

---

# NOTICE OF MEETING

---

## SCHOOLS FORUM

**WEDNESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2015 AT 4.30PM**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A, SECOND FLOOR, THE CIVIC OFFICES**

Telephone enquiries to Jane Di Dino 023 9283 4060

Email: [jane.didino@portsmouthcc.gov.uk](mailto:jane.didino@portsmouthcc.gov.uk)

---

### **Membership**

#### Schools Members

One head teacher representative - nursery phase

Three head teacher representatives - primary phase

Two head teacher representatives - secondary phase

One head teacher representative - special phase

Five academy representatives

Five governors

#### Non School Members

Four Councillors (one from each political party)

One representative from the following organisations:

The Anglican Diocese

The Roman Catholic Diocese

The 16-19 representative

The Early Years providers (from the private, voluntary and independent sector)

---

(NB This agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting).

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: [www.portsmouth.gov.uk](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk)

## **AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**

- 3      **Membership Changes.**
- 4      **Minutes and Matters Arising From the Previous Meeting held on 21 January 2015 (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 5      **Appointment of Chair.**
- 6      **Appointment of Vice Chair.**
- 7      **2015-16 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget. (Pages 7 - 18)**

Purpose

Under the 'School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014, the Local Authority must not later than 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015:

- a. Make an initial determination of their school budget; and
- b. Give notice of that determination to the governing bodies of the schools they maintain.

The purpose of this report is therefore to inform Schools Forum of the initial determination of the schools budget (including the individual schools budgets) for 2015-16 and to seek the necessary endorsement and approvals required.

**RECOMMENDED that the Schools Forum:**

1. **Endorse the determination of the 2015-16 schools budget (including the individual schools budgets) shown at Appendix 1, together with the supporting explanations contained within this report and specifically agree the following budget lines:**
  - i. the amended growth fund;
  - ii. the early years central expenditure; and
  - iii. the Admissions Service and Schools Forum.
2. **Endorse the 2015-16 Element 3 Top-up rates for the Special Schools and Resourced Units as set out in Appendix 2.**
3. **Endorse the 2015-16 Element 3 Top-up rates for the Alternative Provision settings set out in paragraph 6.12.**
4. **Endorse the decision that any carry-forward balances from 2014-15 be used to assist with the continued introduction of the funding reform changes and fund any potential financial pressures arising during 2015-16.**

**8 School Modernisation Capital Programme - Capital Contributions From Schools. (Pages 19 - 30)**

Purpose.

The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement for the schools capital contribution methodology to be used from 2015/16 onwards. This follows the endorsement of the proposed new methodology by Schools Forum on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015 and the subsequent request to schools that was sent out on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2015 asking for confirmation of their support for the new methodology.

**RECOMMENDED that the Schools Forum:**

- a) Note the response and feedback to the request that was sent out to school Governing Bodies to confirm whether they would support the new methodology, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report;**
- b) Acknowledge that the proposed new methodology (as set out in Appendix 1) is unviable, due to the fact that nearly half of the schools that responded confirmed they would not support the proposal;**
- c) Endorse the alternative methodology (as set out in section 6 of this report), whereby only maintained schools having capital schemes delivered will be expected to contribute financially to the schemes.**

**9 Any Other Business.**

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

## SCHOOLS FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the Schools Forum held on Wednesday, 21 January 2015 at 4.30pm at the Civic Offices, Portsmouth.

### Present

Mark Mitchell, Governor	Special (Chair)
Clive Good, Governor	Primary
Jackie Collins, Head Teacher	Primary
Julie Cragg, Head Teacher ( <i>substitute for Sue Wilson</i> )	Primary
Krishna Purbhoo, Head Teacher ( <i>substitute for Margaret Dunford</i> )	Special
Gareth Hughes, Head Teacher	Secondary
David Jeapes, Head Teacher	Secondary
Sarah Sadler, Head Teacher	Primary
Karen Stocks, Head Teacher	Nursery
Margaret Beal	Primary Academy representative
Alison Beane	Special Academy representative
James Humphries	Secondary Academy representative
Steve Labeledz	Secondary Academy representative
Lee Miller	Secondary Academy representative
Cllr Ken Ferret	Labour Party
Cllr Colin Galloway	United Kingdom Independence Party
Steve Frampton	16 - 19 Representative

### 1. Apologies

Apologies were received from:

- Margaret Dunford (substituted by Krishna Purbhoo)
- Sue Wilson (substituted by Julie Cragg)
- Bruce Marr
- Stephen Sheehan
- Councillor Lynne Stagg
- Councillor Neil Young

### 2. Declarations of interests

No interests were declared.

### 3. Membership changes

Richard Webb informed the Forum of the following changes:

#### Leavers

The membership tenures of Sue Wilson and Karen Stocks had come to an end and both have been re-appointed at the Primary Phase Conference this week.

### New Members

The following members have been elected by the Secondary Academy Proprietors to join the Schools Forum to represent the Secondary Academy Proprietors:

Lee Miller - The Thinking Schools Trust  
Steve Labedz - Salterns Academy Trust  
James Humphries - Bohunt Trust

There remains one vacancy for a Nursery Governor Representative.

#### **4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 October 2014 and matters arising.**

##### Matters Arising.

Mark Mitchell noted that the top up rates for funding alternative provision places were only for Harbour School Local Authority funded places.

Richard Webb confirmed that this was correct and that further details would be provided in the budget report in February.

#### **5. School Revenue Funding Arrangements 2015-16**

Richard Webb introduced the report and informed the forum about the updates that had occurred since the meeting papers had been published:

- The Cabinet Member for Children & Education had approved the proposals funding formula and proposed contained within this report at the Portfolio meeting on 19 January. The Forum is now being asked to endorse the approved proposals.
- The Department for Education had notified the Council of an error in its data for the Free School Meal factor for one school. This has been corrected and had resulted in an increased funding requirement of £20,000.

In response to questions he clarified the following points:

The table in section 4.1 was extracted from the report that was considered at the July meeting and shows the estimated financial funding requirement at that time compared to the original 2014-15 budget; whereas Appendix 1 shows the estimated funding requirement changes for 2015-16 against the revised 2014-15 budget.

