63,724	502,607	67,414	506,752	71,559
Midfield Primary School	1,209,752	1,304,081	94,329	1,247,044	37,292	1,328,447	124,248	1,261,898	57,699
Mottingham Primary School	1,427,626	1,677,657	250,031	1,568,125	140,499	1,708,347	287,992	1,599,547	179,192
OAK LODGE PRIMARY SCHOO	1,945,043	2,280,856	335,813	2,252,408	307,365	2,339,353	405,757	2,286,051	352,455
Oaklands Primary School	1,596,031	1,856,631	260,600	1,814,622	218,591	1,899,411	312,240	1,830,903	243,732
Parish C.E. Primary School	1,703,269	1,995,258	291,989	1,943,000	239,731	2,043,804	340,535	1,977,024	273,755
Perry Hall Primary School	1,402,091	1,641,341	239,250	1,603,291	201,200	1,680,866	278,775	1,626,659	224,568
Pickhurst Infants' School	1,198,547	1,401,203	202,656	1,383,902	185,355	1,434,683	236,136	1,410,319	211,772
Pickhurst Junior School	1,597,449	1,886,915	289,466	1,852,401	254,951	1,935,461	338,012	1,875,061	277,611
Poverest Primary School	873,238	922,923	49,685	890,089	16,851	939,849	70,436	902,020	32,607
Pratts Bottom Primary School	430,940	431,211	271	430,940	0	431,211	1,567	430,940	1,296
Princes Plain Primary School	2,060,481	2,323,521	263,040	2,204,416	143,935	2,366,673	315,910	2,241,648	190,885
Raglan Primary School	1,336,743	1,535,248	198,505	1,521,147	184,405	1,573,378	236,635	1,543,743	207,000
Red Hill Primary School	2,413,177	2,759,339	346,162	2,643,002	229,825	2,823,323	423,913	2,674,097	274,688
Scotts Park Primary School	1,581,654	1,863,480	281,826	1,823,258	241,604	1,907,190	334,329	1,855,295	282,434
Southborough Primary Schoo	1,610,694	1,851,164	240,470	1,789,151	178,457	1,890,875	288,638	1,812,122	209,885
St Anthony's R.C Primary	746,960	902,814	155,854	868,780	121,820	918,438	174,932	890,506	147,000
St George's CE Primary	1,134,188	1,298,408	164,220	1,270,918	136,730	1,326,494	198,082	1,291,274	162,862
St James RC Primary School	713,381	825,141	111,760	836,000	122,619	845,229	131,848	847,757	134,376
St John's CE Primary School	992,448	1,124,505	132,057	1,101,959	109,511	1,148,778	161,417	1,114,272	126,911
St Joseph's R.C.Primary Schoc	710,008	814,448	104,440	820,097	110,089	833,420	127,101	831,333	125,014
St Mark's C.E. Primary School	1,411,387	1,652,224	240,837	1,635,161	223,774	1,691,656	287,942	1,665,434	261,720
St Mary Cray Primary School	996,636	1,159,168	162,532	1,087,836	91,200	1,179,070	187,300	1,104,788	113,017
St Mary's Catholic Primary	1,307,424	1,532,871	225,447	1,528,279	220,855	1,573,047	273,289	1,556,763	257,005

St Paul's Cray CE Primary	971,375	1,072,155	100,780	1,021,357	49,982	1,090,569	123,572	1,032,167	65,170	
St Peter & St Paul Catholic Pri	824,417	986,645	162,228	960,343	135,926	1,006,826	186,743	974,073	153,990	
St Philomena's Catholic Prima	770,306	883,376	113,071	868,528	98,223	902,999	136,700	886,545	120,245	
St Vincent's Catholic Primary	774,593	974,466	199,873	966,613	192,020	1,009,072	238,734	991,412	221,074	
The Highway Primary School	813,458	942,408	128,950	936,459	123,001	962,682	153,340	946,635	137,294	
The Pioneer Academy	1,454,931	1,682,591	227,660	1,612,172	157,242	1,720,349	265,418	1,634,773	179,842	
Tubbenden Primary School	1,812,563	2,253,369	440,807	2,233,989	421,427	2,311,401	498,839	2,258,483	445,920	
Unicorn Primary School	1,148,162	1,310,860	162,698	1,311,676	163,514	1,342,852	200,841	1,330,595	188,585	
Valley Primary School	1,704,611	1,975,581	270,970	1,896,045	191,433	2,019,942	315,331	1,940,122	235,510	
Warren Road Primary School	2,482,772	2,860,527	377,755	2,831,423	348,651	2,938,833	456,061	2,873,005	390,233	
Wickham Common Primary Sr	1,364,702	1,547,377	182,675	1,544,413	179,711	1,586,902	229,889	1,560,622	203,609	
Worsley Bridge Junior School	1,025,774	1,152,174	126,400	1,093,568	67,794	1,174,494	153,879	1,110,032	89,416	
			13,769,383		11,357,844		16,356,316		13,122,983	
Beaverwood School for Girls	5,141,497	5,578,693	437,196	5,721,399	579,901	5,445,237	303,740	5,604,280	462,783	
Bishop Justus Church of Engla	4,434,823	4,745,829	311,006	4,865,491	430,668	4,606,576	171,753	4,756,898	322,075	
Bullers Wood School	5,137,008	5,450,603	313,595	5,590,468	453,460	5,347,981	210,973	5,565,797	428,789	
CHARLES DARWIN	5,209,968	5,717,794	507,826	5,859,469	649,501	5,494,975	285,007	5,657,573	447,605	
Coopers Technology College	5,487,110	5,952,079	464,969	6,089,791	602,681	5,759,028	271,918	5,906,275	419,164	
Darrick Wood School	6,112,426	6,507,465	395,039	6,674,349	561,924	6,374,014	261,588	6,658,981	546,555	
Harris Academy Beckenham	3,840,443	4,084,893	244,450	4,162,153	321,710	3,908,485	68,042	3,977,838	137,395	
Harris Academy Bromley	4,073,949	4,384,170	310,221	4,497,657	423,707	4,230,595	156,646	4,280,435	206,486	
Hayes School	5,431,556	5,784,485	352,929	5,935,334	503,779	5,662,213	230,657	5,931,119	499,564	
Kemnal Technology College	3,809,987	4,142,057	332,070	4,277,732	467,744	3,995,795	185,808	4,060,106	250,118	
Langley Park School for Boys	4,846,186	5,076,531	230,344	5,213,283	367,097	4,992,950	146,764	5,247,665	401,479	
Langley Park School for Girls	5,553,328	5,748,732	195,405	5,902,362	349,035	5,654,253	100,925	5,938,594	385,266	
NEWSTEAD WOOD SCHOOL	3,158,296	3,256,303	98,007	3,352,173	193,877	3,287,495	129,199	3,482,541	324,245	
Ravens Wood School	5,173,407	5,492,456	319,049	5,636,816	463,409	5,392,458	219,051	5,641,586	468,180	
ST OLAVE'S GRAMMAR SCHO	2,722,194	2,779,760	57,566	2,866,638	144,444	2,805,686	83,493	2,970,447	248,253	
The Priory School	4,880,333	5,236,480	356,146	5,359,641	479,307	4,975,600	95,267	5,067,362	187,029	
The Ravensbourne School	5,574,626	5,969,826	395,200	6,110,337	535,710	5,787,885	213,259	5,923,052	348,426	
	169,335,372		5,321,018		7,527,955		3,134,089		6,083,412	
Additio	19,500,000									
	188,835,372	188,425,774		188,221,171		188,567,593		188,283,585		
Primary	88,748,234	52%	102,517,618	54%	100,106,079	53%	104,846,367	56%	101,613,035	54%
Secondary	80,587,138	48%	85,908,156	46%	88,115,092	47%	83,721,226	44%	86,670,550	46%
	169,335,372	188,425,774		188,221,171		188,567,593		188,283,585		
Primary:Secondary Ratio	1:1.36		1:1.26		1:1.32		1:1.20		1:1.28	

Sector	DfE MFL	Bromley 14/15	Difference per pupil	Pupil no/ School No	Overall Total	Allocation per pupil
	A	B	C B-A	D	E C x D	
Primary						
AWPU	2880	2880	0	24829	0	
FSM6	882	1500	618	5285	3,266,130	
Prior Attainment	669	1858	1189	5096	6,059,144	
EAL	465	1000	535	1892	1,012,220	
Lump sum	115797	130000	14203	73	1,036,819	
			No pupils	24829	11,374,313	11,703,865
				60.02%	458.11	60.02%
					per pupil	
Secondary						
AWPU KS3	3949	4507	558	9906	5,527,548	
AWPU KS4	4501	4507	6	6633	39,798	
FSM6	1051	1500	449	3634	1,631,666	
Prior Attainment	940	1000	60	3063	183,780	
EAL	1125	1125	0	228	0	
Lump sum	125155	175000	49845	17	847,365	
			No pupils	16539	8,230,157	7,796,135
				39.98%	497.62	39.98%
					per pupil	
			Total pupil nos	41368		19,500,000
						£471.38

This page is left intentionally blank

Comparison of DfE Minimum Funding Levels and Bromley current funding levels

Factor		DfE	DfE	Bromley	highest	Proposed		Bexley	Croydon 12.7m	Greenwich	Lewisham	Kent	Sutton 9.1m
		Original MFLs	Revised MFL	Funding 2014/15		Option 1	Option 2						
		£	£	£									
				1				2	3	4	5	6	7
AWPU	Primary	2845	2880	2235	7th	2938	2880	3021	3022	3118	3727	2727	3307
	Sec KS3	3951	3949	4110	5th	4168	4581	4437	3959	4270	5124	3788	4180
	Sec KS4	4529	4501	4110	6th	4559	4581	4437	4093	5262	5124	4157	4180
FSM6	Primary	893	882	1500	2nd	1500	882	643	986 *	2472	1106 *	359 *	600 *
	Secondary	1079	1051	1500	2nd	1500	1051	762	1027 *	2574	1488 *	334 *	800 *
* also use IDACI													
Prior Attainment													
	Primary	877	669	1858	1st	1858	1858	1779	376	0	634	1052	500
	Secondary	1960	940	1000	6th	1000	1000	2513	1166	550	1154	1105	1917
EAL	Primary	504	465	1000	3rd	1000	1000	336	521	1047	1340	885	150
	Secondary	1216	1129	1000	5th	1129	1129	336	1600	1495	1603	3344	75
Lump Sum	Primary	117082	115797	175000	=1st	155000	175000	133000	150000	175000	131000	120000	100000
	Secondary	128188	125155	175000	=1st	155000	175000	150000	100000	175000	131000	120000	100000
Ratio				1:1.36		1:1.20	1:1.28	1:1.33	1:1.25	1:1.33	1:1.33	1:1.27	1:1.22

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED15108

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 16 October 2014

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Non-Key

Title: REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES IN THE EDUCATION PORTFOLIO 2014/15

Contact Officer: James Mullender, Senior Accountant
Tel: 020 8313 4292 E-mail: James.Mullender@bromley.gov.uk

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

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report details the current and potential income generated by services in the Education Portfolio and a recommendation to introduce a new charge.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

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

- (i) Consider and comment upon the current charging policy for the Education Portfolio
- (ii) Consider the proposal to introduce charges for moderation services provided to academies as detailed in 3.7
- (iii) Note that further work will be carried out to determine the feasibility of introducing charges for parking at Adult Education sites, with the outcome to be reported to a future meeting of the Education Budget Sub-Committee.

