

Central Bedfordshire  
Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands,  
Shefford SG17 5TQ



**please ask for** Martha Clampitt  
**direct line** 0300 300 4032  
**Date** 02 September 2010

## NOTICE OF MEETING

### CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

Date & Time

**Monday, 20 September 2010 at 18.00**

Venue at

**Room 14 - Priory House, Monks Walk, Shefford, SG17 5TQ**

Richard Carr  
**Chief Executive**

To: The Chairman and Members of the CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM:

	Anne Bell, Headteacher, Willow Nursery School
	Neil Bramwell, Headteacher, Stratton Upper School
	Shirley-Anne Crosbie, Headteacher, Glenwood Special School
School Members:	Richard Holland, Governor, Harlington Upper School
	Sue Howley, Governor, Greenleas Lower School
	Sharon Ingham, Headteacher, Hadrian Lower School
	Mr R V Johnson, Governor, Edward Peake Middle School
	Ian Mitchell, Headteacher, Etonbury Middle School
	Ray Payne, Headteacher, Henlow Middle School
	Stephen Tiktin, Governor, Linslade Lower School
Non School Members	Ian Greenley, Church of England Diocese Representative
	Bill Hamilton, Roman Catholic Diocese Representative
	Caroll Leggatt, PVI Early Years Providers Representative
	Bill McCarthy, Teacher's Union Representative
	Chris Vesey, 14-19 Partnership Sector Representative
Observer:	Cllr Anita Lewis – Portfolio Holder Children's Services

Please note that there will be a pre-meeting starting **half an hour before** the Forum meeting to enable technical aspects of the reports to be discussed with officers before the Forum meeting begins.

# AGENDA

1. **Apologies for absence**

To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitute members.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising**

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 June 2010 and to receive an update on any matters arising from these.

## Proposals involving decisions

Item	Subject	Page Nos.
3	<b>School Surplus Balances</b>  To update the Schools Forum on the proposals of the Surplus Balance Sub Group.  Approximately 18:10 – 18:30	* 15 - 30
4	<b>Harnessing Technology</b>  Mitigation of impact of the reduction/removal of the Harnessing Technology Grant.  Approximately 18:30 – 18:45	* 31 - 34
5	<b>Educational Visits and Journeys – EVOLVE</b>  To update the Schools Forum on the use of EVOLVE and to agree the funding of the system.  Approximately 18:45 – 19:00	* 35 - 36

## Updates and Feedback

Item	Subject	Page Nos.
6	<b>Early Years Single Funding Formula</b>  To update the Schools Forum on the progress towards the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) for April 2011.  Approximately 19:00 – 19:10	* 37 - 42

- 7      **Dedicated School Grant**      \*      43 - 44
- To update on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- Approximately 19:10 – 19:20
- 8      **School Contingency Budget**      \*      45 - 48
- To provide an update on the use of the Schools Specific Contingency Budget for 2010/11.
- Approximately 19:20 – 19:25
- 9      **Schools Forum Budget**      \*      49 - 50
- To provide an update on the use of the Schools Forum Budget for 2010/11.
- Approximately 19:25 – 19:30
- 10     **Outline Forward Programme**      \*      51 - 52
- To provide an update on the likely programme for the next year and confirm Sub Group membership.
- Approximately 19:30 – 19:35
- 11     **Correspondence to and from the Forum**
- Approximately 19:35 – 19:40
- 12     **Future meeting arrangements**
- To note that the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum has agreed to meet as follows:
- 1 November 2010 6.00pm, Room 15, Priory House;
  - 24 January 2011 9.00am, Committee Room 1, Dunstable offices;
  - 7 March 2011 6.00pm, Room 14, Priory House;
  - 21 June 2011 9.00am, Room 15 Priory House.
- Approximately 19:40 – 19:45
- 13     **Close**
- Approximately 19:45 – 19:50

This page is intentionally left blank

**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the **CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM** held at Room 14, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford, SG17 5TQ on Monday, 28 June 2010

**PRESENT**

Jim Parker (Chairman)

School Members:	Anne Bell	Headteacher, Willow Nursery School
	Shirley-Anne Crosbie	Headteacher, Glenwood Special School
	Richard Holland	Governor, Harlington Upper School
	Sue Howley	Governor, Greenleas Lower School
	Mr R V Johnson	Governor, Edward Peake Middle School
	Ray Payne	Headteacher, Henlow Middle School
	Stephen Tiktin	Governor, Linslade Lower School
Non-School Members:	Caroll Leggatt	PVI Early Years Providers Representative
	Bill McCarthy	Teacher's Union Representative
Apologies for Absence:	Neil Bramwell	
	Sharon Ingham	
	Ian Mitchell	
	Chris Vesey	
Members in Attendance:	Cllr Mrs A M Lewis	
Officers in Attendance:	Mr M Bowmer	Assistant Director, Finance
	Ms D Lester	Senior Democratic Services Officer
	Mooring	Corporate Policy Advisor (Climate Change/Sustainability)
	O'Loughlin	HR Business Partner
	Mr R Parsons	Head of School Organisation and Capital Planning
	Mrs K Partington	Strategic Finance Manager
	Ms K Riches	Head of Audit
	Willoughby	

CBSF/10/70 **Minutes of 8 March 2010 and Matters Arising**

**RESOLVED**

**the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

The Forum was updated on the following matters arising from the minutes:

L/04/51 – PVI 2010/11 Rate – Members queried the number of hours that Lower Schools would be receiving funding for the delivery of the Early Years Entitlement. It was agreed that clarification would be given at the next meeting of the Forum.

L/04/57 – A briefing note on PFI funding would be circulated to Members of the Forum after the meeting. Information showing relevant budget pressures and savings would also be circulated to Forum Members.

#### **CBSF/10/71 School Audit Strategy**

The Forum considered a report setting out a proposed School Audit Strategy for 2010/11-2012/13. The report outlined the background to the mandatory requirement that all schools be assessed against the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS) and the need for a change as a result of revised guidelines issued by DCSF in April 2010. The proposed Strategy would enable Internal Audit to address the need for a considered risk based approach to FMSiS re-assessments together with a rolling programme of probity assurance work. Approval was also sought for the continuation of DSG funding to enable the work to be carried out.

#### **RESOLVED**

- 1. that the proposed School Audit Strategy as detailed in the submitted report be noted.**
- 2. that approval be given to top slicing DSG funding at the current level of £38,231 over the next four years to enable Internal Audit to deliver a programme of light touch FMSiS re-assessments.**

#### **CBSF/10/72 Vetting and Barring**

Item withdrawn from the agenda.

#### **CBSF/10/73 Surplus Balances**

The Forum considered a report updating members on 2009-10 Balances for Central Bedfordshire Schools and new guidance for local authorities on managing Surplus School Balances. It was noted that the proposal to set up a Surplus Balance Sub-Group to discuss surplus balances arising from the 2009-10 financial year would be considered later in the agenda as part of an overall discussion on membership (minute CBSF/10/83 refers).

## RESOLVED

1. **that the update report on the 2009-10 Balances for Central Bedfordshire Schools and new guidance for local authorities on managing Surplus School Balances be noted.**
2. **that consideration of a Balances Sub-Group to discuss surplus balances arising from the 2009-10 financial year be deferred until item 15 on the agenda in context of the overall discussion on future meetings of the Forum and its Sub Groups (minute CBSF/10/83 refers.)**
3. **that should there be a need for a claw back arising from the 2009-10 review of Surplus Balances that the funds be re-cycled to the School Specific Contingency.**
4. **that revisions to the Scheme for Financing School be consulted upon to:**
  - **require a revised budget plan to be submitted by 31<sup>st</sup> October each year**
  - **reduce the surplus balance thresholds for 2011-12**
  - **redefine the definition of Earmarked Funds.**

## CBSF/10/74 **School Redundancies**

The Forum received a presentation on the process and financial support for school redundancies. The presentation covered the following areas:

- Existing policy
- Historical spend
- School Contingency Budget
- Redundancy process summary
- The way forward.