Mark Mitchell noted that consultation with mainstream schools regarding Outreach services is important. Julian Wooster agreed to feed this back to the Inclusion Support Commissioning Manager.

##### **Schools Members:**

- a) Endorsed the proposed changes to the mainstream schools revenue funding formula as set out in paragraph 5.6.**

- b) Endorsed the de-delegated unit values for 2015-16 as shown at Appendix 2.
- c) Endorsed the amount of the growth fund for 2015-16 at £200,000.
- d) Endorsed the school funding pro-forma at Appendix 3 for submission to the DfE on the 20th January 2015 subject to the inclusion of amendment regarding free school meals factor to correct the DfE data error.

*Note: all the above were approved unanimously.*

#### **The Schools Forum:**

- e) Noted the financial context and challenges facing the Dedicated Schools Grant budgets as well as the wider Council as set out in section 4
- f) Endorsed the proposals in respect of the funding for Outreach services (also known as PSENSP) as set out in section 7.
- g) Endorsed the decision to cease the operation of the Exceptional Circumstances Fund from 1st April 2015.
- h) Noted that the overall indicative Dedicated School Grant budget for 2015- 16 will be presented to a meeting in February for approval before the statutory deadline of the 28th February.

*Note: all the above were approved unanimously.*

### **6. School Modernisation Capital Programme - Capital Contributions From Schools**

Mike Stoneman introduced the report and circulated an updated appendix two, together with the anonymised written responses from schools.

As discussion took place and in response to questions, Mr Stoneman and Mr Webb clarified the following points:

- If the majority of schools decide not to contribute to the scheme the viability of the scheme would be severely affected.
- The mechanism has been adjusted to ensure that school contributions would be reduced if it would mean that their overall revenue and capital balances would be reduced to less than £25,000.
- Financial modelling based on the 2014-15 data showed that the majority of schools (36) would contribute less than £20,000. 10 schools would contribute between £20,001 and £100,000. With two schools contributing over £100,000 (although one is now an Academy and would not be part of the scheme).
- An amended appendix two was circulated which showed that 14 responses had been received; 9 agreed with the new methodology; 6 were against.
- The principle of the scheme was agreed at the Forum meeting in October 2014 and this report and the proposals are based on the comments received in October.
- Without a collaborative approach, the number of schemes that could be completed will be reduced.

Members of the forum expressed the following concerns:

- Schools might decide to decrease their balances in order to reduce their contribution to the scheme.
- Schools felt that the 25% contribution rate for those schools that did not join the scheme was a penalty charge.
- Last February, the Forum discussed school balances and expressed some concern about the large amounts carried forward and maybe this should be revisited.

David Jeapes explained that he agreed with the principle of larger schools assisting smaller ones which is in the best interests of all the children in the city. However, as he represents all the secondary schools he would abstain from voting based on the feedback from the other Secondary Head Teachers.

#### **The Schools Forum:**

- a) Noted the principles adopted in determining the proposed contribution methodology, as set out in section 4 of this report.**
- b) Noted the response and feedback to the consultation, as set out in Appendix 2.**
- c) Considered and approved the proposed methodology for implementation from 1 April 2015 (*i.e. whereby all maintained schools contribute, as set out in section 5 of this report*).**

*Note: Voting: 10 for; 1 against and 5 abstentions).*

#### **Actions**

It was agreed that Mike Stoneman:

1. Would write to Heads and the Governing Bodies of maintained schools requesting that they endorse this proposal.
2. Bring a report back to the Schools Forum meeting in February to update members on the number of schools that agreed to join the scheme and its viability.

#### **7. Budget Monitoring Report as at 30 September 2014**

Richard Webb introduced the report and in response to questions, clarified the following points:

- The costs of some High Needs placements are expensive, particularly where children are placed in Out of City placements.
- The city is not unique in terms of the pressures it is experiencing which are partly due to changes to the funding model.
- Richard and Alison will be attending the DfE - 'Call For Evidence' seminar in relation to the proposed developments for High Needs funding.

Mark Mitchell noted that needs have become more complex nationally. The only options available are to increase the number of places or build more special schools. It is important to reduce the number of out of city placements and increase the level of inclusion especially at primary schools.

Julian Wooster, Director of Children's Services and Strategic Director, Education and Strategic Commissioning explained that although there were



historically low levels of out of city placements, it has been difficult in recent years to find placements in the city. It would not be possible to build more special schools. He offered the Forum more information on these issues at a future meeting.

**The Schools Forum noted the forecast budget position for the financial year as at the end of September 2014.**

Any Other Business.

**The Forum agreed that the meeting provisionally scheduled for 22 April would be removed from the calendar.**

The future 2015 meeting dates are as follows:

- 25 February
- 15 July
- 21 October

The meeting concluded at 6.15pm.

---

Mark Mitchell  
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

**Title of meeting:** Schools Forum

**Date of meeting:** 25 February 2015

**Subject:** 2015-16 Dedicated Schools Grant Budget

**Report from:** Julian Wooster, Director of Children's and Adults Services

**Report by:** Richard Webb, Finance Manager for Children's Services

**Wards affected:** All Wards

**Key decision:** No

**Full Council decision:** No

---

## **1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1. Under the 'School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014, the Local Authority must not later than 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015:
- a. Make an initial determination of their school budget; and
  - b. Give notice of that determination to the governing bodies of the schools they maintain.
- 1.2. The purpose of this report is therefore to inform Schools Forum of the initial determination of the schools budget (including the individual schools budgets) for 2015-16 and to seek the necessary endorsement and approvals required.
- .