2.2 The Portfolio Holder is requested to:

- (i) Recommend that Executive agree the introduction of charges for moderation services provided to academies as detailed in 3.7 as part of the budget setting process for 2015/16

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost: £20k additional income
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: £20k additional income
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Education Portfolio
 4. Total current budget for this head: Controllable: £4.945m (RSG), £111.134m (DSG)
Total Cost: £13,448m (RSG), £112.620m (DSG)
 5. Source of funding: RSG/DSG
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 365.21 current, 0 additional
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: n/a
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
 2. Call-in: Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): 51 academies (for Moderation service)
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 At its meeting on 12th February 2014, the Executive agreed the recommendations from the Cost, Charges and Recharges Working Group of the Executive and Resources PDS Committee. Specifically, this included the recommendation that each PDS Committee reviews the fees and charges for their portfolio at each autumn meeting to enable any changes to be incorporated into the draft budget for the following financial year.
- 3.2 All services within the portfolio that either currently, or have the potential to, charge for services have completed the standard template agreed at the above meeting. The completed templates are included within the appendices:
- 3a - Adult Education - course income
 - 3b - Adult Education - nurseries
 - 3c - Adult Education - lettings
 - 3d - Adult Education - Workforce Development & Governor Services
 - 3e - Blenheim and Community Vision nurseries
 - 3f - Education Psychology
 - 3g - Moderation
 - 3h - Education Welfare
 - 3i - EBP - Work Experience Network and Placement Provision
 - 3j - EBP - Educational Visits
 - 3k - EBP - Enterprise and Employability

Sold Services/Trading Accounts

- 3.3 With the exception of Adult Education tuition and nursery fees, and the two other nurseries' fees, the majority of income in the portfolio is from trading accounts set up to sell services to schools.
- 3.4 The table below details the current charges for Education services:

Service	Charges
Education Welfare	£300/day
Free School Meals	£150-£850 depending on school size
Moderation (proposed)	£400 per visit
Blenheim & Community Vision nurseries	£5.15/hour or £51.50/day (0-2 years) £4.65/hour or £46.60/day (2-3 years) £4.15/hour or £41.50/day (3-4 years)
Education Psychology	£380/half day including follow up report/admin, or £75/hour
Educational Visits service	£200-£595 depending on school size/type
Educational Visits training	£150/£175 per person
Work Experience & Placements	various - see appendix 3j
Adult Education nurseries (0-2 years)	£7.24/hour £25.34/session (2.5 hours) £48.87/day (fri), £54.33/day (mon-thur)
Adult Education nurseries (2+ years)	£6.15/hour £21.53/session (2.5 hours) £41.51/day (fri), £46.13/day (mon-thur)
Adult Education lettings	£22.50-£55/hour or £160-£428/day
Governor services training	£615/£675
Workforce development	Bespoke - full cost
Adult Education courses	various - see Appendix 3a

- 3.5 At its meeting on 16th October 2013, the Executive resolved to continue the provision of sold services to schools so that they can form part of the market testing of education services.

Moderation Services

- 3.6 Key Stage 2 Writing Moderation is currently provided free of charge to all Bromley schools by the School Standards team, and has been funded by a grant from the Department for Education (£10k allocation for the 2014/15 financial year). Guidance provided with the grant clarified for the first time that this grant is intended for moderation services in maintained schools.
- 3.7 The service would therefore like to introduce a £400 charge per visit to academies who commission this service, which it is estimated would generate around £20k income per annum. The template for this potential charge is included at appendix 3g.

Behaviour Service/Secondary Outreach

- 3.8 With effect from the end of July 2014, the secondary outreach service was terminated and the staff assimilated into the Pupil Referral Unit, which then converted to academy status in September 2014. The figures have therefore been excluded from appendices 1 and 2, and no template has been completed for the service.
- 3.9 This service had been operating as a trading account since April 2013 when the budget for Behaviour Services was delegated to schools, and had been operating at a significant cost to the council, with an outturn of £126k overspend in 2013/14, and estimated £80k overspend for the part-year element of 2014/15.
- 3.10 The termination of the service has therefore relieved a significant pressure on the education budgets, however, there will be a budget shortfall in 2015/16 of £133k – the budgeted level of recharges for the service that were covered by the external income, or recharged to other (DSG) services.

Adult Education

- 3.11 The Adult Education budgets in Appendix 2 have been split between 'funded' and 'non-funded' services, and the nurseries. In this context, funded relates to funding from the Skills Funding Agency via the Adult Skills and Community Learning Grants.
- 3.12 Officers are currently investigating the feasibility of introducing parking charges for the adult education sites, however initial discussions with Parking Services suggest that, excluding the one-off cost of £20k for the (second-hand) meters, these charges could raise an additional £15k-£20k of income per annum, net of the estimated parking management/enforcement fee.
- 3.13 Members' should note that this is a very rough 'ballpark' figure, and that previous estimates for new car parks have often varied considerably from what is actually achieved, especially in the short-term.
- 3.14 There is also the potential that introducing parking charges could result in a reduction in general course take-up, and therefore course fee income, and/or contribute to further pressures in parking on the roads nearby to the centres. There are currently restrictions between 12 and 2 pm for non-residents at the Widmore Centre, no restrictions near the Poverest Centre, and no restrictions in one road near to the Kentwood Centre.
- 3.15 It may therefore only be feasible to charge for parking at the Widmore Centre with the current on-street parking policy, and it is intended that a verbal update will be provided at the meeting with more detailed projections.

- 3.16 Currently internal customers contribute approximately 50% of total room bookings income at Adult Education site. Room bookings were advertised internally through onebromley when the Education Development Centre was closed in March 2013.
- 3.17 Officers will seek to further promote room bookings internally, however this will only be of benefit to the authority as a whole if these bookings are made instead of paying for external bookings.

Blenheim and Community Vision Nurseries

- 3.18 Since April 2013, the council's two in-house nurseries, Blenheim and Community Vision have been operating as trading accounts, although not on a full cost recovery basis. They are currently projected to achieve an operating surplus of £87k in 2014/15.
- 3.19 The service is currently undergoing a market testing exercise as agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Education following the PDS meeting on 30th September. If the service is delivered by an external provider, then the surplus could be reduced dependent upon the rental income and any concession fee agreed.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Appendix 1 provides a summary of the latest approved income budgets for the education portfolio. Appendix 2 provides a summary of the budgets for each service that currently generates income from fees and charges.
- 4.2 The introduction of a £400 charge for moderation services as detailed in 3.7 above would generate an estimated £20k additional income per annum.

Conclusion

- 4.3 In considering any changes to the levels of fees and charges, the price elasticity of demand must be taken into account. This refers to the relationship between price and the level of demand. There are exceptions, e.g. certain high-end luxury goods, but the general rule is that as the price of goods or services increases, so the demand will be expected decrease.
- 4.4 The general view of service managers is that fees and charges are currently set at a rate which maximises income generated, and that any additional increases above inflation would result in a greater overall loss due to reduced take-up/ customer movement to competitors.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Court of Appeal has previously ruled that a council may not recover more than the actual cost incurred when charging for services, so this must be taken into account when setting the level of fees.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Executive, 12 th February 2014 - E&R PDS Costs, Charges and Recharges Working Group Report. Education PDS Committee & Education Select Committee 17 th July 2012 – Provision of Sold Services to Schools

This page is left intentionally blank

Education Portfolio Income
Latest Approved Budgets July 2014

	£
Adult Education	
117000 - Adult Education Centres	-2,498,940
117401 - Kentwood Centre	-31,500
117402 - Poverest Centre	-3,500
117403 - Widmore Centre	-31,860
117407 - Widmore Nursery	-97,590
117429 - Kentwood Nursery	-32,200
117445 - Social Care Provision	-8,000
117453 - Poverest Nursery	-49,800
117459 - Family Learning	-102,000
117462 - Family Projects FEMAL	-144,520
117471 - Lifelong Learning PCDL	-533,950
117472 - Neighbourhood Learning in Deprived Communities (NLDC) - Movii	-27,700
117502 - Community Fund Q2	-4,140
117503 - Non-Funded	-63,380
	<u>-3,629,080</u>
Workforce Development & Governor Services	
118333 - Governor Services Trading Account	-42,750
118334 - Workforce Development Trading Account	-62,750
	<u>-105,500</u>
Strategic Place Planning	
121034 - Admissions	-10,000
	<u>-10,000</u>
Alternative Education and Welfare Service	
121333 - Trading Account Education Welfare Service	-133,430
121533 - Trading Account Behaviour Support - Secondary	-355,120
	<u>-488,550</u>
Schools and Early Years Commissioning & QA	
121601 - Blenheim Nursery	-307,080
121602 - Community Vision Nursery	-393,220
122001 - School Standards	-12,110
	<u>-712,410</u>
SEN & Inclusion	
136034 - SEN Reform Implementation	-381,940
136334 - Trading Account Education Psychology Service	-110,430
136586 - Special Central - SEN Transport	-145,510
136598 - Special Central - SEN Recoupment & Outborough Fees	-1,330
	<u>-639,210</u>
Education Services Grant	
137100 - Education Services Grant	-2,732,000
	<u>-2,732,000</u>
Schools Budgets	
102000 - Primary Schools	-1,105,460
104000 - Secondary Schools	-1,973,100
106000 - Special Schools	-1,143,080
134582 - Secondary Central - Pupil Referral	-68,650
137000 - Dedicated Schools Grant and Pupil Premium	-112,620,620
	<u>-116,910,910</u>
Children's Social Care	
130000 - BYSP Delivery	-42,000
130440 - BYSP Central Costs	-67,690
132561 - Bromley Children's Project	-30,890
132567 - Trading Account PC-BP RSG Funded	-317,000
133603 - Blenheim Hub	-63,000
811900 - Community Vision Hub	-29,700
	<u>-550,280</u>
Grand Total	<u>-125,777,940</u>

This page is left intentionally blank

Education Portfolio Trading Accounts
Latest Approved Budgets July 2014

	136334 - Education Psychologists Trading Account £	121601 - Blenheim Nursery £	121602 - Community Vision Nursery £	118333 - Governor Service Trading Account £	118334 - Workforce Development Trading Account £	121333 - Education Welfare Trading Account £	117*** - Adult Education - 'Funded' £	117**** - Adult Education - 'Non-funded' £	117*** - Adult Education Nurseries £	132567 - Business Partnerships Trading Accounts £
Controllable										
Employees	83,580	213,170	309,700	23,720	26,840	84,470	1,782,427	305,413	165,400	262,260
Premises		30,970	33,260				195,338	61,562	2,400	
Transport	2,930	200	200	140	160	6,860	2,350	750	0	2,530
Supplies and Services	1,170	32,050	23,630	9,770	25,400	2,760	417,995	64,225	4,500	52,210
Third Party Payments		2,500	3,000							
Controllable Recharges		28,190	23,430	2,240	2,550		34,740	-9,860	0	
Gross controllable total	87,680	307,080	393,220	35,870	54,950	94,090	2,432,850	422,090	172,300	317,000
Income										
Maintained schools	-44,170			-22,100	-33,160					
Academies	-66,260			-17,900	-26,840	-133,430				-169,000
Internal Grants		-127,210	-126,840				-2,094,460			-125,000
Tuition fees							-1,028,934	-181,577		
Other		-179,870	-266,380	-2,750	-2,750		-18,801	-125,719	-179,590	-23,000
Total income	-110,430	-307,080	-393,220	-42,750	-62,750	-133,430	-3,142,195	-307,296	-179,590	-317,000
Net controllable total	-22,750	0	0	-6,880	-7,800	-39,340	-709,345	114,795	-7,290	0
Non-controllable										
Insurance	60	400	1,270	90	100	100	13,597	4,204	0	
Repairs & Maintenance							52,973	17,658	0	
Capital Charges							299,100	109,900	0	
Excluded Recharges	22,690	72,840	112,430	6,790	7,700	39,240	407,604	142,607	62,000	
Non-controllable total	22,750	73,240	113,700	6,880	7,800	39,340	773,273	274,368	62,000	0
Net total budget	0	73,240	113,700	0	0	0	63,928	389,162	54,710	0

This page is left intentionally blank

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income charges:

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

Adult Education is a non statutory service. A local authority has a duty under the Learning and Skills Act (2000) to provide “reasonable facilities” for persons of age 19 and over. In performing this duty of “reasonable facilities” the Council must “take account of facilities whose provision thinks might reasonably be secured by other persons” and “make best use of Council’s resources and in particular avoid provision which might give rise to disproportionate expenditure”.