During the general discussion that ensued comments were made about the need for adequate forward planning. Whilst schools were currently required to contact the Authority 6 months in advance of an impending redundancy schools may be asked to come forward earlier than the current two terms.

The Forum, noting that to date funding for redundancies/early retirement for 2010/11 was £680K compared to £167K in 2008/09 and £190K in 2009/10, recognised schools needed to explore all possible options and actions that could be taken at an early stage for reducing staffing before looking at the redundancy route.

The Forum, in noting that the Authority was looking at alternative approaches for providing financial support for school redundancies, agreed that a report would need to be brought to a future meeting on what the new criteria for

supporting schools financially might be. Members were asked to pass any comments on the way forward to Dawn Hill.

**[NOTE: A copy of the presentation is attached at Appendix A to the minutes.]**

**CBSF/10/75 School Asset Management**

The Forum considered a report updating members on the development of the Schools Asset Management Plan (AMP) which would form the basis for strategic decision making on the prioritisation of future schools capital programmes. The report also provided an update on the 2010/11 Schools Capital Programme.

As part of its deliberations the Forum received a presentation that provided an overview of the Carbon Reduction challenge (CRC) facing the Council and schools in Central Bedfordshire.

**(Note: A copy of the presentation is attached as Appendix B to the minutes.)**

The Forum discussed the challenges posed by the Carbon Reduction programme. Whilst acknowledging it was a challenge there were actions that when carried out would reduce energy consumption and carbon measures, as detailed in Appendix B of the submitted report.

The report also proposed the establishment of a schools Asset Management Planning Sub Group of the Schools Forum to oversee the further development of the AMP, and the development and delivery of a Schools Carbon Reduction Plan. The Forum agreed that this matter be deferred to later in the agenda as part of an overall discussion on membership (minute CBSF/10/83 refers).

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. that progress made in developing a School Asset Management Plan (AMP) for Central Bedfordshire, as detailed in the submitted report, be noted.**
- 2. that the update provided on the 2010/11 Schools Capital programme, attached as Appendix A to the submitted report, be noted.**
- 3. that the Carbon Reduction challenge facing the Council and schools in Central Bedfordshire, as detailed in the submitted report, be noted.**
- 4. that consideration of establishing a Schools Asset Management Planning sub group, and membership, to oversee the further development of the AMP, the future prioritisation of various school capital programmes, and to take ownership for the development and delivery of a Schools Carbon Reduction Action Plan be**



**deferred to later in the agenda as part of an overall discussion on membership (minute CBSF/10/83 refers).**

**CBSF/10/76 Consultation on the future distribution of School Funding**

The Forum considered a report updating members on the consultation on the distribution to Local Authorities of the Dedicated School Grant (DSG) that finished on the 6 June 2010 together with the School Forum's response to the consultation. Members agreed that the proposal to establish a Technical Funding Sub Group to oversee any proposed formula change resulting from the review would be deferred to later in the agenda as part of an overall discussion on membership (minute CBSF/10/83 refers).

**RESOLVED**

- 1. that the report setting out the consultation of the distribution to Local Authorities of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and School Forum's response be noted.**
- 2. that consideration of establishing a Technical Funding Sub Group to oversee any proposed formula change resulting from the review and agree specific formula elements that require reconsidering be deferred to later in the agenda as part of an overall discussion on membership (minute CBSF/10/83 refers).**

**CBSF/10/77 Dedicated School Grant Out-Turn 2009 - 10 and Budget 2010 - 11**

The Forum considered a report which updated members on the deployment of the 2009/10 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and the application for the 2010/11 DSG.

**RESOLVED**

- 1. that the deployment of the 2009-10 Dedicated School Grant be confirmed.**
- 2. that the application for the 2010-11 Dedicated School Grant be noted.**

**CBSF/10/78 14- 16 Practical Learning and Diploma Funding**

The Forum considered a report on the devolved funding of the DSG 14 -16 Practical Learning Options. It was noted that information had already been circulated to all head teachers explaining the way funding would be allocated for this financial year.

In response to noting that the 14 – 19 Partnership Strategy Group evaluated the effectiveness of current practical learning provision, assurance was given

that the strategy would be reviewed each year to ensure courses remained relevant to need.

## **RESOLVED**

**the Forum noted the following recommendations that were agreed at the 14-19 Partnership Strategy Group on 15 June:**

- (a) This information has already been shared with schools through a note to all head teachers explaining that the way funding is allocated will change for this financial year.**
- (b) The information has been planned by the Central Bedfordshire 14 – 19 finance sub-group (school and FE College representatives) and discussed by the Central Bedfordshire 14 – 19 Operational Group (May 2010)**

### **CBSF/10/79 School License Deficits**

The Forum considered an update report on License Deficit Schools. The report set out details of how the Scheme permits schools to plan for a deficit budget and the length of time (two years) over which schools could recover.

The Forum in noting the agreed criteria that had been set to assess schools on a case by case basis where a deficit beyond a two year period was required suggested that the criteria 'Plans to co-operate within two years with Trust, Federation or Partnerships' needed to be expanded upon to make clear the meaning.

## **RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

### **CBSF/10/80 Good Practice and Future of the School Forum**

The Forum considered a paper from the Chairman setting out proposals from a Sub-Group meeting as to how the Schools Forum's business could be managed more effectively. Members discussed the suggestions, in particular noting the following matters:-

#### **Meeting structure**

Some members, whilst agreeing that increasing meetings from three to five would be beneficial in terms of scheduling business, commented that there could be difficulty for some members in attending day time meetings although acknowledging that day time meetings would be limited to two. It was suggested that there could be future scope for undertaking some of the sub group work within the main Forum meetings. The Forum supported the proposal that a pre-meeting be introduced to allow members to discuss

technical aspects of agenda items with officers but felt that it should be limited to a twelve month trial.

### **Communication**

The Chairman advised members that if the Forum was agreeable he would produce a newsletter to raise awareness of the Forum and to engage with stakeholders. As there was no clear mechanism to allow dialogue to take place with Lower Schools it was agreed that a report would be brought to a future meeting on how this could be facilitated to enable School Forum representation to be effective.

### **Administration Support and Training**

The Forum noted that the Sub-Group had discussed the area of administration support and training. It was felt that there was a need to provide greater administration support to the Forum as well as being more active in communication with the wider school community. The Forum felt that further investigations were needed to establish the scope of this issue.

### **RESOLVED**

- 1. that the number of Schools Forum meetings be increased to five per year and that two be held during business hours;**
- 2. that pre-meetings be held to allow Forum members to discuss technical aspects of the agenda with officers for a trial period of 12 months;**
- 3. that a newsletter be produced by the Chairman to raise awareness and to communicate the work of the School Forum;**
- 4. that a report be brought to a future meeting on how Lower School meeting structures might best allow School Forum representation to be effective.**
- 5. that an audit be undertaken to highlight training needs to enable a suitable training programme to be developed.**

### **CBSF/10/81 School Forum Regulations 2010**

The Forum considered a report setting out details of the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2010 which required changes to be made to the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum membership requirements of its Constitution and Terms of Reference. It was noted that the Regulations required the Forum to be reconstituted by 1 September taking into account the new requirements set out in the Regulations.

Members discussed the requirement that where there was at least one Academy in a local authority's area there must be at least one Academy

member on the Schools Forum. It was noted that if more Academies came into existence it would be necessary to review the number of places for Academy representation. This was because the Regulations required Academies, along with primary and secondary schools, to be broadly proportionally represented, having regard to the total number of pupils registered at them. In view of this members suggested a rider should be added to the Forum's Constitution and Terms of Reference to state that when more Academies are established a review would be carried out of the number of places available to them.