## **2. Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Schools Forum:

- a. **Endorse the determination of the 2015-16 schools budget (including the individual schools budgets) shown at Appendix 1, together with the supporting explanations contained within this report and specifically agree the following budget lines:**
  - i. the amended growth fund;
  - ii. the early years central expenditure; and
  - iii. the Admissions Service and Schools Forum.
- b. **Endorse the 2015-16 Element 3 Top-up rates for the Special Schools and Resourced Units as set out in Appendix 2.**

- c. **Endorse the 2015-16 Element 3 Top-up rates for the Alternative Provision settings set out in paragraph 6.12.**
- d. **Endorse the decision that any carry-forward balances from 2014-15 be used to assist with the continued introduction of the funding reform changes and fund any potential financial pressures arising during 2015-16.**

### **3. Background & Previous Decisions**

- 3.1. The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is a ring-fenced grant for education and can only be used for the purposes of the Schools Budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations.
- 3.2. Members have already received a number of reports and have endorsed or made a number of decisions in respect of the revenue funding arrangements for 2015-16.
- 3.3. The decisions previously made and reflected within the proposed budget at Appendix 1 are summarised below.
  - 3.3.1. The revenue funding formula for 2015-16 for all Primary and Secondary Schools, including the de-delegated budgets and the amount of the Growth Fund.
  - 3.3.2. The proposed changes to the funding arrangements for Outreach Services (also known as PSENSP).
  - 3.3.3. The cessation of the operation of the Exceptional Circumstances Fund and Falling Rolls Fund from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.
- 3.4. The purpose of this report is to seek the necessary approvals and endorsements in respect of the remaining areas of the budget, which have yet to be finalised.

### **4. Centrally Retained Budgets**

- 4.1 As reported in January, the Department for Education has negotiated additional national licences for 2015-16. As a result, the amount proposed to be de-delegated from schools was reduced and the amount proposed to be centrally retained has been increased to cover the anticipated costs from the DfE. A budget provision of £120,000 had initially been set aside whilst preparing the draft budget. The DfE has now issued initial confirmation that the charge for 2015-16 will be £104,600. The initial confirmation has yet to be reviewed and following final confirmation of the charges, any adjustments proposed to the budget may be made as part of the revised budget in July 2015.

- 4.2 The other centrally retained budgets include the Admissions service and the Schools Forum. In accordance with the regulations, these budgets will remain at the 2014-15 and 2013-14 levels.

## **5. Early Years**

### 3 & 4 year old provision

- 5.1 No changes are proposed to the funding formula or rates applied to the three and four year old provision.
- 5.2 As previously reported during 2014-15, an overspend has been forecast in the 3 & 4 year old provision. In order to ensure that there is a sustainable and balanced budget, the budget provision for 3 & 4 year olds has been increased by £241,000 for 2015-16 as shown in Appendix 1 to meet these pressures.

### 2 year old provision

- 5.3 No changes are proposed to the funding formula or rates applied to the 2 year old provision.
- 5.4 As reported in January, the government has announced that the 2 year old funding arrangements, (in terms of the funding the Council receives) will move from the current 'lump sum' allocation basis to a 'participation' funding basis in 2015-16 (i.e. based on actual number of 2 years olds in Nursery settings on a census date). As a result of this change, it is expected that the DSG may experience further financial pressure. This pressure will be as a result of a continued growth in the number of 2 years olds in Nursery settings, with a funding source initially based on the January 2015 census count.
- 5.5 The DfE has confirmed that the initial funding allocation for 2015-16 will be issued in June 2015. Therefore at this stage in the budget setting process, the actual income and expenditure for 2015-16 in respect of the 2 year old funding are unknown. It is estimated that there will be 890 pupils at the time of the January 2015 census count. The number of eligible 2 year olds in Nursery settings is expected to continue to grow towards the current target of 1200, but the timing of this is unknown. A mid-year census count will be used by the DfE to adjust funding in year to reflect any significant increases in take-up of the entitlement; although specific details about this process have not yet been announced.
- 5.6 The budget estimates included within the budget at Appendix 1, have assumed that the number of two year olds required to be funded in the summer, autumn and spring terms will be 890, 1045 and 1200 respectively. However, it has been assumed that the income received will be based on 890 pupils in the Summer Term and only 1045 in the autumn and spring terms. These assumptions may need to be revised

during the financial year as further information becomes available.

- 5.7 In 2014-15 the two year old expenditure budget also included £780,000 of trajectory funding (including carry forward funding from 2013-14) to support the expansion of two year old places in the city. In 2015-16 the Council has not received any further trajectory funding and this is the main reason for the reduction of the two year old expenditure budget of £814,000 in Appendix 1.

#### Central Costs

- 5.8 As highlighted in the January report, on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014, the Full Council agreed savings proposals amounting to £13.1m. Included within these proposals was a requirement for the DSG to fund £200,000 of eligible expenditure (in accordance with the Early Years and Schools Finance (England) Regulations 2014) currently being funded by the Council.
- 5.9 It is proposed that the following eligible expenditure will be funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant in 2015-16:
- a. Support to early years pupils with special educational needs;
  - b. Eligibility checks and support to regarding 3 and 4 year old pupil premium; and
  - c. Expenditure on the provision of childcare for a young child (such as second language support to early year's pupils and advisory teacher support in respect of language development).

## **6. High Needs**

- 6.1 The growing financial pressures in the DSG Budget, particularly in relation to High Needs both in the current and future years, have been reported previously to Members. As a result of the identified pressures, the DSG budgets were revised during 2014-15 and £933,000 of additional funding was made available to support High Needs.
- 6.2 In setting the budget for 2015-16, it has been necessary to fund these pressures; which are continuing to grow. The table below summarises the additional funding required compared to the original 2014-15 budget.

	<b>Additional funding required compared to 2014-15</b>
<b><i>High Needs Budgets:</i></b>	
Additional Special School & Resourced Unit Places	260,000
Element 3 Top Funding	369,000
Medical & Individual Tuition	220,000
Out of City Placements	350,000
Post-16	185,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,384,000</b>

- 6.3 In order to balance the budget in 2015-16, it has been necessary to redirect funding from other areas of the DSG budget, as shown in Appendix 1.
- 6.4 Further details in respect of the High Needs budgets and the financial pressures for 2015-16 are set out below.

#### Place Funding

- 6.5 The place funding value for Special Schools and Resourced Unit remains at £10,000 per agreed commissioned place. For Alternative Provision settings, the 2014 finance regulations require the annual place funding value to increase from £8,000 to £10,000 from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015.
- 6.6 The table below shows the agreed commissioned places for the Special Schools in 2014-15, together with the anticipated additional places required to be funded for the 2014-15 Summer Term and the first two terms of the Academic year 2015-16.