The London Borough of Bromley receives an annual grant from the Skills Funding Agency to support the delivery of Adult Education. There are two strands to the grant, the Adult Skills Fund, which supports approved qualifications and adult English, literacy and numeracy courses (including learning for adults with learning disabilities), and the Community Learning Fund which supports non-qualification bearing learning activities.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis, following indicative funding information becoming available for the following academic year. Course fee changes are introduced at the start of each new academic year (September), with enrolment for those courses commencing in the preceding June.

3. Is the charge set by statute?

No

4. Is the level of charge set by statute?

No.

However, the SFA funding rules stipulates the fee concessions that are to be applied to courses funded under the Adult Skills Fund. See Q 13, (*information in italics*).

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not?

- **Political**
- **Means Tested**
- **Statutory**
- **Negative impact on the environment**
- **Other – please specify**

Where provision is supported by public funding this is used to subsidise the full cost recovery rate.

Provision that is exempt from public funding is charged at a non funded rate which is based on full cost recovery.

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

6. Who uses the service and when and can they go elsewhere?

Adults, 80% of whom are residents of the London Borough of Bromley, use this service. Attendance on courses takes place across the academic year, Monday – Saturday daytime and Monday – Thursday evening.

The Work Club at the Kentwood Centre in Penge operates on Monday and Tuesday mornings across 48 weeks of the year. This is accessed by unemployed local adults, some of whom are referrals from JCP. Some of the accredited provision for unemployed adults continues to run outside of the standard school term time, e.g. during July and August.

See Q14 for information about other providers offering some of the provision currently available at BAEC.

Where adults have children of school age they need to access courses where travel times will allow them to drop off and or/pick up children at school. Some students attending classes in the evening also need to access provision that is within a short travel time of their home, due to either their own or their partners commuting arrangements. Provision located out of borough would not be an option for many service users with these types of travel time restrictions.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

Historical data suggests that there will be a reduction in the numbers of fee-paying learners accessing the provision. Increasing fee rates in previous years has failed to increase the overall income derived from course fees. Anecdotal evidence indicates that when fees increase, some fee paying students choose to enrol on fewer courses, suggesting there is a ceiling on the amount of their disposable income they will use for their lifelong learning activities.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

Public consultation not required, although the Local Scheme of Delegation requires that the view of the BAEC Board of Governors is sought prior to any increase.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some customer groups? If yes, a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken.

As concessionary fees (see Q13) will continue to apply to priority groups providing any proposed increase is low, there is no evidence to indicate a disproportionate impact on any user groups.

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

The members of the public who are required to pay for their courses are accustomed to doing so. An increase in charges is seldom welcomed by the public, however most understand that rising costs in resources, utility bills and staff salaries inevitably lead to an increase in charges to service users. Providing increases are in line with inflation, they are generally accepted. When an increase greater than inflation was applied to the non-funded rate, this resulted in a reduction in enrolments, and subsequently income, for this type of provision

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? If you are not sure please seek advice from the VAT officer in finance.

Not subject to VAT

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Tutors are on sessional contracts, so only work when there are sufficient enrolments to make classes financially viable.

However, it is more difficult to vary the infrastructure costs on the same flexible model. Withdrawal from sites of delivery inevitably leads to a reduction in income, which off sets some of the efficiencies made.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

Course fee concessions apply as follows:

- *Eligible adult Skills Fund: Adults enrolling on courses that are approved for funding and who are in receipt of state benefits (other than state pension and child benefit) can access their course free of charge provided they can confirm they are actively seeking work and their course will help them to seek/gain employment.*
- *Eligible adults can enrol on adult literacy and numeracy classes free of charge regardless of their income levels.*
- *GCSE Maths and English course are free to any adult who has not previously achieved a GCSE pass at grades A* to C.*
- *16-18 year olds can access approved qualification courses free of charge, providing they can confirm that they are taking their course as part of their full time education or training. Otherwise they will be required to pay the non-funded (full cost recovery) rate.*
- Eligible adults enrolling on non-accredited courses supported by the Community Learning Fund and who are in receipt of state benefits (other than state pension and child benefit) are entitled to a reduction of 20% against the advertised fee.
- Family Learning provision, delivered in partnership with the School improvement Team will continue to be delivered free of charge to families.

Italics: These concessions are a requirement of the Skills Funding Agency as set out in their Funding Rules 2014/15.

There are no concessions for non-funded (full cost recovery) courses.

Benchmarking**14a. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the Council?**

There are no commercial training providers in Bromley operating the comprehensive range of services currently provided by BAEC. The wide range of non-accredited community learning courses is not replicated elsewhere in the borough.

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

There are private training providers that offer a few of the individual qualifications that BAEC include as part of their accredited offer. These include Health and Safety, Food Safety, Emergency Life Support, ECDL and Book keeping

Private leisure facilities – offer recreational yoga, Pilates, keep fit and badminton, however these do not routinely include the formal structured progression opportunities that users benefit from in an adult education setting.

A local commercial gardening centre offers a small number of qualification and recreational gardening courses.

The WEA, U3A and Bromley Arts Council have a very restricted local offer of non-accredited learning activities. These activities are predominantly held in the day time.

Bromley College of Further and Higher Education (BCFHE) offers a wide range of vocation training opportunities, but there are only a few areas of direct overlap with BAEC provision, mainly in the following accredited subjects; book-keeping, beauty therapy, counselling, English, maths and languages. In some subject areas the actual qualifications differ so direct comparisons are not really possible. For example the Level 1 Book-Keeping at BCFHE is the manual version, whilst BAEC offer the computerised version.

14b. If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Commercial Garden Centre charges approx £7.50 ph for the non accredited courses. This is a higher rate than the standard BAEC fee of £4.61 because BAEC is able to subsidise the fees using the community learning fund. However, it is worth noting that the class numbers are usually smaller in the commercial setting.

The WEA standard rate is £3.95 ph, which is less than the BAEC standard rate for short courses of £4.61, but marginally higher than the BAEC standard rate for long courses, which is £3.84. The WEA has charitable status and does not have the sort of infrastructure costs (incl premises) that are attached to the adult education service.

Private yoga and Pilates clubs rates vary between £6.00 - £10.00 ph. Private leisure clubs operate on a monthly membership rate which can give members access to similar classes. Monthly membership rates vary from £60.00 - £100.00. Non members can access clubs by paying a daily rate, usually approx £15.00. At Bromley Mytime there is a charge of £5.60 ph hour for a yoga class (members rate) whilst non members are charged £7.10. Standard Bromley Mytime Centre membership is currently £38.00 per annum.

For comparisons with fees charged for similar courses at BCFHE for the 2014/15 academic year, please see table below:

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

Course	BCFHE 2014/15		BAEC 2014/15		Comment
	Advertised Fee	Details	Advertised Fee	Details	
L1 Award Book keeping (manual – BCFHE; Computerised - BAEC)	£265.00	11 wks x 2.5 hrs Incl exam/reg costs	£287.00	12 wks x 3 hrs. Incl exam/reg costs	
L2 Intro to Counselling	£276.00	30 hrs. Excl exam costs	£364.00	34 hrs. Incl exam fees of £68.00	Hourly tuition rate BCFHE = £9.20; BAEC £8.70
L2 Cert in Counselling skills	£875.00	15 weeks Excl exam costs	£466.00	33 wks x 2.5 hrs. Incl exam costs	Course at BCFHE not supported by SFA funding
Non accredited French/Spanish	£220.00	2hrs x 15 weeks	£173.00	3hrs x 12 wks	Course at BCFHE not supported by SFA funding
BSL Level 1	£490.00	Tuition hrs not specified	£304.00	33wks x 2hrs	Course at BCFHE not supported by SFA funding

15a. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Course fees are reviewed on an annual basis and are usually increased in line with inflation for the start of each new academic year.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation? (The scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed).

All fee proposals are scrutinised by the BAEC Board of Governors. Increases above inflation are subject to member approval following scrutiny by the Governors.

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

Many private training providers who access funding from the Skills Funding Agency tend to increase fees in line with the start of the new funding year (i.e. August). However, those not accessing public funds will usually introduce fee increases for the start of the new financial year.

The monitoring of trend data over the last few years indicates that increases are usually in line with inflation. During the recession, some providers have frozen course fees for a period of time in an attempt to encourage enrolments.

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

16. How do charges compare to:

- **Similar councils?**
- **Neighbouring councils?**
- **Other service providers?**

The London Boroughs of Bexley, Sutton and Redbridge run adult education services that are similar to those of Bromley. Bexley, Croydon and Lewisham are the neighbouring boroughs with who we are mostly in competition with for students.

Bexley	Fees at Bexley Adult Education are similar to those at BAEC. Non accredited course fees average out at around £4.50 ph and vary depending on the type of course and costs associated with the delivery of the subject. Fees for accredited provision are closely aligned to those at BAEC.
Croydon	Fees for non accredited provision in Croydon are set at a slightly higher hourly rate than at BAEC, approximately £0.30 - £0.50p per hour higher. However, Concessionary fees are set at 70% of the full fee compared to 80% of the full fee at BAEC. Fees for accredited provision are closely aligned to those at BAEC.
Lewisham	Student fees at Lewisham adult education tend to be slightly lower than those at BAEC. This is because they provide fewer courses, but apply a greater subsidy from their SFA allocation. Concessionary fees are generally set at 50% of the full fee compared to 80% of the full fee at BAEC (i.e. a 20% reduction).
Redbridge	Fees for 2014/15 were not available for comparison at the time of writing this report. However a comparison of the 2013/14 fees indicated that adult education fees in Redbridge were slight lower than those in Bromley, ranging from £2.00 - £5.30 per hour for Community Learning and £2.80 - £.300 for qualification courses. Concessionary fees varied between 50% and 60% of the standard fee rate.
Sutton	Student fees at Sutton adult education are very similar to those at Bromley. Community Learning fees range from £2.50 to £6.00 per hour, fees on qualification courses from £3.00 - £3.30per hour and the full cost recovery fee is £8.50 per hour. Concessionary fees are set at 75% of the standard fee with no concessions for full cost recovery.

For comparisons with other service provider charges, please see 14b above.