The Forum noted that if for any reason the Board of Governors of the All Saints Academy was unsuccessful in appointing a representative, for example if there was an election at which there was a tie, the local authority must take the decision, taking into account details such as individuals' previous membership and experience.

#### **RESOLVED**

- 1. that the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum Constitution and Terms of Reference be amended by:**
  - (a) deleting reference to the Learning and Skills Council as this body has ceased to exist;**
  - (b) adding provision for a representative of the Academy under the category of "School Members", bringing the number of School Members up to 13;**
  - (c) that a rider be added that when more Academies are established a review be carried out of the number of places available to them in accordance with the Schools Forum (England) Regulations 2010; and**
  - (d) changing the number of meetings required by statute per year from 3 to 4 recognising the Forum's earlier decision to increase meetings to 5 a year (minute CBSF/10/80 refers).**
- 2. that the Central Bedfordshire Schools Forum notes that arrangements will be put in place for the appointment of a representative of All Saints Academy to be a member of the Forum by 1 September 2010.**

#### **CBSF/10/82 Correspondence to and from the Forum**

The Chairman reported on the receipt of correspondence that had been referred to the School Finance Manager.

**CBSF/10/83 Future meetings of the Forum and Sub-Group Meetings**

In context of the Forum's earlier decision to increase meetings to 5 a year (minute CBSF/10/80 above refers) members discussed the increasing volume of work coming to the Schools Forum and that a number of Sub-Groups had already been established, as follows:-

Capital Group  
Early Years Reference Group  
Asset Management Group  
Technical Funding Group  
Terms of Reference and Procedure Group.

In view of the above the Forum suggested that there should be one larger main sub-group and that this should be the Technical Funding Group but with a wider membership of 5 members (Shirley-Anne Crosbie, Jim Parker, Richard Holland, Anne Bell and Bill Hamilton) which could be split into two if a need arose. It was noted that ad-hoc sub-group meetings could be held on other issues.

The Forum then considered recommendation 4 of agenda item 7 - School Asset Management, that a Schools Asset Management Planning sub group be set up to oversee the further development of the Asset Management Plan (AMP) (minute CBSF/10/75 above refers). In view of resolution 1 below it was agreed that officers should consult members on the development of the AMP. It was noted that the AMP, including future prioritisation of various school capital programmes and delivery of a Schools Carbon Reduction Action Plan could be taken to the General Heads meeting.

**RESOLVED**

1. **that the Technical Funding Group be the main sub-group of the School Forum with a wider membership of 5 members (Shirley-Anne Crosbie, Jim Parker, Richard Holland, Anne Bell and Bill Hamilton) and if a need arises ad-hoc sub-group meetings be held on other issues.**
2. **that the response to recommendation 4 of agenda item 7 - School Asset Management, that a Schools Asset Management Planning sub group be set up to oversee the further development of the Asset Management Plan (AMP) (minute L/04/75 above refers) be as follows:-**
  - **that members of the Forum be consulted on the development of the Asset Management Plan, including future prioritisation of various school capital programmes and delivery of a Schools Carbon Reduction Action Plan.**
3. **That the date of the next meeting of the School Forum be circulated to members of the Forum.**

CBSF/10/84 **Proposed Work Programme**

It was noted that a proposed work programme would be included on every School Forum agenda for the forward planning of business.

(Note: The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and concluded at 8.28 p.m.)

Chairman .....

Dated ..... ..

---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** School Surplus Balances  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To update the Schools Forum on the proposals of the Surplus Balance Sub Group

---

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Technology House, Bedford

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. To note the latest update from the Surplus Balance Sub Group.
2. To approve 17 schools holding balances in accordance with the additional criteria of £10,000 or one percent of the School Budget Share be allowed to retain their surplus balances.
3. To agree a letter be sent to all schools advising that the additional allowance will not be in place for balances arising beyond 2009/10.
4. To approve the nine schools where the Sub Group accepted the information supplied in support of the Schools excess balance to retain the surplus balance.
5. To approve further information be requested from the remaining eight schools with 'minded to' clawback recommendation be subject to an appeals meeting. The results to be brought back to the next meeting.
6. Approve the school with extenuating circumstances and heavily supported by the LA not be subject to clawback.

## Background

1. The Scheme for Financing Schools, Section 4, determines the treatment of surplus balances arising in relation to budget shares (Appendix A). Where schools have a surplus balance that exceeds the prescribed thresholds, the Governing Body are required to put in place a financial plan to reduce the surplus to below the threshold. The plans are reviewed and agreed by the Sub Group of the Schools Forum annually and monitored to ensure such surpluses are to be used appropriately for the benefit of the school. However, if the Sub Group is minded to believe this not to be the case, excess funds can be recycled through an agreed process.
2. The total Revenue Surplus Balance for Central Bedfordshire Schools for 2009/2010 was £7.9m. After the declaration of committed balances (Earmarked funds), 35 of the 138 Central Bedfordshire Schools were referred to the Surplus Balance Sub Group holding balances above the defined thresholds.
3. It was agreed at the Forum meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010 that the main forum sub group would be the Technical Funding Sub Group. Membership as follows:-

Shirley Anne Crosbie, Headteacher, Glenwood Special  
Ann Bell, Headteacher Willow Nursery  
Bill Hamilton, Roman Catholic Diocese Representative  
Jim Parker, Chair of Schools Forum and Headteacher Manshead Upper  
Richard Holland, Governor Harlington Upper.

As there is not a sub group specifically designated for Surplus Balances, the above group were invited to attend.

## Update

4. The Sub Group met on the 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010 (Minutes attached Appendix B). The group proposed that as in previous years, a further allowance of £10,000 or 1% of the School Budget Share (SBS) would be given in addition to the allowable threshold of 8% (Nursery, Lower and Special Schools) and 5% (Middle and Upper). This reduced the number of schools by 17.
5. It was further proposed that this additional allowance would apply to 2009/10 balances only. This would steer schools to reduce balances in line with the revision to the Scheme for Financing Schools reducing the thresholds allowable for the 2011/12 financial year.
6. Each school was discussed in detail and supporting documentation reviewed. The group accepted and proposed no claw back to nine of the eighteen schools.
7. One school experiencing extenuating circumstances, with significant support from the Local Authority, was also proposed by the group to not be subject to claw back. Also under such circumstances should not have been subject to the group.
8. The Sub Group recommended 'minded to claw back' pending further information for the remaining eight schools.



Table one below summarises the overall position.

**Table 1**

	Total no of Schools in Phase	Total No of Schools with Surplus Balances (after Earmarked Funds)	No. of Schools below £10,000 or 1% SBS	No, of Schools Explanation / Evidence accepted	Minded to claw back	
					No.	Amount
Nursery	4	4	0	3	1	£57,800
Lower	95	25	12	6	7	£235,160
Middle	24	3	3	0	0	
Upper	9	1	1	0	0	
Special	6	2	1	1	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>£292,960</b>

### Next Steps

9. The proposed deadline for further information being the 30<sup>th</sup> September, with the Sub Group re-convening early October to bring final recommendation to the School Forum at the 1<sup>st</sup> November meeting.

### Appendices:

Appendix A – Extract from Scheme for Financing Schools (September 2009 to March 2011)

Appendix B – Minutes from the meeting of the Sub Group on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix A

### Extract from The Scheme for Financing Schools (September 2009 – March 2011)

#### 4. THE TREATMENT OF SURPLUSES AND DEFICIT BALANCES ARISING IN RELATION TO BUDGET SHARES

##### 4.1. The Right to Carry Forward Surplus Balances

Schools may carry forward from one financial year to the next any surplus/deficit in net expenditure relative to the school's budget share for the year plus/minus any balance brought forward from the previous year.