<b>School</b>	<b>Original Agreed Commissioned Places 2014-15</b>	<b>Additional Places Summer Term 2015*</b>	<b>Additional Places Academic Year 2015-16*</b>
Cliffdale	104	-	19
Harbour	84	-	-
Mary Rose	125	7	14
Redwood Park	141	-	-
Willows	42	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>33</b>

\* additional places required when compared to original agreed commissioned places

- 6.7 There are no proposed changes to the number Alternative Provision places commissioned at the Harbour School and Flying Bull Academy.

- 6.8 The small movement in the budget at Appendix 1 for the Resourced Units place funding, reflects the anticipated full year funding requirement for the provision at St Edmunds.

### Element 3 Top-up Funding

- 6.9 As previously reported, no changes are proposed to the current Element 3 Top-up funding rates for pupils in Special Schools or Resourced Units in 2015-16. The proposed rates for 2015-16 are shown in Appendix 2.
- 6.10 Although there have been no changes proposed to the top-up funding rates, the budget provision has been amended to reflect the changes arising from a growth in the number of places and the known and forecast effect of 'band creep'. The reduction in the Element 3 top-up funding budget shown in Appendix 1 reflects the cessation of the Exceptional Circumstances Funding which has been re-directed to support the various High Needs pressures.
- 6.11 With the introduction of the new finance regulations, the DfE are changing the annual place funding for Alternative Provision (AP) places from £8,000 per place to £10,000 with effect from 1 September 2015. The DfE have been clear that there will be no additional funding and they will expect to see a reduction in Element 3 Top- up funding to maintain affordability.
- 6.12 In order to maintain a balanced budget, it will be necessary to amend the Element 3 Top-up rates for pupils placed by the Local Authority at Flying Bull Primary and The Harbour Alternative Provision settings in 2015-16 as shown below.

	<b>The Harbour School</b>	<b>Flying Bull Primary Academy</b>
Element 3 Top up rate (Apr 15 - Aug 15)	£5,273	£6,638
Element 3 Top up rate (Sept 2015 to Aug 2016)	£2,714	£4,638

### Out of City Placements

- 6.13 The cost of out of city placements is forecast to increase by £150,000 in 2015-16 to £1.55m, due to the continued number of active placements being in the region of 30. Currently there are 29 children in placements out of the city. The average cost of a placement is £52,617, although the actual cost of individual placements varies and the current maximum placement cost is circa £148,000.
- 6.14 The Inclusion Service is currently reviewing all of the out of city placements to determine whether any of the pupils are able to be



educated within Portsmouth. Additionally, the service is working to adapt or develop provision to meet pupils' more complex needs within the city in future, to reduce the need for out of city placements.

## 7. Dedicated Schools Grant

- 7.1 On the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014, the DfE announced the Dedicated Schools Grant Allocations for Portsmouth for 2015-16; which amounted to £131.298m (2014-15 = £129.300m); excluding two year old funding. These allocations include the funding for both maintained schools and Academies; therefore the amount received directly by Portsmouth City Council will be less.
- 7.2 As explained earlier, due to the change in funding for two year olds moving from a 'lump sum' allocation basis to a 'participation' basis, the initial two year funding allocation will not be announced until June 2015; following completion of the January 2015 census count. Additionally, the Early Years Block initial funding allocation will be updated by the DfE following the January census count.
- 7.3 The funding allocation for Portsmouth is shown in the table below. The amount expected to be received directly by Portsmouth City Council is £95.891m. The funding received directly will continue to change during the year as schools convert to Academy status and receive their funding directly from the Education Funding Agency rather than through the Council.

<b>DSG Funding</b>	<b>2015-16 £m</b>
Schools Block	71,859
Early Years Block*	8,347
High Needs Block	12,999
2 Year Old Funding**	2,878
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>96,083</b>

\* This is a Provisional Allocation and will be updated later in the year.

\*\* This allocation will not be confirmed until June 2015 and has been estimated.

## 8. 2015-16 Mainstream Funding Formula

- 8.1 Following submission of the revenue funding formula for all Primary and Secondary schools and Academies, the Department for Education completed its national review process of the funding proformas submitted by Local Authorities. As a result of that review, together with the correction to the underlying data provided by the DfE, it has been necessary to amend the proforma. As a consequence of these changes the overall funding requirement has reduced by circa £165,000. It is

proposed that this funding continues to be set aside for all mainstream schools and Academies in Portsmouth and that therefore the value of Growth Fund is increased by £165,000 to £365,000.

- 8.2 The mainstream funding proforma has been adjusted and resubmitted to the DfE and they have confirmed that it is now compliant with the regulations. The final budget shares and the supporting guidance for schools and Academies will be issued as soon as possible.

## **9. Carry Forward Balances**

- 9.1 At this stage in the financial year we are unable to confirm what the final carry forward balance will be, although indications are that this could be in the region of £1.8m. Any carry-forward balance would be a one-off funding source and therefore should be used to support one-off expenditure items rather than recurring expenditure budgets.
- 9.1 In setting the budget for 2015-16, it is considered necessary to retain any carry forward balance to assist with the continued introduction of the National Fair Funding Formula arrangements and be available to support the financial risks and pressures arising in 2015-16. As in 2014-15 it is expected that there will be continuing pressures in respect of High Needs and Early Years, as well as the new 2 year old funding arrangements.

## **10. Reasons for recommendations**

Members are recommended to endorse the proposals contained within this report. Under the 'School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014, Local Authorities must not later than the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015 make an initial determination of their school budget.

## **11. Equality impact assessment (EIA)**

This report does not require an Equality Impact Assessment as the proposal does not have any impact upon a particular equalities group.

## **12. Legal comments**

The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014 require local authorities to make an initial determination of their schools budget by the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015. The recommendations in this report have regard to the requirements of those regulations and in particular identify elements of the proposals in respect of which the Schools Forum's specific endorsement is required.

### 13. Head of Finance comments

Financial comments have been included within the body of this report.