- **How are charges structured, and why?**

Please see appendix 1 for information regarding the structure of BAEC course fees for the 2014/15 academic year.

Fees for the accredited courses are charged at a slightly lower hourly rate as these are considered a priority by the national Government and as such receive a higher subsidy. Where courses are more expensive to run, such as ICT, which requires specialist equipment, software and regular maintenance etc, both the fee rate and the paid subsidy are higher. Examination and qualification charges are set by the awarding bodies and are in addition to the tuition fee costs. These are all included in

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

the final advertised fee as appears in the printed brochure and on the website. SFA funding rules prevent BAEC from passing the exam and qualification charges on to those students who are in receipt of state benefits (other than state pension and child benefit) and accessing their course free of charge.

Fees for the non-accredited Community Learning courses fee rates vary depending on the subject being studied and the length of the course. Courses requiring specialist resources, such as cookery, some arts and crafts and ICT have a higher hourly rate to reflect the additional costs involved in providing the course. Within the subject types categories, rates are differentiated depending on the length of the course. This is to reflect the additional administrative costs involved when running a number of short courses compared to a long course that spans three terms. For example, a student enrolling on a 30 week painting and drawing class will only require one enrolment and one set of data processing for the SFA returns. However, if instead that same student enrolled on three separate art courses each term that would require three enrolments and three sets of SFA data processing. The hourly fee rate for the non-funded courses was originally based on the amount it costs the service to run a course per hour, including on-costs and overheads, assuming an average of 14 learners per class. Variations in the level of recharges applied to the service, and the time at which the service has been informed of these charges, has resulted in the inflationary increase on the fully funded rate not always reflecting the actual increase in on costs.

- **How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?**
- **What data will we need?**
- **Can we collect this data cost effectively?**
- **When should we next review our approach?**

Enrolments on courses are monitored routinely so that additional in-year planning can take place to adjust volumes and help the College meet its SFA targets. Termly milestone enrolment data is captured and this is compared with previous years to enable the impact of any changes to be considered. Enrolment data is routinely obtained from the College MIS and income from the financial monitoring system.

The Governors at the College hold termly student focus groups to gather the views of learners on a range of topics, including enrolment and fees. As part of the annual student survey, students are asked their views on the value for money of their course. This data is all used to help gauge impact on fee paying service users.

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?**
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?**

- a) No discounts are offered for advance payment. If this were implemented it could have a negative impact on course viability in some cases, requiring more enrolments to be achieved before financial viability is reached. Such a scheme could be difficult and time consuming. to administer as courses start

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

across the academic year, not just at the start of each term, so early booking windows would have to be applied at individual course level (over 1,300 courses planned each year).

- b) Fee income is collected at the point of enrolment. Students can enrol for their courses in person, via the telephone, online or by post. Online enrolments now make up approximately 26% of all enrolments. At the time of writing the adult education service has reviewed its incoming telephone calls planned, to identify if this part of the service could be delivered more cost effectively using the Contact Centre service. This will include telephone enrolments.

The service offers a structured payment plan for courses over 16 weeks to minimise financial barriers to lifelong learning where possible.

Other**18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals?**

Proposals for course fee increases are usually drawn up in January/February each year when the following variable information is known:

- Likely changes to funding grants for the next academic year
- Likely changes to funding rules for the next academic year
- First full term and initial start of second term enrolment data for current year (initial analysis of impact of previous changes to fees)
- LBB annual inflationary increase rate
- Plans for increases in neighbouring/similar borough adult education services that are under consideration or being proposed.

(Information as available June 2014)

Bromley Adult Education – Course Fees

Appendix 1

Summary Table of Tuition Fees 2014/15

Funding	Provision	2014/15 rate ph	Comments
ASF funded	Entry and Level One qualifications	3.08	10 wk x 2 hr = £62.00 25wk x 2 hrs = £154.00 (+ awarding body costs)
	Level 2 qualifications	3.25	30 wks x 2 hrs = £195.00 (+ awarding body costs)
	ESOL (English as a Second Language)	3.08	20 wks x 5 hrs = £308.00 (+ awarding body costs)
CL funded	Standard non-accredited (long courses)	3.94	28 wks x 2 hrs = £221.00
	Standard non-accredited (short courses)	4.73	12 wks x 2 hrs = £114.00
	Non accredited, specialist resources (long courses)	4.19	28 wks x 2 hrs = £235.00
	Non accredited, specialist resources (short courses)	5.00	12 wks x 2 hrs = £120.00
	ICT standard non accredited	6.00	6 wks x 2 hrs = £72.00
	Community Provision	3.08	12 wks x 2 hrs = £74.00
Non- Funded	One-day Saturday rate	8.71	6 hrs = £52.00
	English as a Foreign Language	8.71	12 wks x 4 hrs = £418.00
	ICT – high level	8.71	6 wks x 2 hrs = £105.00
	Self-Funded (incl L3 courses)	8.71	33 wks x 3 hrs + £863 (+ awarding body costs)
	Non EU rate	8.71	

This page is left intentionally blank

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income charges:

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

This is a non statutory service. The three adult education nurseries were set up, with support from the Skills Funding Agency (then known as the Learning and Skills Council), to provide flexible childcare to meet the specific needs of learners attending classes at BAEC. When it became clear that there was insufficient demand from learners alone to maintain the nurseries operating at a level that would generate sufficient income, the nurseries were opened to local residents as well as students and staff. This means that they now contribute to the provision of places which support the delivery of the Councils statutory sufficiency duty.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis once the service has been notified of the LBB inflationary increase being applied to budgets. Any increases are applied at the start of the academic year.

3. Is the charge set by statute?

No.

4. Is the level of charge set by statute?

No.

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not?

- **Political**
- **Means Tested**
- **Statutory**
- **Negative impact on the environment**
- **Other – please specify**

Fees and charges cover all direct costs. Only one of the nurseries generates sufficient income to cover the costs of all overheads. Market forces and the charges of other local providers were a key factor when determining the fees charged for this service.

6. Who uses the service and when and can they go elsewhere?

The service is used by students attending BAEC, staff working at the College and local parents. The nurseries are open term time only between 9.00 – 16.30. There are other local providers of pre-school childcare in Bromley.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

To date, increases in line with inflation have had little impact on the service. However, if the price is set too high, it will negatively impact on the occupancy of the provision.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

Consultation on fees are not required, although the Local Scheme of Delegation requires that the view of the BAEC Board of Governors is sought prior to any increase.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some customer groups? If yes, a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken.

No.

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

An increase in charges is seldom welcomed by the public, however most understand that rising costs in resources, utility bills and staff salaries inevitably lead to an increase in charges to service users. Providing increases are in line with inflation, they are generally accepted.

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? If you are not sure please seek advice from the VAT officer in finance.

No.

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Nursery assistants are employed on a sessional basis so that staffing costs can be adjusted to meet fluctuations in demand. There is a maximum capacity in each nursery and Ofsted staff ratios have to be adhered to.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

N/A

Benchmarking**14a. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the Council?**

Yes.

14b. If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Charges are broadly in line with other local provision

15a. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Charges are reviewed annually and increased in line with LBB inflationary figure. Changes to charges are implemented at the start of the academic year.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation? (The scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed).

Yes

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

Yes

16. How do charges compare to:

- **Similar councils?**
- **Neighbouring councils?**
- **Other service providers?**
- **How are charges structured, and why?**
- **How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?**
- **What data will we need?**
- **Can we collect this data cost effectively?**
- **When should we next review our approach?**

See Appendix for BAEC table of nursery charges.

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?**
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?**

Payment can be made by cash, debit/credit card or cheques and is made termly in advance. The nurseries also accept the Nursery Education grant for 3 and 4 year olds, the grant for 2 year olds and the salary sacrifice scheme.

BAEC has access to a grant, the Learner Support Fund, from the Skills Funding Agency which can be used to support the costs of childcare for learners in receipt of state benefits who are attending approved qualification courses.

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals?

APPENDIX

BAEC Nursery Fees 2013/14

	Age	2013/14 with increase
Hourly rate	0 - 2	£7.24
	2+	£6.15
Sessional rate (2.5 hrs)	0 - 2	£25.34
	2+	£21.53
Day rates		
Mon - Thur Fri	0 - 2	£54.33
		£48.87
Mon - Thur Fri	2+	£46.13
		£41.51

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income charges:

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

This is a non statutory service.

Room lettings provide a significant additional income to the adult education service. The Widmore Centre also provides a useful and convenient service to a broad range of sections of the Council, particularly since the closure of the EDC at Princes Plain, particularly when suitable accommodation for training activities and meetings is not available at the Civic Centre.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis once the service has been notified of the LBB inflationary increase being applied to budgets.

3. Is the charge set by statute?

No.

4. Is the level of charge set by statute?

No.

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not?

- **Political**
- **Means Tested**
- **Statutory**
- **Negative impact on the environment**
- **Other – please specify**

Charges are based on a full cost recovery model, taking into account the cost of admin time, caretaking, cleaning, utilities and general maintenance.

6. Who uses the service and when and can they go elsewhere?

The service is used by private sector organisations, the third sector and departments / teams within Bromley Council.

Bookings predominantly occur Monday – Friday between 9.00 – 16.00 hrs, with some occasional Saturday morning usage. One private sector organisation uses a significant number of rooms at the Kentwood Centre during July and August for the teaching of English to overseas students on cultural exchange visits.

There are private organisations that offer room hire for training and conference purposes. In addition, other departments within Bromley Council, such as the library service and the BEECHE, offer rooms for hire and there are various local community halls across the borough also available, some of which would be suitable for meetings and training activities.

Bromley Adult Education – Lettings

Within the neighbouring boroughs, the adult education services of both Bexley and Croydon Council offer room hire services.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

Historical data indicates that increases in line with inflation have no discernible change on the service, other than a slight increase in the income from this funding stream.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

Consultation on charges are not required.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some customer groups? If yes, a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken.

N/A

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

Providing increases are in line with inflation, they are generally accepted by users.

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? If you are not sure please seek advice from the VAT officer in finance.

Not subject to VAT, except for the hire of the Sports Hall which is subject to VAT for casual users.

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Lettings are a secondary service to the provision of adult learning and training activities, which are given priority. As such, the offer of rooms for hire is limited at any given time to those spaces not in use for learning and training activities. This places an upper limit on both the type and volume of accommodation available. A decrease in demand will have a negative impact on the service income that is not derived from public grants.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

No concessions available.

Benchmarking**14a. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the Council?**

There are a variety of other providers offering venues and rooms for hire, both in the private and public sector. Hotels, private clubs and training organisations advertise room hire stated as suitable for meetings, conferences and training activities. However, the majority of those advertised are large spaces more suited to conferences and private functions than small team meetings. Other smaller organisations, such as local churches and Bromley Arts Council also advertise rooms and halls for hire for a range of activities. There are also a wide range of community and village halls available for hire across the borough, mostly run by the voluntary sector.

14b. If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Room hire charges vary considerably across the borough, depending on facilities available, standard of accommodation and the market being targeted. For example, charges for room hire at the commercial hotels are considerably higher than at BAEC. Rates are usually charged by the day or half day, rather than at an hourly rate, and include refreshments and stationary (pads, pens etc). In some cases, day rates also include the use of other hotel leisure facilities such as gym, steam room etc.

