London Borough of Bromley

**PART ONE - PUBLIC** 

Decision Maker:	Schools' Forum	
Date:	20 September 2012	
TITLE:	CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OUTTURN REPORT 2011/12	
Contact Officer:	David Bradshaw, Head of Education and Care Services Finance Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk	
Chief Officer:	Tessa Moore, Assistant Director of Education	
Ward:	Boroughwide	

## 1. REASON FOR REPORT AND SUMMARY OF BUDGET POSITION

1.1 This report provides the provisional final outturn position for 2011/12.

#### 2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 The Schools' Forum is asked to note the report for information.

#### 3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 This report went to the Education Budget Sub Committee on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July 2012 outlining the outturn position for the 2011/12 financial year.
- 3.2 The Schools' Forum are asked to note the report, particularly in the areas of the Schools Block.
- 3.3 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) underspent in the financial year 2011/12 by £1,698k. This will be carried forward into the 2012/13 financial year.

#### 4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 A detailed breakdown of the projected outturn by service area is shown in **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2**.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy Implications		
	Legal Implications		
	Personnel Implications		
Background Documents:	2011/12 Budget Monitoring files in ECS Finance Section		
(Access via Contact Officer)			

Report No. ED12017 London Borough of Bromley

## **PART ONE - PUBLIC**

Decision Maker:	Education Budget Sub-Committee		
Date:	31 July 2012		
Decision Type:	Non-Urgent	Executive	Non-Key
TITLE:	CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE OUTTURN REPORT 2011/12		
Contact Officer:	David Bradshaw, Head of Education and Care Services Finance Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk		
Chief Officer:	Tessa Moore, Assista	ant Director of Education	on
Ward:	Boroughwide		

## 1. REASON FOR REPORT AND SUMMARY OF BUDGET POSITION

1.1 This report provides the provisional final outturn position for 2011/12.

### 2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The Education PDS Budget Sub-committee are invited to:
  - (i) note that there was an underspend of £751,000 on controllable expenditure at the end of 2011/12 and consider any issues arising out of it;
  - (ii) note the net carry forwards totalling £120,000 agreed by the Executive as detailed in Appendix 5;
  - (iii) refer the report to the Portfolio Holder for approval.

## Corporate Policy

Policy Status: Not Applicable:
BBB Priority: Children and Young People:

### **Financial**

1.	Cost of proposal:	Not Applicable:	
2.	Ongoing costs:	Not Applicable:	
3.	Budget head/perform	ance centre:	CYP Portfolio budgets
4.	Total current budget	for this head:	£74,213k
5.	Source of funding:	RSG, Counci	I Tax, DSG, other grants

#### <u>Staff</u>

- 1. Number of staff (current and additional): 5,162 Full Time Equivalent, of which 4,425 are based in schools, and 737 are based in the CYP department.
- 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A

#### <u>Legal</u>

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

### Customer Impact

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

### Ward Councillor Views

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

# 3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 This report provides an update of the final budget position for the Children and Young People (CYP) Portfolio PDS committee, which is broken down in detail in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.
- 3.2 The final outturn for the 'controllable' element of the CYP budget in 2011/12 is an underspend of £751k against a budget of £31,549k, representing a 2.4% variation. This compares to the last reported figure of £298k underspent which was based on activity at the end of January 2012. After allowing for the net £120,000 carry forward request agreed by the executive on the 20 June, the final outturn position will be £631k.
- 3.3 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as "controllable" and "noncontrollable" in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as "controllable" as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has influence and control. "Non-controllable" budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder's service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include for example cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This ensures clear accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the "controllable" budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance.
- 3.4 Appendix 3 provides a breakdown of any full year implications arising from the final 2011/12 outturn and Appendix 4 provides a detailed reconciliation of the original 2011/12 budget to the latest approved 2011/12 budget
- 3.5 On the 20<sup>th</sup> June the Executive approved a number of carry forward requests where cost pressures will follow through into 2012/13. Appendix 5 provides a detailed breakdown of all of the carry forward requests.
- 3.6 The main variations between the last reported montioring in March and the outturn are:-

#### Non Schools Block

- 1) Increased pressures in Social Care with regard to placements
- 2) Additional savings across the Department in running costs and vacancies

#### Schools Block

- 1) Lower than anticipated costs in Special Education Needs placements
- 2) Increased volumes and cost in behaviour services
- 3) Carry forward into 2012/13 of unspent Dedicated schools Grant contingency

## 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 "Building a Better Bromley" refers to the Council's intention to remain among the lowest Council Tax levels in Outer London through greater focus on priorities.
- 4.2 The Resources Portfolio Plan has the target that each department will spend within its budget.
- 4.3 "Updates on Financial Strategy 2012/13 to 2015/16" will be reported to the Executive highlighting the pressures facing the Council.
- 4.4 Chief Officers and Heads of Finance stress the need for strict budget monitoring to minimise the risk of compounding pressures in future years. It is key to performance management.

# 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 A detailed breakdown of the projected outturn by service area is shown in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	2011/12 Budget Monitoring files in ECS Finance Section