.....  
Signed by: Julian Wooster, Director of Children's & Adults' Services

### Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Dedicated Schools Grant Budget 2015-16

Appendix 2 - Element 3 Top-Up Rates 2015-16

### Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
2015-16 Revenue Funding Arrangements: Operational Information for Local Authorities	DfE Website
The School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2014	<a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk">www.legislation.gov.uk</a>
School revenue funding working papers	Education Finance

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by:

## Appendix 1 - Dedicated Schools Grant Budget 2015-16

	Revised 2014-15 Budget (including Academies)	Estimated Budget Revisions	2015-16 Schools Budget (including Academies)	2015-16 Schools Budget (excluding Academies)
	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Individual School Budgets (ISB)</b>				
Primary	58,837	1,870	60,707	47,792
Secondary	43,666	(33)	43,633	21,144
Special School Place Funding	5,094	94	5,188	2,898
Resourced Unit Place Funding	870	32	902	612
Alternative Provision Place Funding	1,304	190	1,494	1,384
	<b>109,771</b>	<b>2,153</b>	<b>111,924</b>	<b>73,830</b>
<b>De-delegated and central budgets</b>				
Growth Fund	300	65	365	365
Falling Rolls Fund	109	(109)	0	0
De-delegated budgets	1,485	(923)	562	562
Licences	64	56	120	120
Schools Forum	15	-	15	15
Admissions	252	-	252	252
	<b>2,225</b>	<b>(911)</b>	<b>1,314</b>	<b>1,314</b>
<b>Early Years</b>				
3 & 4 Year Old Provision	7,559	241	7,800	7,800
2 Year Old Provision	3,692	(814)	2,878	2,878
Central Expenditure on under 5	398	201	599	599
	<b>11,649</b>	<b>(372)</b>	<b>11,277</b>	<b>11,277</b>
<b>High Needs</b>				
Element 3 Top-up funding	6,952	(347)	6,605	6,605
Out of City Placements	1,400	150	1,550	1,550
SEN Support Services	687	-	687	687
Medical Education	573	-	573	573
Outreach Services	232	(45)	187	187
Fair Access Protocol	60	-	60	60
	<b>9,904</b>	<b>(242)</b>	<b>9,662</b>	<b>9,662</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>133,549</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>134,177</b>	<b>96,083</b>
<b>DSG Income<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>(129,300)</b>	<b>(1,999)</b>	<b>(131,299)</b>	<b>(93,205)</b>
<b>DSG Income (2 Year Old Funding)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>(3,349)</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>(2,878)</b>	<b>(2,878)</b>
<b>One-off use of Carry Forward</b>	<b>(900)</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(133,549)</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>(134,177)</b>	<b>(96,083)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per DfE allocations 17<sup>th</sup> December including provisional Early Years funding

<sup>2</sup> Estimated funding. Initial allocation will be announced by DfE in June 2015



Special Schools

	<b>Cliffdale</b>	<b>Harbour</b>	<b>Mary Rose</b>	<b>Redwood</b>	<b>Willows</b>
	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Band A	18,834	18,011	19,461	21,283	20,182
Band B	10,486	9,859	11,246	11,898	12,462
Band C	8,844	8,255	9,629	10,051	10,943
Band D	7,491	6,933	8,299	8,529	9,692
Band E	5,802	5,284	6,636	6,630	8,130
Band F	3,475	3,012	4,346	4,014	5,978
Band G	2,663	2,219	3,547	3,101	5,227
Band H	1,191	781	2,098	1,446	3,866

*Note: the top-up rate for places in Stamshaw is £28,190*

Resourced Units

	<b>2015-16</b>
	<b>£</b>
Devonshire Infant	0
Milton Park	8,476
Northern Parade Junior	0
Penhale Infant	101
Portsdown	0
Southsea Infant	2,731
Victory	1,934
Craneswater Annex	25,448
St Edmunds	0

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Subject:** Schools Modernisation Capital Programme - capital contributions from schools

**Date of meeting:** 25 February 2015

**Report from:** Julian Wooster, Director of Children's and Adults Services

**Report by:** Mike Stoneman, Strategic Commissioning Manager

**Wards affected:** All Wards

**Key decision:** No

**Full Council Decision** No

---

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement for the schools capital contribution methodology to be used from 2015/16 onwards. This follows the endorsement of the proposed new methodology by Schools Forum on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015 and the subsequent request to schools that was sent out on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2015 asking for confirmation of their support for the new methodology.

## 2. Recommendation

### 2.1 It is recommended that Schools Forum:

- a) Note the response and feedback to the request that was sent out to school Governing Bodies to confirm whether they would support the new methodology, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report;
- b) Acknowledge that the proposed new methodology (as set out in Appendix 1) is unviable, due to the fact that nearly half of the schools that responded confirmed they would not support the proposal;
- c) Endorse the alternative methodology (as set out in section 6 of this report), whereby only maintained schools having capital schemes delivered will be expected to contribute financially to the schemes.

## 3. Background to current methodology

- 3.1 Each year, the Council agrees a school modernisation capital programme which addresses urgent condition works in LA maintained schools. The

projects which feature in the programme have been identified through Asset Management Plan meetings with the schools, condition surveys and recommendations by Education officers concerning the needs of specific pupils.

- 3.2 The existing methodology, applied for 2013/14 and 2014/15, was based on the following:

Minimum Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) contribution proposed from schools (25% maximum threshold for Primary Schools)

- Scheme Value £15,001 - £50,000 – equivalent of 1 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation
- Scheme Value £50,001 - £190,000 – equivalent of 2 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation
- Scheme Value above £190,000 – equivalent of 3 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation

- 3.3 For schools where there were multiple schemes, the methodology described above was applied to each scheme.

- 3.4 Where schools converted to Academy status, the outstanding contributions would be deducted in calculating their final surplus or deficit.

- 3.5 In all cases contributions were subject to affordability. The existing criteria for this are set out below:

- All maintained schools are expected to financially contribute to capital works, related to school condition projects carried out at their school. The level of the contribution will be in accordance with scales agreed by Schools Forum.
- In the following circumstances, the contributions from the schools in respect of condition projects may be recovered over an extended period (the extension will be by one financial year):
  - the school already has an on-going commitment to contribute to a previous condition project; or
  - the school has had more than one scheme approved in the current financial year which attract a contribution; and
  - the schools financial reserves (capital and revenue) at 31 March of the previous financial year are less than 4% (Primary/Special) and 2% (Secondary) of the schools delegated budget share.
- In the following circumstances, the contributions from the schools in respect of condition projects may be waived:
  - the school already has an on-going commitment to contribute to a previous condition project; and



- the schools financial reserves (capital and revenue) at 31 March of the previous financial year are less than 1% (Primary/Special), 0.5% (Secondary) of the schools delegated budget share or,
- the expected contribution would cause the school to have an in-year and overall deficit balance.