At Bromley Parish Church room hire rates vary from £9.00 ph for a small committee room that seats up to 15, up to £80.00 for a minimum 4 hour session in a small hall that can accommodate up to 80 people. Rooms are available for hire at the Bromley Arts Council, Ripley Centre, from £8.50 ph up to £68.65, depending on size and type of room required. All bookings are for a minimum period of three hours and charges are in 6 bands based around peak/off peak charges and hirer category, with affiliated members in the lowest bands and commercial organisations in the most expensive.

15a. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Charges at BAEC are reviewed annually and are usually increased in line with inflation.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation? (The scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed).

Yes.

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

Insufficient information available.

16. How do charges compare to:

- **Similar councils?**
- **Neighbouring councils?**
- **Other service providers?**

The adult education services in the neighbouring boroughs of Bexley and Croydon both offer a room hire service. There are also other departments in Bromley Council that offer room hire, including the Library service, BEECHE and various local community halls. Charges tend to vary and are structured around the organisation or departments main business needs and hours of operation.

Charges in neighbouring councils

Hourly room hire charges at the adult education service in Bexley range from £15.75 to £23.50 per hour depending on the type of room and specialist equipment required. Croydon adult education services charges range from £25.00 ph (minimum 2 hrs) up to £60.00 depending on the type of room and the times required.

Bromley Adult Education – Lettings

Charges in other LBB departments

Room rental rates in Bromley libraries generally range from £9.50 ph up to £41.00 ph depending on the size of room and the times required. However, Bromley Central Library also has on offer a small interview room from £3.40 ph and a small training room (max 8 people) from £4.75 ph. All room hire is for a minimum of 2 hours.

Charges are based around three bands with the lowest rates applied to charities, local government and local play groups, 60+ groups etc and the highest band applied to the commercial sector.

At the BEECHE charges are usually applied on a half or full day basis and range from £115.57 (half day, off peak) up to 220.63 (full day, peak season). Additional charges are made for use of equipment.

There are a wide range of community and village halls available for hire across the borough.

- **How are charges structured, and why?**
- **How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?**
- **What data will we need?**
- **Can we collect this data cost effectively?**
- **When should we next review our approach?**

Please see Appendix for current room hire charges at BAEC. Charges are routinely reviewed on an annual basis as part of the review of all fees and charges in the adult education service. Recommendations by service officers are discussed at Governors meetings before being seeking chief officer approval.

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?**
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?**

Payment is required in advance upon receipt of invoice, or by internal journal transfer where the hirer is part of Bromley Council.

Where the room hire contract is for a regular booking across an academic year (or similar period of time) such as in the case of the U3A or WEA, invoices are raised on a termly basis. All processes comply with LBB financial regulations.

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals?

N/A

Room letting charges BAEC 2014/15

Organisation	Hourly Rate	Daily Rate
Standard Classroom Rate	£22.50	£160
Conference Room (KW)	£45.00	£322
EDC 3 Rate (Widmore)	£45.00	£322
Main Hall Rate (Widmore)	£55.00	£428
Sports Hall Rate (Widmore)	£28.00	N/A

Fees are per hour, with a 15 minute lead time either side of booking made.
Please note that the hourly rates are for room hire only.

This page is left intentionally blank

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income charges:

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

There is currently no statutory element to provide training for School Governors. However, the government places high regard on the recruitment and training of School Governors with a focus on becoming 'more professional'. In light of the recent Birmingham "Trojan Horse" scandal, Ofsted is placing even higher importance of the correct training of school governors. Ofsted reports judge Governance under Leadership and Management and make reference to Governor training undertaken.

The service also provides training for NQTs and early years providers, both of which are also non statutory. The council provides this service in order to maintain an influence over the quality of the teaching and learning in schools and the quality of the care in early year's providers within the borough. This supports the schools in achieving and maintaining the expected high standards as defined in Building a Better Bromley

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates. ,

3. Is the charge set by statute?

No.

4. Is the level of charge set by statute?

No.

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not?

- **Political**
- **Means Tested**
- **Statutory**
- **Negative impact on the environment**
- **Other – please specify**

Training is charged at full cost recovery rate.

6. Who uses the service and when and can they go elsewhere?

The service is used by local schools and early year's providers. Training runs daytime Mon-Fri and evenings Mon- Thurs. Occasionally training events take place on a Saturday morning.

There are other providers in the region who offer similar services.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

Adult education took over the management of this service in April 2013 and holds insufficient historical track data to make reasonably accurate predictions on the

Bromley Adult Education – Workforce Development and Governor Services Training

impact of fee increases. Anecdotal information suggests that increases in line with inflation are usually considered acceptable by most users and therefore impact is expected to be minimal.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

Consultation on fees are not required

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some customer groups? If yes, a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken.

N/A

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

Anecdotal information suggests that increases in line with inflation are usually considered acceptable by most users.

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? If you are not sure please seek advice from the VAT officer in finance.

Not subject to VAT

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

As more local schools convert to academy status the statutory element of this service reduces.

The majority of trainers are employed on casual basis so it is easy to adjust some of offer to meet demand. A small element of the training is delivered by school improvement advisory team as part of their responsibilities.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

No concessions in this area of work.

Benchmarking

14a. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the Council?

The Warren Teaching School Alliance is the main competitor for schools workforce development within the borough. They offer a support programme for NQT's, science, maths and literacy forums as well as a programme aimed at good teachers who aspire to become outstanding. Information on the offer and charges for the 2014/15 academic year was not available for comparison at the time of completing this template.

The main competition for Governor Support services comes from neighbouring local councils (see Q16). However, the type of programme on offer varies, presumably to meet local council priorities and their local school needs.

14b. If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

See Q16 below for information on charges in Bromley and neighbouring boroughs where some comparisons are available. Local councils structure their training

Bromley Adult Education – Workforce Development and Governor Services Training

packages differently with differing volumes and levels of training available and there are no like for like comparisons available. Many other local authorities have service level agreements with private sector organisations with the training forming part of the contracted package. The training is focussed on a mix of national priorities and changes along with local priorities and needs.

15a. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

All fees and charges are reviewed on an annual basis once the service has been notified of the LBB inflationary increase being applied to budgets. Any increases are applied at the start of the academic year. For the 2014/15 academic year fees and charges were increased by 2.5% compared to 2013/14.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation? (The scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed).

Yes

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

No information currently available.

16. How do charges compare to:

- **Similar councils?**
- **Neighbouring councils?**
- **Other service providers?**
- **How are charges structured, and why?**
- **How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?**
- **What data will we need?**
- **Can we collect this data cost effectively?**
- **When should we next review our approach?**

Bromley Governor Services Training Costs

2014-15	£615 price if purchased before 31 st July £675 price if purchased after 31 st July	Increase of 2.5% from 2013/14
---------	---	----------------------------------

Other neighbouring Council Governor Services Training Costs 2014-15

2014-15	Bexley	Up to £940
2014-15	Croydon	£2400 SLA
2014-15	Greenwich	£500 (clerking £2500)
2014-15	Kent	£200 for 1 st 100 pupils then £1.30 per pupil thereafter.
2014-15	Lambeth	£800
2014-15	Lewisham	Awaiting response
2014-15	Southwark	Awaiting response

Payment Methods**17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?**

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?**
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?**

Early Years providers pay fees by debit or credit card at time of booking the place on the training course or event. Schools pay via invoice or journal transfer which is processed after the booking. These methods of payment were put in place following feedback from the service users.

- a) There is an advance payment discount for the Governor Services Support Package, see Q 16
- b) The administrative processes in place are not overly bureaucratic and are in line with council financial regulations.

Other**18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals?**

N/A

Information correct at 24/06/2014

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income Charges.

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

This is not a statutory service, but it does provide places which support the delivery of the Councils statutory sufficiency duty. The service is subject to a market testing exercise which will determine the best governance arrangement for the service, and outsource if necessary.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposed increase would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis and increased in line with inflation., Fee changes are introduced at the start of each new financial year.

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No, but is influenced by the amount of funding provided for statutory Early Years places provided

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

➤ Political

➤ Mean Tested

➤ Statutory

Blenheim and Community Vision Nurseries

- Negative impact on the environment

- Other – please specify

The charges have been set to cover the cost of providing the service, whilst still being in line with other similar provision in the area to ensure our provision is competitively priced..

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

The service provides Free Early Education places for 2,3 and 4 year olds and full day care places for working parents and those accessing full time training.

There is alternative provision in the environs, but places are under pressure, particularly full day care places for babies.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

If the places are not priced competitively parents will be unable to afford places and this will negatively impact on the occupancy of the provision, and ultimately its continued sustainability.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

We have already committed to review the charges annually in April. There would need to be due notice given if this was going to be changed.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

The services are situated in areas of need, and as such any increase would adversely impact on those who are on low income or reliant on benefits.

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

There have been few adverse comments about the current pricing policy and parents are used to having to pay for full day care.

Blenheim and Community Vision Nurseries

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

Yes there are a variety of other commercial providers offering childcare and Free Early Education places. These consist of childminders, pre-schools, school nurseries and full day care nurseries. However, our 2 nurseries are in areas of need, where other high quality provision is at a premium.

- 14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Blenheim and Community Vision Nurseries

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

yes

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

yes

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils?
- Neighbouring councils?
- Other service providers?
- How are charges structured, and why?

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
- What data will we need?
- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
- When should we next review our approach?

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable? No – this would not be in line with the market involved

b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient? Yes – fees are collected at point of delivery. An invoicing and tracking system is in place and utilised by both nurseries.

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

There are a small number of bad debts which are rigorously followed up. This is usual for this type of service

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income Charges.

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

Yes. The EPS currently provides a free statutory service and also provides charged assessment and consultation services which enable schools to understand and meet their pupils' needs more effectively.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

The proposed change is from partial to full cost recovery.

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No the charge however is at market value.

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

➤ Political

➤ Mean Tested

➤ Statutory

The EPS is currently required to provide a statutory service at no charge to schools.

➤ Negative impact on the environment

➤ Other – please specify

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

Schools make referrals to the EPS when they have concerns about the special educational needs of their pupils. They can access independent educational psychologists for non- statutory work. Independent advice will often be accessed from psychologists who will have no understanding of the context of Bromley schools and therefore will not have the “inside knowledge” of what is available locally.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

The current relationship with schools may change and EPs may find that they need to accept referrals based on school request rather than agreed criteria.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

There have been variations in the rate of referral to the EPS across different schools, although this is still subject to change as schools adapt to the new system. This could indicate that some schools may not be referring pupils who they might have referred before charges were introduced.

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

There has been a recent complaint by a school and a Cllr regarding not enough services being available for schools. There is a risk of this increasing.

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Level of staffing may be harder to predict and service demand may vary at different times of the year. Less of this intervention to maintain pupils in schools and other provisions may result in higher exclusion levels and lower identification of a range of needs.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

Statutory services are currently provided at no cost.

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

- 14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

The Bromley EPS service charges were set at a competitive level, slightly below some local providers..

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Not currently planned but will need to be revisited.

- 15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

Yes

- 15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

Education Psychology

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils?
- Neighbouring councils?
- Other service providers?
- How are charges structured, and why?

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
- What data will we need?
- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
- When should we next review our approach?

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?

b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

Extending the charge to all EPS services could result in inequity across schools with some buying in services much more frequently than others. This could mean that some pupils who currently have access to the service may not in the future.

It is also possible that schools will become more subject to parental pressure when making referrals rather than adhering to previously agreed referral criteria. This could result in EPs seeing pupils at lower levels of need whilst more needy pupils are not referred.