##### 4.2 Reporting On The Intended Use Of Surplus Balances

Surplus balances held by schools as permitted under this scheme are subject to the following restrictions with effect from 1 April 2008:

- a. the Authority shall calculate by 31 May each year the surplus balance, if any, held by each school as at the preceding 31 March. For this purpose the balance will be the recurrent balance as defined in the Consistent Financial Reporting Framework;
- b. the Authority shall deduct from the calculated balance any amounts for which the school has a prior year commitment to pay from the surplus balance and any unspent Standards Fund grant for the previous financial year;
- c. the Authority shall then deduct from the resulting sum any amounts which the governing body of the school has declared to be assigned for specific purposes permitted by the authority, and which the authority is satisfied are properly assigned. To count as properly assigned, amounts must not be retained beyond the period stipulated for the purpose in question, without the consent of the Authority. In considering whether any sums are properly assigned the Authority may also take into account any previously declared assignment of such sums but may not take any change in planned assignments to be the sole reason for considering that a sum is not properly assigned.
- d. if the result of steps a-c is a sum greater than 5% of the current year's budget share for secondary schools, 8% for primary and special schools, or £10,000 (where that is greater than either percentage threshold), then the Authority shall deduct from the

current year's budget share an amount equal to the excess, subject to the review by the Sub Group of the Schools Forum, set out below.

Funds deriving from sources other than the Authority will be taken into account in this calculation if paid into the budget share account of the school, whether under provisions in this scheme or otherwise.

Funds held in relation to a school's exercise of powers under s.27 of the Education Act 2002 (community facilities) will not be taken into account unless added to the budget share surplus by the school as permitted by the Authority.

The total of any amounts deducted from schools' budget shares by the Authority under this provision are to be applied to the Schools Budget of the authority.

To assist the LA in carrying out its financial monitoring role, Governing bodies are required to report to the LA on the use which the school intends to make of surplus balances – after taking account of any earmarked funds, as per the annual CFR return - in cases where the total balance exceeds the threshold's set out in d. above.

Where schools have a surplus balance that exceeds the above thresholds of the School's Budget Share at the financial year end, the Governing Body are required to put in place a financial plan to reduce the surplus to below the threshold.

The plan will be reviewed and agreed by a Sub Group of the Schools Forum, each year and monitored to ensure such surpluses are used appropriately for the benefit of the school.

If the Sub Group of the Schools Forum is minded to believe that a school is not retaining the balance for appropriate reasons, then a process will be started to recycle the funds in excess of the threshold.

The calculation of the excess balance will be notified by a letter in the format of Appendix D1, Schools will also be required to complete the Declaration of Earmarked Funds and Surplus Balances(appendix D2), which must be submitted to the LA and supported by relevant evidence..

Relevant evidence must support B02 Uncommitted Revenue Balances and be in written form and may comprise of:-

- Finance Governors Minutes
- Three year plans
- Projected Pupil Numbers
- Correspondence with Contractors
- Any other relevant information

## Minutes

**Title of Meeting:** Surplus Balances Group

**Date of Meeting:** Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2010

## PRESENT

<b>Anne Bell</b>	<b>Head Teacher Willow Nursery</b>
<b>Shirley Crosbie</b>	<b>Head Teacher Glenwood Special</b>
<b>Bill Hamilton</b>	<b>Roman Catholic Diocese Member</b>
<b>Dawn Hill</b>	<b>Senior Finance Manager Children Services - Schools</b>
<b>Gina Chandler</b>	<b>Schools Statutory Financial Services Manager</b>

**Apologise**

**Jim Parker – Head Teacher Manshead Upper**

**Richard Holland – Governor Harlington Upper**

All school Earmarked Fund Forms and back up has been received. The number of schools to be discussed exceeding the allowable threshold is 35.

The decision to allow the first £10k or 1% of the SBS in addition to the 5% and 8% thresholds were discussed. This had been allowed in previous financial year and had been discussed at Forum as to whether this should be removed. The group felt that as this had not been communicated to all schools that it should remain for the 2009/10 balances. The following proposals were made:-

1. to allow the first £10k or 1% of the SBS in addition to the 5% and 8% thresholds, to stand for the surplus balances for 2009-10
2. that a letter be sent to all schools advising them this additional allowance will not be taken into consideration in future years

This additional allowance reduced the number of schools to discuss in detail to 18. Recommendations are listed below.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMENDATIONS**

	Schools Reasons for holding surplus balances	<b>2008-09 Excess Balance</b>	<b>2009-10 Excess Balance</b>	<b>2009-10 DFC Balance C/f</b>	<b>10/11 DFC Allocation</b>
Arlesey Nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £1k to upgrade alarm</li> <li>• £2k upgrade electric cable to fuse box</li> <li>• £2K new ICT equipment</li> <li>• £1K replace furniture</li> <li>• £2K develop 'wild area' in garden &amp; landscaping</li> <li>• £800 new safety surface in playground</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£17,084	£7,963	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
The Lawns Early Excellence Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restructure of Staffing of Nursery School &amp; Children's Centre to ensure services future and VFM. Funds to cover redundancies &amp; protected salaries</li> <li>• Move Nursery School into Garden Annex to save on maintenance costs. This requires structural work</li> <li>• Equipment for Children's Centre to evidence targets met for impending OFSTED</li> <li>• Promote work of Children's Centre</li> <li>• Health &amp; Safety issues re apparatus, provision of shade &amp; increase cycling to centre.</li> </ul>	£20,484	£57,800	£36,882	
		Recommendation: Minded to Claw back Subject to the School submitting additional information regarding the payment of redundancies and expectation of what costs to be met by the LA.			
Westfield Nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to cuts re new EYSFF c/f to be used to make informed decisions re restructure and planning changes</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£22,995	£32,395	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
Willow Nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance due to in-year savings in staff costs</li> </ul>	£11,063	£20,714	£9,365	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c/f to avoid redundancies in 2011/12 as plan goes into deficit</li> <li>Implementation of EYSFF</li> </ul>	Recommendation: No Claw back			
Gothic Mede Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No H/T since Sept 09, acting to Dec 10</li> <li>Change of admissions policy</li> <li>Needed to support future years budget</li> </ul>	£31,700	£17,725	£19,179	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
Ramsey Manor Lower	<p>Refurbishments highlighted in condition survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Windows £48K</li> <li>External doors £4k</li> <li>Foundation Stage classroom refurbishment £10K</li> <li>Fire alarm system replacement £17K</li> <li>Kitchen ventilation replacement £17k</li> <li>Lighting £7K</li> <li>Fencing of grounds £8K</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£29,181	£17,392	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
Chalton Lower	<p>Using underspend to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pay for new staff, only two permanent teaching staff in school</li> <li>Maintenance work for outside painting &amp; electrical work</li> </ul>	£6,774	£6,672	£1,298	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K – group did not discuss			
Kingsmoor Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£10K capital project to develop outside area after removal of mobile total cost £28K, using FC £18K + £10K revenue</li> <li>£20K support teaching &amp; learning as school moves to single form entry. TA staff phased out and not have contracts renewed for 12/13.</li> </ul>	£15,352	£30,010	£0	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
Gravenhurst Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of Foundation stage</li> <li>Advertised for FS teacher p/t</li> </ul>	£9,114	£9,208	£76,443	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costed in budget for next two years so need to keep balance</li> </ul>	Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Houghton Conquest Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refurbishment of Early Years Foundation stage play area – resurfacing as per school development plan</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£5,612	£33,191	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Meppershall Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support future years budgets, dip in pupil numbers Jan 11</li> </ul>	£8,688	£4,119	£0	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Laburnham Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entered into contract to build new dining room, use of dining room grant of £83520</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£18,534	£92,411	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
Southill Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reimbursement from LTA in Period 13 following a claim. In year deficits for 10/11 and 11/12 so need c/f to support the budget</li> </ul>	£21,916	£9,549	£91,170	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Sundon Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monies originally allocated for anticipated redundancies no longer required.</li> </ul>	£4,639	£23,130	£2,836	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mouchel survey highlighted significant areas in urgent need of R&amp;M.</li> <li>• Support future years budget</li> </ul>	<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to the school providing additional information relating to the redundancies &amp; details of the repairs &amp; maintenance. Proposed claw back on remainder.</p>			
Sutton Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes unspent 10% contribution towards capital for 2009-10</li> </ul>	£2,502	£3,332	£0	
		<p>Recommendation: No Claw back</p> <p>Under £10K group did not discuss</p>			
Aspley Guise Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract to replace temporary units with brick built structure.</li> <li>• Drawdown £28K of 2011/12 future years FC</li> </ul>	£6,643	£45,343	£81	
		<p>Recommendation: No Claw back</p>			
Ashton St Peters Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LA issued unsafe structure notice after issues with canopy therefore decorating project of £6870 delayed whilst legal and structural advice sought</li> </ul>	£422	£7,252	£0	
		<p>Recommendation: No Claw back</p> <p>Under £10K group did not discuss</p>			
Lancot Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain teacher to support literacy £26K</li> <li>• Upgrade overhead projectors £10K</li> <li>• Two LSA's to support groups of children&amp; library £15K</li> <li>• Replace fencing £11K</li> <li>• Security £3K</li> <li>• FC all used for dining room build</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£69,855	£111,439	
		<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to additional information being provided regarding the dining room grant (Keith Armstead to confirm). School to be advised on concern of sustainability of staffing structure</p>			