#### 4. Background to the proposed new methodology

- 4.1 A report was presented to Schools Forum on 15 October 2014, which identified a significant funding gap and issues related to the existing methodology for calculating school contributions. Schools Forum endorsed, in principle, a proposal to introduce a new affordable and equitable scheme methodology, whereby all schools contribute, regardless of whether they are having a capital scheme undertaken in that financial year. This collaborative approach would generate greater contributions and deliver the completion of far more schemes than is affordable under the existing mechanism.
- 4.2 Various options were considered by Schools Forum and the scheme outlined in Appendix 1 is the one endorsed by Schools Forum i.e. that a collaborative approach be adopted, whereby all maintained schools contribute a weighted percentage of budget share, in order to ensure that a sustainable capital programme is preserved and an increased number of urgent capital projects is delivered.
- 4.3 The key principles that have been used in designing the new methodology are to:
- (i) Generate additional funding to enable further high priority schemes to be completed;
  - (ii) Ensure that the new methodology is equitable, by taking account of each school's funding level and ability to pay; and
  - (iii) Adopt a straightforward model with minimal complexity.
- 4.4 **However, each governing body will ultimately have to approve their school's participation in the scheme, for an initial period of 2 years, which will require the majority of schools to agree, in order to proceed.** Failure to move to the new methodology will result in many priority schemes being delayed to future years and works being undertaken at the minimum level required to meet statutory and health & safety requirements, in order to maximise the use of the limited financial resources.
- 4.5 Officers were requested, by Schools Forum, to undertake consultation with all maintained schools, with a view to introducing the new methodology from the 2015/16 financial year. A consultation paper was issued to all LA maintained schools on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2014, which sought views and an indication as to their likelihood of committing to the proposed new method of contributing to the capital programme. The results of the consultation were presented to Schools Forum on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015. The majority of schools that responded supported the new methodology but there were several schools who were opposed.

## 5. Responses to the request to Governing Bodies

- 5.1 All maintained schools, were requested to confirm the Governing Body's support for the new methodology.
- 5.2 The responses to the request, including key comments, are outlined at Appendix 2. Any responses received after 13<sup>th</sup> February 2015 will be presented verbally at the meeting.
- 5.3 In total 22 schools responded. 12 supported the new methodology; 10 were opposed to it. The fact that nearly half of the schools who responded stated they would not support the scheme confirms that the proposed new methodology is not viable as its implementation depends on the support of the vast majority of schools.

## 6. Alternative updated existing methodology

- 6.1 Should the proposed methodology, as outlined in Appendix 1 not be supported, then an alternative mechanism, following the principles of the existing methodology, will need to be endorsed and implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. However, both the 'banding' and 'affordability' criteria will need to be amended.

- 6.2 Under this alternative method the below bands and contribution levels will apply:

### Contribution Calculations

- Scheme Value £1- £50,000 – equivalent of 1 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation
- Scheme Value £50,001 - £100,000 – equivalent of 2 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation
- Scheme Value above £100,000 – equivalent of 3 year's Devolved Formula Capital allocation

- 6.3 In order to ensure both the 'affordability' of schools to contribute as well as acknowledging the level of school balances, the following weightings have been applied to the scheme contributions.

Level of balances as at 31 March 2015 (Revenue & Capital)*	Annual DFC Equivalent
Below £25,000	Nil Contribution
£25,000 - £75,000	0.5xDFC
£75,001 - £150,000	1.0xDFC
£150,001 - £300,000	1.25xDFC
£300,001 - £500,000	1.5xDFC
Over £500,000	2.0xDFC

\*Excluding balances held in trust for other bodies (eg cluster funds)

- 6.4 Schools will also be expected to contribute financial to any urgent works projects identified during the year. The calculation for the financial contribution will be based on the methodology set out above.
- 6.5 Schools' contributions will be collected at the beginning of each financial year. Should a school convert to academy status during the financial year, their contribution is still payable in full for any schemes underway, with any outstanding or future years' contributions being collected as part of the final surplus/deficit calculations on Academy conversion. Any works, included in the approved capital programme, which have commenced, will still be completed.
- 6.6 The table below offers examples of the contributions payable by schools, at a range of DFC levels, across each of the bands outlined in paragraph 6.3 above, for a scheme costing £150,000. The calculation is for each capital scheme.

Scheme Cost	School DFC	Total Balances (Revenue + Capital)	DFC Multiple	Total Contribution (over 3 years)
£150,000 (3 Years DFC)	£5,000  (x 3 Years = £15,000)	Below £25,000	Nil	Nil
		£25,000 - £75,000	0.5	£ 7,500
		£75,001 - £150,000	1.0	£ 15,000
		£150,001 - £300,000	1.25	£ 18,750
		£300,001 - £500,000	1.5	£ 22,500
		Over £500,000	2.0	£ 30,000
£150,000 (3 Years DFC)	£7,500  (x 3 Years = £22,500)	Below £25,000	Nil	Nil
		£25,000 - £75,000	0.5	£ 11,250
		£75,001 - £150,000	1.0	£ 22,500
		£150,001 - £300,000	1.25	£ 28,125
		£300,001 - £500,000	1.5	£ 33,750
		Over £500,000	2.0	£ 45,000
<b>£150,000</b> (3 Years DFC)  <b>*See Example Below</b>	<b>£10,000</b>  <b>(x 3 Years = £30,000)</b>	Below £25,000	Nil	Nil
		£25,000 - £75,000	0.5	£ 15,000
		£75,001 - £150,000	1.0	£ 30,000
		<b>£150,001 - £300,000</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>£ 37,500</b>
		£300,001 - £500,000	1.5	£ 45,000
		Over £500,000	2.0	£ 60,000
£150,000	£15,000  (x 3 Years = £45,000)	Below £25,000	Nil	Nil
		£25,000 - £75,000	0.5	£ 22,500
		£75,001 - £150,000	1.0	£ 45,000
		£150,001 - £300,000	1.25	£ 56,250
		£300,001 - £500,000	1.5	£ 67,500
		Over £500,000	2.0	£ 90,000