The important relationship between schools and EPs may change with the introduction of a commercial dimension.

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income Charges.

- 1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

Yes we are required to be able to offer moderation to all schools including academies. Maintained schools have to use us to moderate, and we provide this free as we are funded to do so. Academies can choose to use another moderation service, however we have to provide it if they wish, but we can charge them.

- 2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

New charge

- 3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No

- 4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

- 5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

- Political

- Mean Tested

- Statutory

- Negative impact on the environment

Moderation Services

➤ Other – please specify

The charge will be based on the charge for similar functions within the available market

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

All Infant and Primary schools use the service. Academies can choose to use another LA, but we are required to offer a service

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

Negligible

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

No

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

N/A

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

N/A

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

N/A

Moderation Services

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

We are required to have a service by statute, charging Academies will help to offset our costs as funding is only made available for LA maintained schools

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

N/A

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council? N/A

- 14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

N/A

- 15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

N/A

- 15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

N/A

Moderation Services

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils? Charges will be set to be in line with other services provided.
- Neighbouring councils? As above
- Other service providers? Other service providers don't exist at present
- How are charges structured, and why? Charge covers the cost of providing training to school staff on moderation and the cost of the staff who undertake the moderation process

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges? Review Annually
- What data will we need? Take up of the service
- Can we collect this data cost effectively? Yes
- When should we next review our approach? When there are further changes to the moderation process

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable? No

b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient? Yes

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

Risk that Bromley Academies will not choose to use Bromley's moderation service once a charge is made. As there is only a small in house team, with additional staff being commissioned separately, the service can be quickly reduced to meet demand.

DRAFT TEMPLATE

Checklist of questions all managers will need to consider when setting income Charges.

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

The Education Welfare Service comprises of both Statutory and non Statutory elements. The statutory element places a duty on the LA to investigate poor attendance and hold parents to account via legal intervention and disposal through the court system. Whilst the non-statutory element comprises of early intervention and preventative strategies, which in turn would lessen the need for legal disposal. All Bromley maintained schools received this service.

At the onset of the Academy agenda 2010, it was the policy that Education Services develop service delivery to Academies in order to maintain income, that was then devolved direct to Academies which had previously been paid into the LA through Direct Schools Grant.

Subsequently, members have confirmed that long term Bromley will not be delivering Sold Services in Bromley, however it has been agreed to sustain a Sold Service delivery for inclusion of market testing for Education Services, the outcome of which will be known in 2015.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Education Welfare is currently operating on a full cost recovery. Income has exceeded budget set. The directive given was not to develop and expand. Charging levels have been reviewed , however remain unchanged. This will be reviewed in line with any income target changes or restructuring .

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

Education Welfare Service

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

➤ Political

➤ Mean Tested

➤ Statutory

➤ Negative impact on the environment

➤ Other – please specify

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

Schools and Colleges. Private providers in the market, however limited.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

There is a possibility that an increase in charge will result in clients seeking alternatives in the market place. The consequence of this could be a reduction in staffing levels.

However as staff do not gate keep and oversee preventative measures, an increase could occur in statutory delivery with the potential of not having the staff to provide the LA statutory duty.

Schools that had previously chosen to go with private providers, have since returned to LA

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

No consultation in terms of charging . Yes, consultation in terms of restructuring staff would be required

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

No

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

NA

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

Yes – however schools are able to reclaim

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Please see 7

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

At present no, however rates for MATS are being reviewed

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Yes. Unable to ascertain rates. Private Companies do not disclose rates in public domain

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

No

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

NA

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

NA

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils?
- Neighbouring councils?
- Other service providers?
- How are charges structured, and why?

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
- What data will we need?
- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
- When should we next review our approach?

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use? **Neither – makes no difference**

a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable? NA

b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient? YES

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

No proposals to change model that is being put forward for market testing

Sold Service Review September 2014

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

Bromley Work Experience Network, Service Package, Pre-Placement Visit Service and Placement Provision

Under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, the LA is responsible for the approval of work experience schemes for school age children. It is able to delegate this authority to the governing bodies of schools including Academies, Free and Independent Schools. However, it retains responsibility for monitoring the standards of schemes, including ensuring that they comply with local, regional and national standards and that they fulfil their duty of care for their students by placing them safely and appropriately.

To help the LA fulfil its statutory responsibilities, Bromley Education Business Partnership, provides a package of work experience services for schools which gives them the tools to deliver a high quality scheme. The package includes training, professional development opportunities and arrangements for sharing information and good practice. Collectively the schools buying into the package form the Bromley Work Experience Network and ensure

- there is a safe and consistent approach to the organisation of work experience schemes in the Borough
- there is a critical mass large enough to enable the services can be offered on a cost effective basis
- schools and employers can benefit from information sharing arrangements which reduces the administrative burden on all parties

Bromley EBP provides a placement finding and management service for colleagues in other LBB Departments e.g. SEN, LAC and the Behaviour Service, and for schools and colleges looking to provide alternative locations and styles of learning for young people struggling to access the school curriculum because of learning, behaviour or other issues. By successfully placing young people in work experience placements, either on a short or long term basis, BEBP contributes to the Council's obligations for raising the participation age, reducing the number of young people who are NEET or at risk of becoming so and tackling youth unemployment.

BEBP also provides a pre-placement visit service for schools/colleges in the Borough and for external agencies who wish to buy into it. The aim of a pre-placement visit is to assess the suitability of an employer as a work experience provider. BEBP provides this service because

- 1) it can - it has a very extensive database of employers who have offered work experience placements in recent years and whether or not they have a PPV in place and can share this information with those who need to know.
- 2) It's desirable for it to do so – as it allows BEBP to retain an overview of which employers in the Borough are providing work experience and which may offer other opportunities to young people to enhance their employability skills.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Existing charges apply.
Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis, following indicative funding information becoming available for the following academic / financial year.

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

The delivery plan and charges for the Bromley EBP Work Experience Network and Placement Provision Programmes are based on recovery of controllable expenditure only, as the trading account was not set up as full cost recovery. The service is profiled to balance salaries, overheads and specific training expenditure or resources with income that is generated through sold service revenue plus contribution from LBB for statutory duties and income generated from national funding through external contracts.

➤ Political

➤ Mean Tested

➤ Statutory

This service satisfies the statutory obligations of the Council and is part funded by the Council.
Charges for discretionary or bespoke services are based on an assessment of the cost of staff time required to deliver the service plus any necessary resources and expenses, plus a percentage uplift to cover management costs, overheads and other administrative costs.

Bromley EBP – Work Experience Network and Placement Provision

- Negative impact on the environment

- Other – please specify

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

The Work Experience Service Package is available, on a renewable annual basis, to all secondary schools who operate a work experience scheme for pupils in Y10 and Y11. It is predominantly bought by Bromley schools but several schools in the London Borough of Bexley also buy into it.

The package has been developed in consultation with SMTs in Bromley schools/colleges and with the Bromley Work Experience Network so that it meets the specific needs of Bromley schools. No other organisation offers exactly the same service. If they wished Bromley schools could approach organisations who organise work experience schemes on behalf of schools (rather than provide services to enable them to do themselves. This includes Capital South (formerly Croydon EBP), Lewisham Work Experience (part of Lewisham Council) or the Skills Team at Greenwich Council. However, in the first instance, these organisations would refer schools/colleges back to Bromley EBP, who would do the same if the situation was reversed.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

If charges increase to the extent that some members withdraw then it would be necessary to either reduce the service offer or further increase charges to remaining members. If schools/colleges withdraw and decide to 'go it alone' the benefits of partnership working and economies of scale are lost.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

The Bromley Work Experience Coordinators Networks and SMTs in schools/colleges would need to be consulted. This would not necessarily be a lengthy process. Initial consultation could take place at a network meeting of work experience co-ordinators which are held termly.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

No

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

Not applicable

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

No

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Yes.
BEBP employs a number of staff on casual hours contracts thus ensuring that the service not only copes efficiently with the natural peaks and troughs of demand for placement finding and pre-placement vetting that occur during the year but also adapts to variation in customer demand for support with new placement programmes or as new contracts arise.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

We do not always charge colleagues in other Council Departments for finding and managing work experience placements for young people for whom they are responsible e.g. LAC.

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

No, historically, Education Business Partnerships have provided a service finding and managing work experience placements for schools and colleges in their area. In London this tended to be on a Borough basis. So, each EBP usually only provided services for schools/ colleges in their area

However, following the ending of government funding for education business link services, including work experience, some EBPs have ceased to exist and others have been re-formed on a different basis, e.g. as charitable trusts or commercial organisations. This has opened up the potential for competition but commercial providers are not yet operating in Bromley, primarily because of the very strong links that BEBP has built up with schools/colleges over many years, the very specific service it provides and its value for money.

Bromley EBP – Work Experience Network and Placement Provision

14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Not applicable

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Charges are agreed and set in consultation with the Bromley Work Experience Network according to the service level deemed appropriate for the coming year. Increases have not exceeded inflation in the past and there are no plans to increase these in the future.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

Yes

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

N/A

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils?
- Neighbouring councils?
- Other service providers?
- How are charges structured, and why?

Bromley EBP – Work Experience Network and Placement Provision

Service/Activity	Price	Description
Work Experience Support Package	£1250	Package of services to enable subscribers to deliver high quality work experience schemes. Includes network meetings, annual training, access to databases, pre-placement visits, help line, and resources.
Scheme Management Support	£1450 plus other pay as you go charges	Includes help with scheme planning, placement checking, liaison with parents/carers and employers, co-ordination of placement paperwork
Placement Finding Support	£95 per student per placement	Help with finding short term placements for students looking for general experience of the world of work or to support a particular course or curriculum area
Extended Placement Provision	£990 per student per academic year	Providing long term placements e.g. one or two days a week for students who need vocational experience or who would benefit from an alternative style and location to learning in school.
Pre-Placement Visit Service	£55 per visit	Visits to employers to assess, in advance of the placement, their suitability as placement providers
Basic training for new work experience co-ordinators	£100 per person	Introduction to the role, training in procedures, systems and standards
Annual update training for work experience co-ordinators	£100 per person	Continuous professional development
Network meetings for work experience co-ordinators	£100 per person	Opportunities to share good practice, air and address common concerns, find out more about services and activities provided by BEBP
Student Placement Finding	£225 per half day workshop	Information for young people about how to maximise their chances of finding work experience placements

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
- What data will we need?
- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
- When should we next review our approach?

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

For Work Experience Network, partners receive an invoice at the start of the summer term. This invoice is for services through-out the academic year ending July.

Schools can pay in either the Summer or Autumn term depending on the budget-setting relating to their academic year funding.

Invoices for placement provision and additional pre-placement visits are raised retrospectively on a termly basis to avoid the inconvenience of proforma invoices.

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?

Bromley EBP – Work Experience Network and Placement Provision

The invoicing is done as a bulk request and payments are tracked monthly through FBM along with other transactions. The process for LBB is as efficient as we can make it and for partners an annual or termly charge (as applicable) saves the inefficiencies of 'pay as you go' arrangements and irregular demands per placement or visit unit .