St Christophers Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replacement of school oven due to H&amp;S issues £15K</li> <li>After new extension, drains damaged refit £15K</li> </ul>	£58,561	£29,366	£0	
		<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to additional information being provided regarding the H &amp; S issues, clarification on ownership of ovens in the kitchen and query on insurance cover for drain damage</p>			
Eaton Bray Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build of new classroom started May 2010 future years capital borrowed</li> </ul>	£18,406	£16,586	£50,000	
		<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to additional information regarding need for new classroom / pupil numbers (Keith Armstead)</p>			
Tithe Farm Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bills totalling £9800 received for items ordered last year</li> <li>Repair work to fences and pool £19K</li> <li>£5K support for extended services</li> <li>£50K towards building project delayed start</li> </ul>	£10,534	£72,545	£69,290	
		<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to additional information on £5k support for extended services and 50k delayed building project. School to be advised on correct accounting procedures for accruals.</p>			
Husborne Crawley Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building works last autumn, builder went into liquidation so other projects delayed including : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>exterior redecoration originally planned during 09/10</li> <li>extensive remedial all repairs to library held off until capital project completed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Small pupil numbers</li> <li>Savings from teaching staff left Autumn Term not replaced</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£12,466	£20,363	
		<p>Recommendation: Minded to Claw back</p> <p>Subject to additional information on building works</p>			

Kensworth Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earmarked for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Playboat £1395</li> <li>Honeycomb matting £226</li> <li>Trays £335</li> <li>Advertising £718</li> <li>Imprest £1742</li> </ul> </li> </ul> (Invoices sent in )	£5,070	£937	£53,625	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Ridgemont Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School were able to forecast and calculate implications of Jan numbers, 8 children left in year. Sch made savings</li> <li>Support future years budgets, very small contingencies</li> </ul>	£316	£1,697	£57,296	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Stanbridge Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To support single year groups across the school in 2010/11</li> </ul>	£2,922	£11,212	£35,545	
		Recommendation: Minded to Claw back Subject to additional information on single year groups, not sustainable, need clarification from school			

Studham Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To support staffing salaries and falling role, unless carry forward sch go into deficit</li> </ul>	£30,339	£2,575	£0	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Woburn Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicative budget for 2011/12 in deficit request keep balance to reduce.</li> <li>2010-11 budget OK</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£113	£49,362	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
John Donne Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£1637 invoice for painting &amp; decorating carried out during Easter Hols, work delayed due to waiting to see if successful in LCVAP bid</li> <li>£3056 10% on new early years building, originally £6884</li> <li>Standards funds earmarked for Nursery furniture</li> <li>Additional class in academic year 2011/12 due to expected class size.</li> </ul>	Not subject to group	£7,904	£0	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Etonbury Middle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£9,600 upgrade information management system</li> <li>5,304 subscription to trust</li> </ul>	£2,457	£15,146	£134,359	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Less than 1% of School Budget Share therefore group did not discuss			
Burgoyne Middle		£3,091	£55	£115,390	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Streetfield Middle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend existing car park to ASD unit £7,500</li> </ul>	£132,829	£7,279	£78,852	

		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Vandyke Upper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earmarked for replacement fire alarm/development of learning facilities. (Tender documents prepared June 10 )</li> </ul>	£102,409	£22,721	£0	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Less than 1% of School Budget Share therefore group did not discuss			
Glenwood Special	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funds transferred into budget for additional TA support</li> <li>IDI from Roger Day dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 10</li> </ul>	£9,823	£7951	£56,373	
		Recommendation: No Claw back Under £10K group did not discuss			
Sunnyside Special	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Minibus</li> </ul>	£21,655	£22,899	£61,438	
		Recommendation: No Claw back			
A further school was discussed; however, the group felt that it should not be subject to the group due to their extenuating circumstances and heavy LA involvement.					

This page is intentionally left blank

---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** Harnessing Technology 2010-11  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** Mitigation of impact of the reduction/removal of the Harnessing Technology Grant

---

**Contact Officer:** Neil Turner & Cathy Piotrowski, e-Learning Strategy Team, Learning & Strategic Commissioning  
**Public/Exempt:** Public  
**Wards Affected:** All  
**Function of:** Council  
**Reason for urgency (if appropriate)** 50% cut in Harnessing Technology Grant for 2010 - 2011

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. To reduce the contribution for the web MIS system by 50%**
- 2. Broadband costs charged in full to schools**
- 3. No change to current charging methodology for Broadband**
- 4. To note the impact from July 2011 on implementing Learning Platforms and software resources**
- 5. To reduce the 40% devolved allocation to schools by 50%**

**Background**

1. Harnessing Technology is a three year funded grant which started in 2008 and has been administered by Becta (a government agency that has been leading the national drive to ensure the effective and innovative use of technology throughout learning).

The table below details the funding over the three year period:

2008-09	Bedfordshire County Council	£1,951,236
2009-10	Shared Service	£1,850,073
2010-11	Central Bedfordshire Council	£1,121,341

2. It was resolved at the Schools Forum Meeting of the 13<sup>th</sup> March that each year 60% of this grant would be retained centrally and 40% devolved to schools. Each funding year Becta published guidelines as to how the grant should be used to support learning and teaching with ICT. This arrangement continued for 2010-11.
3. The Harnessing Technology grant has been used in the past two years for the following:
  - Funding support for broadband revenue costs
  - Funding support for implementing learning platforms
  - Funding resources for use within the learning platform e.g. Encyclopaedia Britannica, espresso
4. In July 2010 the new Coalition Government cut this grant, firstly by 25% then by 50%. The grant Central Bedfordshire will now receive for April 2010 – March 2011 is £560,670.
5. However, commitments have already been made by the LA to fund programmes centrally and schools have been advised of the value of the 40% devolved to each school.
6. The commitments made for April 2010 – March 2011 are as follows:
  - Resolved at the Schools Forum meeting of the 19<sup>th</sup> October to support Schools in the transition to a web based Management Information System ( MIS)
  - Funding support for broadband costs
  - Funding support for implementing learning platforms
  - Funding support resources for use within the learning platform (up to £100,000 until July 2011)
  - 40% Devolved Allocation to Schools
7. The eLearning Board has been made aware of the above commitments for April 2010 – March 2011. This Board has Head Teacher representation from the different school phases. The group has responsibility for monitoring governance and accountability on matters relating to ICT.