*\* Example*

School 'B' Capital Scheme Cost 2015/16	£150,000
Required Contribution	3 Years DFC Equiv.
School 'B' DFC	£ 10,000
School 'B' Total Balances (Revenue + Capital)	£ 225,000
Multiple to be applied	1.25 x DFC Contrib'n
Contribution calculation for School 'B'	£10,000 x 3 x 1.25
Total Contribution Payable by School 'B'	<b>£37,500</b>
Annual Instalments	£12,500

## **7. Contingency and risk management**

- 7.1 Within the budget for each project, there is a level of contingency of between 6 - 10% of the project value. Should an emergency project be identified during the year that is not within the school modernisation capital programme, then the following will be considered:
- to establish if any further savings within the existing programme of works can be made to fund any additional work identified
  - a review of the identified projects to establish if there are any project savings that can be made or if any project can be re-phased without causing a health and safety concern
  - finally, any urgent works that cannot be funded by the other actions would have to replace the lowest priority projects providing works have not commenced.
- 7.2 If the urgent works cannot be funded from within the existing portfolio resources, then an additional capital bid may be submitted to the Council during the financial year. Any in year bids for additional capital funding, must follow the procedures set out within the Council's constitution, which includes approval by Full Council.

## **8. Legal implications**

- 8.1 The Council has an obligation to ensure that the premises of schools which it maintains are maintained to prescribed standards in accordance with section 542 of the Education Act 1996 and regulations made under that section. The annual schools modernisation capital programme contributes to the fulfilment by the Council of that obligation.
- 8.2 The Full Council will determine the amount of capital funding to be made available for the purposes of the programme each year and the Cabinet Member for Children and Education has power to approve the detail of the programme.
- 8.3 In addition to specific duties to consult the Schools Forum in respect of certain matters prescribed by Regulations, the Council has a general power to consult the Forum on such matters concerning the funding of schools as it thinks fit and this report seeks the Forum's approval/views in relation to a proposed change in the methodology for determining schools' financial contributions to works within the capital programme.

## **9. Head of Finance comments**

- 9.1 The report sets out the proposals for continued school contributions towards the cost of the condition projects from their delegated budgets. Contributions will not be sought for schemes relating to the removal of friable asbestos since the local authority carries the statutory burden in these areas.

- 9.2 Financial modelling has been undertaken on both the proposed capital contribution methodologies, utilising the 2014-15 capital programme data. If the proposed new methodology set out in Appendix 1 had been applied in 2014-15, then an additional £890,000 of capital funding would have been generated, enabling 8 additional capital schemes to have been undertaken. If the alternative option set out in section 6 had been applied, then only £101,500 of additional contributions would have been generated, enabling only 1 additional scheme to be completed.
- 9.3 Any on-going revenue implications will be met by individual schools through their individual budgets which are funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

.....  
Signed by: Julian Wooster, Director of Children's and Adults' Services

#### **Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

<b>Title of document</b>	<b>Location</b>
Asset Management Plan files	Housing Property Services
Condition Survey Reports	Housing Property Services – Concerto database
School Organisation Plan	Education
School Capital Programme and Contributions Working Papers	Education Finance

.....  
Signed by:

## Appendix 1

### Proposed new methodology - all schools contribute to the capital programme

Schools Forum agreed that the way to ensure the maximum number of urgent capital projects proceed, is via an affordable and equitable scheme whereby all maintained schools contribute, regardless of whether they are having a capital scheme undertaken in that financial year. This collaborative approach will require an initial 2 year commitment and will generate greater contributions, delivering far more schemes than is affordable under the existing mechanism.

In order to ensure both the 'affordability' of schools to contribute as well as acknowledging the level of school balances, the following weightings have been applied to the expected annual contributions.

Level of balances as at 31 March 2015 (Revenue & Capital)*	% of 2015/16 Budget Share (before de-delegation)
Below £25,000	Nil Contribution
£25,000 - £75,000	0.5%
£75,001 - £150,000	1.0%
£150,001 - £300,000	1.25%
£300,001 - £500,000	1.5%
Over £500,000	2.0%

\*Excluding balances held in trust for other bodies (eg cluster funds)

Where a school's contribution would take balances below £25,000, contributions would be restricted to ensure that no school has overall balances below £25,000, as a result of its capital contributions.

The table below offers examples of the contributions payable by schools, at a range of budget share levels.

Budget Share	Total Balances (Revenue + Capital)	Multiple	Annual Contribution
£750,000	Below £25,000	Nil	£0
	£25,000 - £75,000	0.5%	£3,750
	£75,001 - £150,000	1.0%	£7,500
	£150,001 - £300,000	1.25%	£9,375
	£300,001 - £500,000	1.5%	£11,250
	Over £500,000	2.0%	£15,000
£1.0 Million	Below £25,000	Nil	£0
	£25,000 - £75,000	0.5%	£5,000
	£75,001 - £150,000	1.0%	£10,000
	£150,001 - £300,000	1.25%	£12,500
	£300,001 - £500,000	1.5%	£15,000
	Over £500,000	2.0%	£20,000
£1.25 Million	Below £25,000	Nil	£0
	£25,000 - £75,000	0.5%	£6,250
	£75,001 - £150,000	1.0%	£12,500
	£150,001 - £300,000	1.25%	£15,625

	£300,001 - £500,000 Over £500,000	1.5% 2.0%	£18,750 £25,000
<b>£1.5 Million</b>	Below £25,000 £25,000 - £75,000 £75,001 - £150,000 <b>£150,001 - £300,000</b> £300,001 - £500,000 Over £500,000	Nil 0.5% 1.0% <b>1.25%</b> 1.5% 2.0%	£0 £7,500 £15,000 <b>£18,750</b> £22,500 £30,000
<b>*See Example Below</b>			
£3.0 Million	Below £25,000 £25,000 - £75,000 £75,001 - £150,000 £150,001 - £300,000 £300,001 - £500,000 Over £500,000	Nil 0.5% 1.0% 1.25% 1.5% 2.0%	£0 £15,000 £30,000 £37,500 £45,000 £60,000

*\*Example:*

School 'A' Budget Share	£1,500,000
School 'A' Total Balances (Revenue + Capital)	£ 225,000
Multiple % to be applied	1.25%
Contribution calculation for School 'A'	£1.5 Million x 1.25%
Contribution Payable by School 'A'	<b>£ 18,750</b>

Had this proposed scheme been implemented in 2014/15 an additional 8 priority schemes could have been completed. This would have resulted in a much improved educational environment for many more children and staff in Portsmouth schools. A rejection of the new proposals would undoubtedly mean many priority schemes will be delayed into future years.