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

--

This page is left intentionally blank

Sold Service Review September 2014

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

Educational visits that are organised by Council employees and employers in other educational establishments are managed under the duties associated with the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (also referred to as HSWA, the HSW Act, the 1974 Act or HASAWA). This is the primary piece of legislation covering occupational health and safety in Great Britain. The Health and Safety Executive, with local authorities (and other enforcing authorities) is responsible for enforcing the Act and a number of other Acts and Statutory Instruments relevant to the working environment. The Local Authority is responsible for the management of health and safety in settings where it is the employer. This extends to the health and safety of employees and to anybody who is affected by the 'business' it is engaged in. The management of educational visits falls fully under the Act and its regulations.

The Council cannot entirely devolve its duties as an employer but it can delegate these providing it sets standards, monitors provision and enforces requirements. The Council is also required to share good practice with others and to work in partnership with educational establishments in Bromley in order to secure Safeguarding for young people.

The Educational Visits Training and Support Package is designed to supplement the basic statutory service associated with these terms and provides an equitable offer to all Bromley establishments through the Bromley Educational Visits Network regardless of whether the Council is the employer or not. By opening the service to educational establishments where the Council is not the employer it:

- a) ensures there is a consistent approach both to safeguarding and to this valuable aspect of educational provision for young people
- b) secures a critical mass to enable the service to work cost effectively for all
- c) provides a one stop shop for external partners who provide other related services of benefit to the Council and local educational establishments.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis, following indicative funding information becoming available for the following academic / financial year.

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

The delivery plan and charges for the Educational Visits Service are based on recovery of controllable expenditure only, as the trading account was not set up as full cost recovery. The service is profiled to balance expenditure on salaries, overheads and specific training expenditure, membership of the Council for Learning Outside the Classroom (CLOtC) and resources with income that is generated through the sold service package plus contribution from LBB for statutory duties.

Prices for training courses are dependent on group size for viability. Bromley is not currently running group training other than for Education Visits Administrators (EVAs) due to the long-term sickness absence of the LBB in-house trainer. Similar charges would apply if the service were to buy-in a trainer in order to run a borough based group course. At present we are signposting a third party provider to ensure that Education Visits Co-ordinators (EVC) Basic Training is available.

➤ Political

➤ Mean Tested

➤ Statutory

This service satisfies the statutory obligations of the Council and is part funded by the Council. The SLA contribution made by service users reduces the financial burden on the Council.

➤ Negative impact on the environment

➤ Other – please specify

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

The Educational Visits Service Package is available to all Council departments, schools and other Bromley based educational establishments. It provides a range of training/monitoring, help-line, educational visit logging software, out-of-

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

hours emergency support, membership to CLOtC and signposting to other services/partners. The package is renewable annually. For discretionary/pay as you go aspects of the service, such as certificated training courses, users can access a number of other providers and the Educational Visits Service already signposts Network members to these providers where feasible especially if it is not cost effective for the Bromley team to run a bespoke course.

Heads of Services and Governing Bodies in educational establishments where the Council is the employer cannot go elsewhere because the Council does not hold a service level agreement with another Local Authority or provider to cover its statutory duties. These duties could be delegated through an appropriate agreement but cannot be devolved and it would still be necessary for Bromley Council to monitor educational visits arrangements being made by these teams, units or schools.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

The costs of the service are shared across all Network members. If charges increase to the extent that some members withdraw then it would be necessary to either reduce the service offer or further increase charges to remaining members. In the event that all external clients were lost the Council would need to fully cover the costs of fulfilling its duties to services and education settings where it is the employer.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

The Bromley Educational Visits Forum would need to be consulted initially with recommendations being taken to the next Education Safety Group meeting for information. This should be followed by a full consultation with all Network members – ideally including presentation at the Annual Update for EVCs in January. Any changes to charges would take place in-line with the notice periods stated in the Council's current contract for sold services.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

No

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

Not applicable

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

No

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

The Council can adjust if demand increases.
If demand falls the service would adjust to ensure statutory obligations and limited support were available to remaining members

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

Provision for Council departments is funded by the Council.

Schools where the Council is the employer receive a £100 discount on their relevant charge band.

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

No not for the provision of a SLA covering legal duties, support, advice, management systems and monitoring.

Local Authorities all run a similar service in their own areas, we belong to the Outdoor Education Advisers Panel (OEAP) and meet both nationally and regionally to drive this agenda. Some Local Authorities have teamed up to provide full approval services but most maintain a bespoke service according to the local needs.

Commercial providers generally offer a different product which Bromley does not currently provide – typically training courses, visit venues and adventure activities. We work in partnership with these providers and signpost their service offer to the whole Network thus ensuring consistency and cost effectiveness for all parties – and access to light touch monitoring in respect of the Council's duties. Typically we work closely with:
Widehorizons is our closest approved provider delivering the nationally certificated training for EVCs and charges £100 plus VAT (not including lunch) for EVC Basic Training or Visit Leader Training. This is cheaper than Bromley can offer. Widehorizons also provides a wide range of outdoor learning and adventure activity leader training (including National Governing Body accreditation).

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

The Council for Learning Outside the Classroom provides short courses and INSET. Surrey LA provides Snowsport Organiser accredited courses – we signpost Bromley teachers to its courses – or if there are enough people needing training in Bromley then the Outdoor Education Adviser from Surrey will run a Bromley based course for us.

14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Bromley is not in competition with other providers.

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Charges are agreed and set by the Bromley Educational Visits Forum according to the service level deemed appropriate for the coming year. Increases have not exceeded inflation in the past and there are no plans to increase these in the future.

15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed)?

Yes

15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

N/A

16. How do charges compare to:

➤ Similar councils?

The Outdoor Education Advisers' Panel (OEAP) is a national body of Council representatives with responsibility for outdoor learning and educational visits. Members hold informal discussions but it is not common practice for Panel members to publish commercially sensitive data

➤ Neighbouring councils?

Bromley offers a minimal service for Educational Visits. Most neighbouring Councils offer a full vetting and approval system including the approval of various outdoor adventure providers for use by their schools thus taking full responsibility for this function.

Discussion between OEAP members in 2012 muted the benchmark of £1 per pupil per annum for full service provision but this was not confirmed

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

and no further discussions have been held at regional level. Charges vary widely and a few examples for SE region of OEAP are given below.

NB – These charges are not necessarily directly comparable to Bromley because they generally include a full Council-led visit approval service in addition to training, advice and resources. A full-time post at senior officer level (with specialist training in managing health & safety and teaching/leading outdoor education activities) is assigned to these duties. In Bromley we provide light touch monitoring but the approval of educational visits is delegated to Governing Bodies and Heads of Services. Our training and support service provides the management advice and monitoring system that they need to run activities.

Example 1

SLA works out to about £2 a head, that can vary a little depending on how many residential trips happen in a year as there is an additional charge for a residential.

Example 2

£1 per pupil, plus a £200 charge for EVOLVE. Currently looking at charges for academies and private schools, which has – to date – been the same as for state maintained schools.

Example 3

£1 per head per annum for academies. The educational visits service is provided free of charge for maintained and VA schools (i.e. where the Council is the employer)

Example 4

Charge £2.00 pp to academies. Have just started charging maintained schools, on a scale from £0.45p to £0.85p from Infants to secondary.

Example 5

Charge of £1.03 per pupil per academic year.

Example 6

Academies pay £1 per head per annum for a service level agreement. The educational visits service is provided free of charge for maintained and VA schools (i.e. where the Council is the employer).

- Other service providers?
Not applicable as no other provider current offers this service in Bromley
- How are charges structured, and why?
The delivery plan and charges for the Educational Visits Service are based on full cost recovery of Controllable expenditure. The service is profiled to balance salaries, overheads and specific training expenditure or resources with income that is generated through the sold service package plus contribution from LBB for statutory duties.

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

Service Package 2014-15 Financial Year	EV001	£200	Infant Schools up to 180 pupils
	EV002	£265	Infant Schools more than 180 pupils
	EV003	£200	Junior or Primary Schools up to 180 pupils
	EV004	£265	Junior or Primary Schools between 180 and 310 pupils
	EV005	£335	Junior or Primary Schools between 311 and 500 pupils
	EV006	£400	Junior or Primary Schools more than 500 pupils
	EV007	£595	Secondary Schools and Colleges (including Academies and Independents)
	EV008	£265	Special Schools
Training Courses 2014-15 Financial Year	EV009	£175 per person	Educational Visits Coordinator (EVC) – New Coordinator Basic Training / Refresher Training (1 Day)
	EV010	£175 per person	Visit Leader Training (1 Day)
	EV011	£175 per person	Outdoor Visit Leader Training (1 Day)
	EV013	£150 per person (free to Service Package subscribers)	Educational Visits Administrator (EVA) Training (1 Day)
Other Educational Visits bespoke training, in-school sessions and consultancy by negotiation	EV014	(tba)	(tba)

➤ How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
At notice deadline for schools to drop-out of LBB contract for this service. This is on a rolling basis but as it is renewable annually with no refund for part year it is easy to assess in the run up to each new financial year.

➤ What data will we need?
Membership of the Network confirmed in various cost bands
Income to be generated on confirmed membership if costs remain the same

Educational Visits Service – Training and Support Package.

Profiled costs of running proposed service for coming year to include salaries, resources, training venues/hospitality/speakers, overheads.

- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
We hold this information – this is how we balance the financial profile each year.
- When should we next review our approach?
Indicative membership will need to be reviewed prior to the confirmation of charges and issue of invoices for the 2015-2016 Financial Year and each FY thereafter.

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

Partners receive an invoice at the start of the financial year. Schools can pay in either the Summer or Autumn term depending on the budget-setting relating to their academic year funding.

a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?

Partners are charged in advance. No further discounts are appropriate or desirable. We are very flexible and schools appreciate this.

b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?

The invoicing is done as a bulk request and payments are tracked monthly through FBM along with other transactions. The process for LBB is as efficient as we can make it and for partners a one charge service package saves the inefficiencies of 'pay as you go' arrangements.

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

- If partners drop out of the Network the Council could be in a position where it:
- is bearing the full cost of shared school journey insurance unless this is renegotiated on a different basis in future
 - has insufficient critical mass to run an adequate service to cover the Council departments and education establishments where it is the employer.

Sold Service Review September 2014

1. Do we need to provide this service at all and if not please explain why we are providing it?

This is a non-statutory service.

The income generated provides additional income to the Bromley EBP budget. The service also provides economy of scale for schools wanting to engage with employers to support young people's development of employability skills. BEBP engages with the national and local business community to offer opportunities for them to meet their CSR obligation of reaching out to the local community and volunteering their support.

Delivery of these activities helps schools to:

- meet Ofsted guidance to provide impartial careers advice following demise of Connexions
- keep updated with what's really happening in the world of work and how this will influence/support the curriculum and provide employment opportunities in the future
- facilitate study opportunities and access to employers or providers that would otherwise be restricted due to confidentiality, health and safety or business limitations e.g. Health & Social Care and Chemistry at Work events

Delivering these activities helps the Council to:

- maintain communication with schools/young people for contact details of young people to help fulfil obligation to NEET/EET targets
- Maintain communication with local employers and help to influence local economy in relation to skills and training for residents.
- achieve its corporate goals (Building a Better Bromley).
- demonstrate an effective track record and positive impact thus enabling it to make a strong case for when submitting bids for external funding.

2. Is this a new charge to be considered or an amendment/change to our existing charging policy?

BEBP has operated a sold service for these E & E events for over 10 years. Our charging policy is based on team member's individual hourly charge out rate, event running costs plus a 20% overheads charge to cover core and fixed costs

Any proposals would be an amendment to existing fees and charging rates, which are reviewed on an annual basis, following indicative funding information becoming available for the following academic / financial year.