## **Update**

### **Web Based MIS**

8. The support for the transition to a web based MIS for the Nursery, Lower and Special schools aimed to cover; data transition, licence fee, annual support and data hosting charges for the first year.
9. Following majority decision of the Lower, Nursery and Special schools the preferred MIS system is Integris G2. The transition to IntegrisG2 was undertaken during the summer term 2010 and involved 4 Nursery schools, 6 Special schools and 83 Lower schools (total 93). A further 7 Middle schools also transferred to G2.



10. The actual cost of funding those schools in Central Bedfordshire that have transferred is approx £200k. For a number of schools (particularly those that previously used SIMS), a major incentive to transfer to a web MIS was the agreement that the LA would pay for costs covering the transition and support charges for the first year.
11. This will be discussed at the briefing session for Head Teachers. However, due to the reduction in the grant the LA only has funds to support 50% of the costs.

### **Broadband**

12. The broadband network is nearing the end of a renewal process to ensure all schools have a greater bandwidth. The renewal of the schools network has incurred significant excess charges which have been paid for from the Harnessing Technology Grant carry forward from 2009-10. The carry forward was the result of savings made through aggregated purchasing on behalf of all schools.
13. Taking into account the reduction in the grant, and to continue funding the broadband network, the average costs to schools will need to increase by approximately 40% from April 2011. This would mean that:  
  
The average Lower, Nursery & Special School costs would increase from **£3,063 to £4,288**  
The average Middle School costs would increase from **£5,569 to £7,797**  
The average Upper School costs would increase from **£7,240 to £10,136**
14. Schools are charged according to the school phase and number of pupils in school. Schools are not charged based on the geographical location of the school or the ease of which internet suppliers can provide services to that location. (i.e. the excess charges to connect a small rural lower school in the middle of the county costs over £20,000).
15. At the last meeting of the Central Bedfordshire e-Learning Board (our ICT governance group) the issue regarding schools needing to fund the increase in costs for broadband services via e2bn (the regional broadband consortium) was discussed. Head Teacher representatives agreed that the impact of increased charges for broadband warranted further discussion in a larger forum in the Autumn Term. This will be discussed at the briefing session on the 15<sup>th</sup> September.

### **Implementing Learning Platforms and support resources**

16. The annual maintenance charge for learning platforms would cost schools approximately £4.00 per registered pupil per year. This equates to
  - A typical Lower school would expect to pay £600
  - A typical Middle school would expect to pay £2000
  - A typical Upper school would expect to pay £4000

***However it should be noted that negotiations for pricing are still being discussed at Local Authority level and it may be that these figures will be reduced.***

17. Integrated learning platform and school based digital learning materials will also be affected by the reduction in grant and includes:
- Espresso: this would cost approximately £4 – £6 per pupil per year.
  - Encyclopaedia Britannica: this would cost approximately £1 - £2 per pupil per year
18. The impact on the Learning Platform and support resources will be applicable from July 2011, as these have been funded in advance.

#### **Devolved Allocation to Schools**

19. Schools were advised in March 2010 the amount of the devolved allocation to Schools for the financial year 2010-11. Schools are paid termly in advance and to date have received five months allocation (April – August). Due to the cut in the HT grant the LA cannot pass on the remaining seven months allocation as previously advised. One final payment will be made to schools in September to the value of 50% of the amount previously advised. should the proposal be agreed.

#### **Recommendations**

- (1) Contribution of the HT Grant to support the transition to a web based MIS be reduced by 50%.
- (2) To note the need for full cost recovery on the Broadband network.
- (3) To continue with the current charging methodology based on phase and pupil numbers.
- (4) To note the implications from July 2011 on charges relating to implementing the Learning platform and support resources
- (5) To reduce the 40% devolved allocation to Schools by 50% in line with the overall cut to the Harnessing Technology Grant

**Appendices:** None

---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** Educational Visits On-line Virtual Environment (EVOLVE)  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To update the Schools Forum on the use of EVOLVE and to agree the funding of the system

---

Contact Officer: Glynis Yates, Council Offices, Dunstable

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. **To agree:**
  - a) **the continued use of the EVOLVE system for the approval, monitoring and evaluation of Educational Visits and Journeys;**
  - b) **that from 2010/11 the annual costs of £5,000 should be centrally held as a legitimate DSG expense.**

#### **Background**

1. EVOLVE is an easy to use, web-based service which records and stores all school visits quickly and electronically. This system supports schools and the Local Authority in fulfilling their statutory responsibilities in relation to risk management and monitoring, as set out in Health and Safety: Responsibilities and Powers - December 2001 DfES. Currently there are 55 local authorities using the system to support the safeguarding of pupils and staff offsite.
2. Schools that take young people away from 'the base' have to seek some level of approval. The level of approval varies; the Local Authority approves all visits abroad or those involving adventure activity or a residential experience. Other visits are delegated to the Headteacher or equivalent for 'internal approval'. Evolve allows the Local Authority to track all delegated visits and to advise and support Visits Coordinators and Headteachers where there may be a failure to comply with the policy and regulations. Evolve also allows headteachers and Governing Bodies to instantly access information in relation to visits such as risk assessments, emergency procedures and nominal rolls and to generate detailed reports when the need arises.

### Current situation

3. Central Bedfordshire Council introduced the system in September 2009 and the annual cost is £5000. This covers the licence, technical support, updates and improvements to the system and continued storage of all LA visits.
4. The first year of using the system has been very successful and one hundred and twenty five schools (125) are using the system. There are 15 Lower schools who have still not registered onto the system.
5. Training has taken place centrally on several occasions and has been very well attended. Work based training has also been offered and many schools have opted for this to enable all staff to be trained on the same occasion.
6. Between September 2009 and August 2010, 1941 approved visits were recorded on EVOLVE with 66194 young people taking part in activities on 2607 days. The total number of participant days has been 109077.
7. There have been 93 visits abroad to 14 different countries including the usual Europe destinations but also those to Venezuela, Singapore and Africa.
8. Young people have taken part in 314 visits which included adventure activities and 182 residential experiences.
9. An increasing number of young people from Lower schools are experiencing visits abroad and those which are residential.
10. The majority of users like the system as it allows them to track visits and has reduced the need for paper systems. All information regarding staff competency, training, visits approved, young people's participation and evaluation of visits is stored electronically and can be retrieved quickly.

---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** Early Years Single Funding Formula  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To update the Schools Forum on the progress towards the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) for April 2011.

---

**Contact Officer:** Sue Tyler  
**Public/Exempt:** Public  
**Wards Affected:** All  
**Function of:** Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Schools Forum notes the progress towards the implementation of the EYSFF for April 2011.**

**Update**

1. Following the decision to allow local authorities (LAs) to defer the implementation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) in April 2010, the Department for Education (DfE) requires all LAs to introduce a single local funding formula (EYSFF) for all providers of the free flexible early years entitlement (FFEE) from April 2011.
2. Work has been undertaken on sampling the typical costs across a range of schools and settings providing FFEE. Six possible formula options were developed following this work and after considerable discussion the Early Years Reference Group is recommending that three formulae are consulted on during September and October. These options were chosen as they best reflected the needs of schools and the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector.

3. The factors within the three chosen options are as follows:

**Option A:**

- A differential base rate for all schools and settings of £3.20 per hour of those schools and settings providing up to 15 hours provision weekly and £3.50 for those providing over 15 hours weekly
- A social deprivation factor at three levels 20p per hour for the 30% most disadvantaged, 10p for 31-60% disadvantaged and 0p for remaining 61-100%
- Nursery school lump sum of £40,000
- A quality factor awarded at three levels 20p per hour to qualified teacher (QTS) and early years graduate with early years professional status (EYP), 15p per hour to an early years graduate without EYP and 10p per hour to a level 4. This factor will apply to the highest qualified practitioner and where two colleagues job share their total hours contact time applies
- Private, voluntary and independent (PVI) settings administration factor of £100 lump sum per year plus 10p per hour
- Nursery schools and PVI rent and rates factor of 10p per hour
- Nursery schools and PVI utilities factor of 10 per hour.