The proposal, if approved, will provide certainty to schools and the planning process, in terms of their capital contributions as well as having a positive impact on the number of schemes delivered. Additionally, the two year commitment required of schools will benefit the capital works planning process.

A key element of the new mechanism is that no contributions will be payable by schools with total balances (capital + revenue) below £25,000. Furthermore, following discussion at Schools Forum, the level of contributions will be capped to ensure that contributing to the new scheme will not take a school's balances below £25,000.

Contributions will be collected at the beginning of each financial year. Should a school convert to academy status during the financial year, their contribution is still payable in full for that year and any works included in the approved capital programme will still be completed.

Under the proposed new methodology, schools would no longer be expected to contribute the first £5,000 (Primary) or £10,000 (Secondary) towards urgent works, as a small contingency would be held from the contributions received.

The Council is fully aware that some Governing Bodies may decide not to accept the new collaborative approach. Schools choosing to reject the proposed scheme will be required to contribute 25% (up to a maximum of £225,000) towards each priority scheme at their school. Each payment will be a one-off with no deferral over 2 or 3 years.

Should a majority of maintained schools reject the proposals, an alternative scheme will need to be implemented, although the contributions required will increase significantly for those schools with priority schemes approved in the capital programme.



## Appendix 2

### Annual Schools Modernisation Capital Programme - capital contributions from LA maintained schools

**Response from schools to the statement:** *The Governing Body of.....School agrees to contribute funding to the annual school modernisation programme for a two year period as set out in section 5 of the report to Schools Forum dated 21 January 2015.*

**Responses received: 22**

**Yes: 12**

**No: 10**

#### Comments:

- Want to know exactly what contribution is expected.
- Although in favour, the percentage scale should not be increased, this should also be reviewed after a 2 year period.
- In the case that insufficient schools sign up, can you assure us that the amount requested above will not increase?
- Despite our instincts to be collaborative and work for the good of all schools in the city, this proposal would have a dramatic impact on our finances and is not in the school's best interest at this time.
- The Governing Body have approved it on the basis that it is the 'right thing' to do but felt that the details provided didn't give sufficient information to have a balanced discussion. It would have been good to see what programmes were completed and those that would have been included within the 14/15 if this scheme had been adopted. We would like the school to know all the schemes that are funded in 15/16 as a result of this change. We would have liked more time and better impact information that would have permitted a more informed debate. It felt rushed and a no choice option.
- The worries and concerns are already represented in comments listed from the previous consultation.
- Please refer to previous letter outlining the school governors' reasons for rejecting the proposals. The school position has not changed, the governors do not support the proposed new methodology and the school will not be contributing funding.
- The governing body does not agree to contribute and believe that the consultation gave late and unreasonable notice allowing governors little time to meet and review. The proposal does not fit alongside local or national financial requirements which all schools are required to adhere to. To date capital funds have been used by the local authority to support capital projects, revenue funding is intended for the education of pupils in that school and not to be raided to support other schools capital projects. This completely goes against the local authority pledge to raise standards for the pupils of Portsmouth.
- Section 4.10; we would question whether there is a legal framework for putting pressure on a school to comply with using delegated funds to support this project, or face a financial penalty. If schools are now required to support other school budgets, under the umbrella of collaborative working, how does this fit within the Fair Funding

formula? The Local Authority has responsibility for maintaining school buildings and this would remain the case for these schools not taking part. How can this be fair?

- This is an ill thought out scheme with little attention to detail. There is no distinction between committed and uncommitted funds and no consideration of budgets held by schools for breakfast and after school provision, cluster groups etc.
- We are very concerned as to how this proposal will affect our school. Our revenue balances are committed to ensuring we can employ extra teaching staff so that children can work in smaller groups for literacy and numeracy. This has had a very positive impact on our attainment and progress. We would be happy to consider contributing from capital monies. As other schools are, we are concerned with part 4 which appears to penalise any school who doesn't agree to a contribution, surely the LA still legally has Landlord responsibilities?
- While we support a collaborative approach we are not happy with the proposed annual contributions particularly in relation to schools with high budget shares. We endorse much of what was said in the letter from Springfield school. The third paragraph (re: local management of schools and its purpose) is one that we particularly agree with. We also echo what was said about the lack of distinction between committed and uncommitted balances. Could the calculations not be based purely on revenue and uncommitted balances. That would then leave schools free to plan and carry out particular building projects or staffing restructures.
- If despite our decision to say no to this proposal, the majority of schools say yes and the scheme goes ahead then we would expect to be given another opportunity to decide whether we want to take part in this scheme.
- If the scheme goes ahead then we would also expect our planned commitments for summer 15 refurbishment works, our restricted grant funds and our existing capital contributions to the previous capital scheme to be taken into account when determining whether our surplus balance is above the £25k threshold.
- In principle yes but would prefer the uncommitted balances to be the amount that is available for clawback.
- Schools that have saved for a specific capital project should not be penalised through the proposed methodology.
- The Governing Body will not contribute funding! The school budget is used each year and balances are small. We cannot afford to contribute more for a capital programme when we have other urgent needs such as IT equipment for pupils. Our forecast is for reducing balances in the next 3 years.
- The governing body has reservations about the proposal and the effect it might have. The proposal has not changed even though there was considerable feedback; neither was there a response to the feedback giving appropriate arguments that might have been considered.