Bromley EBP – Enterprise and Employability Events.

3. Is the charge set by Statute?

No

4. Is the level of charge set by Statute?

No

5. If 3 & 4 above are not applicable, is the proposed charge based on full cost recovery and if not please specify why not

The delivery plan and charges for the Bromley EBP Enterprise and Employability Programme are based on recovery of controllable expenditure only, as the trading account was not set up as full cost recovery. The service is profiled to balance salaries, overheads and specific training expenditure or resources with income that is generated through sold service revenue plus income generated from national funding through external contracts.

6. Who uses the service and when, and can they go elsewhere?

Primary schools, Secondary schools/academies and Colleges in Bromley and to an extent neighbouring Boroughs. Services are delivered during academic year either as a planned event by us on specific days or bespoke to meet the school's needs.

They can choose

- Not to provide this type of work related learning activities
- To provide similar events in-house
- To find suitable providers in the open market.

Experience has shown that our rates are very reasonable compared to other similar providers.

Schools also appreciate the quality of activities delivered which eases the burden on already busy school staff. The schools also benefit from a significant number and range of business representatives involved providing face to face support and updated information for the young people. These business representatives are checked, trained and able to provide a professional service whilst in schools.

7. What impact will any change in charging have on the service?

Schools are operating under increasingly different circumstances within the conversion to academies agenda. Although our work is highly regarded by the schools, with stretched budgets and their capacity to deliver a bespoke curriculum, the number of requests from schools has diminished over the past two years.

Some schools have moved towards delivering this type of events in-house which could mean approaches to local business organisations by 18 separate

Bromley EBP – Enterprise and Employability Events.

institutions. Bromley EBP's role as the facilitator avoids this type of approach which can, in some circumstances, have a negative effect and impact on an employer's ability to get involved to support schools and young people.

Our Offer of Services is a key part of the service we provide. Our track record of delivering contracts particularly in connection with supporting potential NEET groups has been successful. As a result a significant proportion of our funding in recent years has come from these large external contracts. A reduction in service delivery or access to this type of activity could impact negatively on the Council's success in applying for external funding as these activities often represent key elements of the bid criteria.

8. Will consultation need to be undertaken out and how long will this take?

Bromley EBP is accountable to a Steering Group made up of representative stakeholders from business, education and the local community. Any key change in our income generation would need to take into account their views.

9. Is there evidence that there will be a disproportionate impact on some Customer groups? If yes a full equality impact assessment will need to be undertaken

No

10. How acceptable are the proposals to the public?

N/A

11. Is the charge subject to VAT? (if you are not sure, please seek advice from the VAT Officer in Finance)

No

12. Impact on service demand – if demand increases/falls, can the Council adjust its provision accordingly?

Bromley EBP can adjust capacity to meet increasing or decreasing demand because the service employs a number of staff on casual hours contracts thus enabling it to adapt quickly to changes or cope with peaks and troughs in the annual pattern of delivery.

Bromley EBP – Enterprise and Employability Events.

13. Which services do we offer concessions on? Please state if this happens in your area.

Not generally applicable unless Bromley EBP holds a contract to deliver the activity on external funding in which case activities may be delivered free of charge to the school/college as part of the contract outputs.

Benchmarking

14. Are third party commercial providers operating similar services in competition with the council?

Yes as far as I know...

- 14b If yes, what/how do our charges compare and why are they different?

Our charges are favourable and below the market average. This is due to the fact that originally we received central government funding to provide under the recent Enterprise Agenda to provide these sort of activities at highly subsidised rates. Schools enjoyed taking advantage of that reduced rate and, in some cases, found it difficult to adjust to them being charged at full cost recovery.

15. Is there a planned rate of increase for charges (above inflation) and how frequently are charges increased above inflation?

Prices are reviewed each academic year when the revised Offer of Services is made to schools. Prices have remained the same for the last two years at very favourable rates.

- 15b. Is member approval needed for new charges or increases above inflation (scheme of delegation allows chief officers to increase by inflation only, unless specifically agreed?)

Yes

- 15c. Is this consistent with third party commercial providers?

N/A

Bromley EBP – Enterprise and Employability Events.

16. How do charges compare to:

- Similar councils?
- Neighbouring councils?
- Other service providers?
- How are charges structured, and why?

The delivery plan and charges for the Enterprise and Employability Events are based on full cost recovery of Controllable expenditure. The service is profiled to balance salaries, overheads and specific training expenditure or resources with income that is generated.

Title	Price	Aim of event/Curriculum support	BEBP Set activity or bespoke for schools	No. of employers involved
Not all Chemists wear white coats – Chemistry at Work	£10 per student for full day	One day event to encourage a positive attitude to science and to inspire young people to follow a career within the sector	BEBP	10 from range of organisations
What's it like to work in Health & Social Care	£5 half day £10 full day	2 day event to support Health & Social Care courses and to inspire students to understand the breadth of employment opportunities within the sector	BEBP	15 from range of organisations
Dragon's Pen (enterprise)	£4.00 per student half day	Enterprise activity delivered in school to introduce the concepts of enterprise and creativity to young people (Year 9/10)	Bespoke for each school	Between 10/15 at each event
Next Steps	£800 per school	A bespoke employability event aimed at helping young people (17/18) to improve their transition to the workplace	Bespoke for each school	Between 10/15 at each event
Maximise your potential for work	£700 per school	A bespoke employability event aimed at young people with learning difficulties to build their confidence and develop their employability skills	Bespoke for each school	Between 5/8 at each event
Get Ready for Post 16 options	£900 per school	A bespoke employability event aimed at students in Year 11 to raise their awareness of the opportunities opened to them in connection with new RPA legislation	Bespoke for each school	Between 10/12 at each event

- How and when will we evaluate the impact of charges?
Termly monitoring of performance to date and future bookings provides a general indication of demand and service trends.
What data will we need?

Income to be generated on confirmed and anticipated bookings if costs remain the same.

Profiled costs of running proposed service for coming year to include salaries, resources, training venues/hospitality/speakers, overheads.

- Can we collect this data cost effectively?
We hold this information – this is how we balance the financial profile each year.

Bromley EBP – Enterprise and Employability Events.

- When should we next review our approach?
In spring/summer term 2015 prior to confirmation of BEBP staffing in 2015-2016 Academic Year and publication of the new brochure

Payment Methods

17. Income collection method – does it advantage/disadvantage or encourage/discourage use?

A non refundable booking deposit is charged with the balance being due on completion of the event. Cancellation terms apply due to the intensive nature of preparation work and venue booking costs.

Invoices are raised on a termly basis.

- a) Is a prompt/advance payment discount appropriate/desirable?
This would not be appropriate as it would make the booking and fee collection system overly complicated for both the Council and schools/colleges.
- b) Is the administrative process involved economic and/or efficient?

Other

18. Please identify if there are any risks or unintended consequences as a result of the proposals.

Report No.
ED15112

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: EDUCATION BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 16 October 2014

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

Title: FREE SCHOOL MEALS UPDATE

Contact Officer: Robert Bollen, Head of Strategic Pupil Place Planning
Tel: 020 8313 4697 E-mail: Robert.Bollen@bromley.gov.uk

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

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 To update Members on progress made within Bromley schools with regards the implementation of the Free School Meals for Infants programme.
-

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1 That Members note the progress of Bromley Schools in introducing Universal Free School Meals for infant age pupils from September 2014.

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Non-Recurring Cost
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Education Capital Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £387,000
 5. Source of funding: Universal Infant Free School Meals Capital
-

Staff

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

Legal

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

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Approximately 12,000
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 In September 2013 the Government announced its intention that all KS1 pupils in state funded schools should receive a free school lunch from September 2014. This duty has since been enshrined in legislation and capital and revenue funding provided by the Department for Education (DfE), including specific transitional funding for smaller schools, to enable implementation.
- 3.2 In Bromley responsibilities for the school meals have been devolved to schools for a number of years. Until 2013 the local authority had an in-house support service that oversaw the contracts for school catering and cleaning. Catering contracts are now managed either via a Bromley Schools Catering Consortium made up of primary and special school headteachers or through single school contracts.
- 3.3 Prior to the implementation of the new universal free school meals contract all Bromley schools have been able to provide a hot meals services. However, meals for Grovelands PRU have been provided via Midfield Primary School.
- 3.4 The contracts negotiated or entered into by the catering consortium or individual schools were not negotiated on the basis of the high levels of take up (85%+ in KS1) resulting from the introduction of universal infant free school meals. Similarly kitchens have not been designed, built and/or equipped to deal with such high levels of demand for hot school meals.

Implementation

- 3.5 The local authority has no direct control over the delivery of school meals at Bromley schools. However, from discussions with schools and the catering consortium it is understood that all eligible Bromley schools were able to deliver universal infant free school meals from the beginning of September 2014.
- 3.6 The local authority has undertaken suitability surveys at 40 schools where it, the CE diocese or the RC archdiocese had responsibility for supporting the implementation of infant free school meals. A consultant was commissioned to review the suitability of school kitchens to both deliver universal infant free schools places and comply with BB103, the latest guidance on school premises. These surveys were carried out during summer term 2014 and analysis and prioritisation is currently ongoing
- 3.7 The only exception to the above is schools within the delivery phase of the Council's Basic Need Programme and where it has been agreed that permanent expansion will take place. In these instances compliance with universal infant free school meals has been added to the requirements of school design and an additional budgetary allowance has been allocated from Basic Need Capital Grant.
- 3.8 Through negotiation with the catering consortium and school heads, the approach agreed in order to ensure implementation by September 2014, was that schools in dialogue with their catering contractor should purchase the equipment required to ensure delivery. Schools are able to fund this equipment through both equipment refresh clauses within their contracts (based on takeup) and the surplus funding available from the revenue allocation made to each school by central government. The local authority has set aside its funding to address infrastructure issue with school kitchens i.e. utility upgrades, ventilation and health and safety requirements.
- 3.9 Schools also led on negotiations with their catering contractors. This dialogue included catering contractors advising schools on additional equipment required in order to deliver universal infant

free school meals and ensuring that they had sufficient staffing levels to deliver the increased provision.

- 3.10 The Council has procured and appointed a mechanical and electrical consultant who will work with schools to deliver a programme of infrastructure works. However, it is unlikely that all works will be delivered via the £386,780 capital grant received from the DfE and major works may need to be programmed via other capital programmes such as the education planned maintenance programme.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 From September 2014 all schools with an infant/KS1 intake must be able offer pupils of infant age a free school meal. The local authority has been provided capital grant by the DfE for supporting schools in ensuring that kitchens are capable of delivering a school meal for all infant pupils.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Bromley has received a capital allocation of £387k to support maintained school in delivering this new initiative through kitchen improvements. Additional revenue funding has been announced for 2014/15 of £2.30 per pupil per meal who have become newly eligible for free school meals under the new legislation.
- 5.2 Provisional full year funding to schools was announced in June 2014 which provided funding for meals for the remainder of the 2014/15 financial year. The final allocation in the summer of 2015 will be subject to take up over the year. Funding beyond 2015/16 will be considered by Government as part of the next spending review.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Children and Families Act 2014 provides a legal duty by inserting new provisions in the Education Act 1996 on state-funded schools in England, including academies and free schools, to offer a free school lunch to all pupils in reception, year 1 and year 2 from September 2014.

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

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