**Option B:**

- A differential base rate for nursery schools, lower schools and PVI settings
- For lower schools and PVI settings the base rate and additional factors are as in Option A
- For nursery schools:
  - Base rate of £3.45 per hour
  - Social deprivation factor at three levels as in Option A
  - Plus factors in current nursery school formula for pupil led funding:
    - Summer term intake
    - Free school meals
    - Insurance
    - School meals
    - HILLN (SEN)
  - Plus factors in current nursery school formula for:
    - Conditions survey
    - Floor area
    - Rent and rates
    - Lump sum
    - Insurance lump sum
    - School meals lump sum

**Option C:**

- A differential base rate for all schools and settings of £3.10 per hour for those schools and settings providing up to 15 hours provision weekly and £3.40 for those providing over 15 hours weekly
- An enhanced social deprivation factor at three levels with greater emphasis on the most disadvantaged children
- All other factors as Option A.

Appendix A sets out a summary of the three formula options.

4. The impact that the different formula options have on minimum and maximum hourly rates are as follows:

	Current hourly rate	Option A		Option B		Option C	
		Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
<b>Nursery Schools</b>	N/A	£4.04	£4.54	Due to the use of specific lump sums and rateable value a general hourly rate is not quantifiable, this will be individual to each Nursery / Lower School		Due to the use of IMD Data for Social Deprivation a general hourly rate is not quantifiable, this will be individual to each setting	
<b>Lower Schools (Nursery Class)</b>	N/A	£3.40	£3.90				
<b>PVI</b>	£3.70	£3.50	£4.20	£3.50	£4.20		
		Plus £100 lump sum PVI only					

Note : (1) To calculate the hourly rate for Option A for Lower and Nursery Schools it has been assumed that a qualified teacher is in place (2) Nursery School Lump sum equates to 0.54p per hour (3) The Lower School hourly rate only applies to the Early Years element of the school Individual Schools Budget.

5. It is proposed that the consultation with providers will be undertaken in September and October and that it will be published on the Central Bedfordshire website. Both email and paper based responses will be accepted. The process will be supported by the provision of information evenings.

### Recommendations

6. The Schools Forum notes progress towards the implementation of the EYSFF for April 2011.

### Reasons For Recommendations

7. Central Bedfordshire Council has a legal requirement to implement the EYSFF in April 2011.

### Appendices:

Appendix A – Summary Formula Options

This page is intentionally left blank



## Appendix A – Summary EYSFF Formula Options

The make-up of EYSFF Options A, B and C and rates are set out in the table below (calculations are based on an hourly rate per child and are at 2010-11 funding levels):

	<b>Option A</b>	<b>Option B</b>		<b>Option C</b>
<b>Base Rate</b>	All schools and settings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 15 hours provision £3.20 per hour</li> <li>Over 15 hours provision £3.50 per hour</li> </ul>	Nursery Schools - £3.45 per hour	Lower Schools & PVI settings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 15 hours provision £3.20 per hour</li> <li>Over 15 hours provision £3.50 per hour</li> </ul>	All schools and settings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 15 hours provision £3.10 per hour</li> <li>Over 15 hours provision £3.40 per hour</li> </ul>
<b>Social Deprivation</b>	Social deprivation (3 levels) - 0p, 10p and 20p per hour	Social deprivation (3 levels) – 0p, 10p and 20p per hour		Enhanced social deprivation using IMD Data
<b>Quality Factor</b>	Qualified Teacher (QTS) or Early Years Graduate with EYP – 20p per hour Early Years Graduate - 15p per hour Level 4 – 10p per hour			
<b>Administration</b>	PVI Administration - £100 lump sum plus 10p			
<b>Premises</b>	NS & PVI Rent & rates – 10p NS & PVI Utilities – 10p	PVI Rent & rates – 10p PVI Utilities – 10p		NS & PVI Rent & rates – 10p NS & PVI Utilities – 10p
<b>Other</b>	Nursery school lump sum - £40K	Nursery Schools only: Plus current factors for pupil led funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summer term intake</li> <li>Free school meals</li> <li>Insurance</li> <li>School meals</li> <li>HILLN (SEN)</li> </ul> Plus current factors for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conditions survey</li> <li>Floor area</li> <li>Rent and rates</li> <li>Lump sum</li> <li>Insurance lump sum</li> <li>School meals lump sum</li> </ul>		Nursery school lump sum - £40K



---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2010/11  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To update on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

---

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**To note the update on the 2010/11 Dedicated School Grant.**

**Background**

1. Since the beginning of the financial year 2006/07 local authorities have received allocations of DSG to finance the Schools Budget in each authority. The full DSG received must be applied to the Schools Budget in each authority, although authorities may provide additional resources in support of the Schools Budget should they decide to do so.
2. The Schools Budgets, as set out in the Statutory Section 251 budget, comprises the following:
  - a) Individual Schools Budgets (ISB), delegated to individual schools, by phase (also known as School Budget Shares). These allocations are delegated via the local Fair Funding Formula, which the Local Authority (LA) sets, in conjunction with its Schools' Forum.
  - b) Central Expenditure. This is the amount held back centrally for expenditure on pupils and includes:
    - Expenditure to fund Nursery Education in non-maintained settings (Private, Voluntary and Independent Sector)
    - School Specific Contingency
    - Special Education Needs - provision for statemented pupils, pupil referral units, behaviour support units
    - Termination of Employment costs

3. Central expenditure must not increase as a proportion of the overall Schools' Budget. This mechanism is known as the Central Expenditure Limit (CEL) and can only be breached in exceptional circumstances and with the specific approval of the Schools' Forum. In the case of Schools' Forum refusal the LA can ask the Secretary for State to approve the breach.
4. The final Schools' Budget depends on the January PLASC count and is determined by the units of funding (no of pupils - FTE) multiplied by the Guaranteed Unit of Funding (GUF).

### **Update**

5. Individual School Budgets (ISB) were issued to schools in March 2010 for the financial year 2010/11. In July 2010 the total DSG for Central Bedfordshire Council of £146.9m was published by the Department for Education (DfE). This takes into account an indicative recoupment figure for the All Saints Academy. The LA will be informed of the final DSG allocation in due course. However, should there be a shortfall of expected DSG, it has been previously agreed by Schools Forum (September 2006) to be met from the School Specific Contingency. The estimated shortfall in DSG is £309k.
6. The Individual Schools Budget (ISB) provides for 100% funding for rates, excluding Upper schools, where 60% applies (the remainder is said to be included within the 6<sup>th</sup> Form Funding). All schools with Foundation status are entitled to 80% mandatory relief on rates. In Central Bedfordshire there are 15 schools with Foundation status.
7. The LA is actively working with those schools that have yet to claim the mandatory relief to enable a release of funds through the ISB to the School Specific Contingency. The estimated increase to the Schools Specific Contingency is £390k, which will support the funding of shortfall in DSG.

**Appendices:** None

---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** Schools Specific Contingency Budget  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To provide an update on the use of the Schools Specific Contingency Budget for 2010/11.

---

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**To note the School Specific Contingency position statement as at Period 04.**

**Background**

1. The Schools Specific Contingency Budget falls under Schedule 2 of The School Finance Regulations 2008. 'Classes or descriptions of planned expenditure prescribed for the purposes of the Schools budget of a Local Authority which may be deducted from it to determine the Individual Schools Budget' (top slice Direct Schools Grant – DSG).
2. At the Central Bedfordshire School Forum on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2010, the following budgets were agreed:
  - £500,000 General Contingency
  - £275,670 SEN Contingency plus £205,058 to finance the shift of funding between the two new authorities arising from the Special Schools Funding Formula review. This is the final payment to Bedford Borough and thereafter the new national formula for DSG distribution will be in place. The recurrent budget of £275,670 is the balance of the former allocation to Rainbow School (now closed), where it was agreed that the funding would be retained for SEN provision.
3. Total Budget agreed for 2010/11 is £980,728.

The School Contingency carry forward from 2009/10, as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 is £873,843 which is split into General (£585,638) and SEN Contingency (£288,205).

4. The General Contingency budget can be utilised to fund the following:
- Rent and Joint Use equalisation charges;
  - Rates adjustments that have arisen from re-valuations or an adjustment to original formula;
  - Lease/planning permission associated with curriculum classes;
  - Adjustment to Formula i.e. floor area, teacher threshold, NQT, additional pupil numbers;
  - Contribution to part fund the administration of License Deficit Schools;
  - DSG shortfall;
  - Closing Schools;
  - Redundancy / Safeguarding costs where budget led;
  - Funding of exceptional circumstances, with up to £10,000 delegated to the Director of Children's Services;

**General Contingency Spend to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2010**

5. The following table sets out the spend against the General contingency.

	<b>BUDGET £</b>	<b>SPEND £</b>	<b>BALANCE £</b>
Carry Forward from 2009-10	585,63		
Budget Allocation 2010-11	500,000		
Floor Area Adjustments		(23,099)	
Lump Sum Adjustment		(7,915)	
Pupil Headcount Adjustment		(39,270)	
Rates Adjustments		199,149	
Rent and Joint Use		4,091	
LD Schools		(30,000)	
Balance relating to closing school		(2,501)	
Redundancy/Safeguarding costs		32,997	
<b>Total General Contingency</b>	<b>1,085,638</b>	<b>133,452</b>	<b>1,219,090</b>

6. The detail on the spend is as follows -
- Floor Area adjustments to the initial allocation of SBS.
  - Lump sum adjustment as agreed by School Forum for St Vincent School
  - Adjustment to pupil funding relating to revised school capacity.
  - Rates adjustments that have arisen from re-valuations/ rates relief.
  - Equalisation of costs relating to rent.
  - Contribution to the administration of License Deficit Schools as agreed by School Forum
  - Balance of deficit relating to the transfer of the Academy.
  - Accrual to offset funding of safeguarding and redundancy costs where budget led.

**SEN Contingency Spend to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2010**

7. It was resolved at the September 2007 School Forum meeting that the former Rainbow School budget would be ring fenced for Special Education Needs and would include growth bids for the period 2008/09 to 2010/11. This would include :-
- A growth in BESD provision
  - Revised formula for Special Schools
  - Additional and alternative models of specialist provision within mainstream schools
  - Additional support to mainstream schools:-
    - i. Specialist support services and BESD services
    - ii. Special Schools Outreach
    - iii. Commissioned support
8. The following table sets out the commitments to date against the SEN contingency.

	<b>BUDGET £</b>	<b>COMMITMENT £</b>	<b>BALANCE £</b>
Carry Forward from 2009-10	288,205		
Budget Allocation 2010-11	480,728		
Outstanding Oakbank Invoices		(50,000)	
Finance Shift of Funding (BBC)		(205,058)	
Estimate Outreach Work		(102,500)	
Estimate Closing School Deficit		(30,000)	
Redundancy costs		(80,000)	
Savings Lump Sum Closing School		58,007	
Accruals Oakbank Invoices		7,002	
<b>Total General Contingency</b>	<b>768,933</b>	<b>(402,549)</b>	<b>366,384</b>

9. The remainder of the SEN Contingency will be set aside to offset the cost in the increase in Central Bedfordshire children attending other Local Authority schools (Special Recoupment).

**Appendices:**

None

This page is intentionally left blank



---

**Meeting:** Schools Forum  
**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010  
**Subject:** School Forum Budget  
**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services  
**Summary:** To provide an update on the use of the School Forum Budget for 2010/11.

---

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford  
Public/Exempt: Public  
Wards Affected: All  
Function of: Council  
Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**To note the School Forum position statement as at Period 04.**

**Background**

1. The School Forum Budget falls under Section 2 of The School Finance Regulations 2008. 'Classes or descriptions of planned expenditure prescribed for the purposes of the Schools budget of a Local Education Authority which may be deducted from it to determine the Individual Schools Budget' (top slice Direct Schools Grant - DSG) – 'establishment and maintenance, of and consultation with, schools forums'.
2. It was agreed at the School Forum meeting of the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2010 that a budget of £5,000 will be available for costs associated with the operation of the Forum e.g. venue hire, expenses and clerking costs, of which £2,000 be set aside and delegated to the Chairman of the Schools Forum to fund the commissioning of consultancy and administration support. The level of the budget will be reviewed annually.
3. The School Forum budget under spend from 2009/10, as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 is £2,694, which is carried forward to 2010/11.

**Expenditure to Date**

4. It was further resolved at the School Forum meeting of the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2010 that Central Bedfordshire would remain a member of the F40 Group, representing the lowest funded Local Authorities and that £2,000 from the Schools Forum budget be utilised for the annual subscription.

5. The following table sets out the spend against the School Forum Budget.

	<b>BUDGET £</b>	<b>SPEND £</b>	<b>BALANCE £</b>
Carry Forward from 2009/10	2,694		
Budget Allocation 2010/11	5,000		
F40 Subscription		(2,000)	
Consultancy DSG Review		(1,625)	
Subsistence		(5)	
Conference Expenses		(216)	
<b>Total General Contingency</b>	<b>7,694</b>	<b>(3,846)</b>	<b>3,848</b>

**Appendices:**

None

**Meeting:** Schools Forum

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010

**Subject:** Outline Forward Programme

**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Children's Services

**Summary:** To provide an update on the likely programme for the next year and confirm Sub Group membership

Contact Officer: Dawn Hill, Borough Hall, Bedford

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

Reason for urgency  
(if appropriate)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**To note the programme and to agree the establishment of a schools Asset Management sub group and to request membership.**

**Update**

- Set out in the table below are the likely agenda items for the Schools Forum for the 2010/11 Academic Year. The programme will need to be flexible, to respond to national and local policy issues and the actual timings of preparatory work, including that of any sub-groups.

	<b>1<sup>st</sup> November (p.m.)</b>	<b>24<sup>th</sup> January (a.m.)</b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> March (p.m.)</b>	<b>21<sup>st</sup> June (a.m.)</b>
Surplus Balances	Yes			Yes
Dedicated School Grant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Technical Funding Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Standards Fund			Yes	
SEN Special Recoupment		Yes		
Early Years	Yes	Yes	Yes	
License Deficit Schools	Yes		Yes	
Impact of Council's Budget	Yes			Yes
Scheme for Financing Schools	Yes		Yes	
School Capital Programme		Yes		
14 – 19 Arrangements	Yes		Yes	
School Risk Register	Yes		Yes	
School Contingency and Forum Budget	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

2. Possible future dates Monday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2011 and 24<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

**Sub Groups**

3. The Early Years Reference Group is already established as a sub-group to the Schools Forum on the Early Years Reform.
4. The 14 – 19 Partnership effectively acts as a sub-group for 14-19 funding decisions, in its strategic capacity within the authority and the Children’s Trust.
5. At the June 2010 Forum meeting it was resolved that there should be one larger main sub group and that this should be the Technical Funding sub group and if need arose ad-hoc sub group meetings be held on other issues.
6. It is proposed that the Technical Funding sub group agree specific areas of the current LA formula to be revisited along side any guidance issued following the current consultation on School Funding for 2011/12.
7. Members of the Technical Funding sub group met in July 2010 to discuss Surplus Balances arising from the 2009/10 financial year, as there was no specific group agreed at the previous meeting.
8. It is proposed that a School Asset Management sub group be set up to take part in discussions on the development of the Asset Management Plan (AMP) and School Carbon Reduction Plan.

**Appendices:** None