

SCHOOLS FORUM
Wednesday, 18 May 2016 at 0800
VENUE: Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

PLEASE NOTE

All meetings will be held in public; the agenda, decision list and minutes will be publicly available on the Council's website and Committee Secretariat, Room 112, City Hall, Bradford.

The taking of photographs, filming and sound recording of the meeting is allowed except if Councillors vote to exclude the public to discuss confidential matters covered by Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. Recording activity should be respectful to the conduct of the meeting and behaviour that disrupts the meeting (such as oral commentary) will not be permitted. Anyone attending the meeting who wishes to record or film the meeting's proceedings is advised to liaise with the Forum Clerk Asad Shah - 01274 432280 who will provide guidance and ensure that any necessary arrangements are in place. Those present who are invited to make spoken contributions should be aware that they may be filmed or sound recorded

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Business Advisor (Schools) will report the names of alternate Members who are attending the meeting in place of appointed Members.

2. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

To receive disclosures of interests from Members on matters to be considered at the meeting. The disclosure must include the nature of the interest.

An interest must also be disclosed in the meeting when it only becomes apparent to the member during the meeting.

3. MINUTES OF 16 MARCH 2016 & MATTERS ARISING (Minutes) 1 - 14

Recommended –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2016 be signed as a correct record (previously circulated).



4. **MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOLS**

Members will be asked to consider any issues raised by schools.

Members will be asked to consider a specific matter under agenda item 12, which is put forward as closed agenda item, where the public and non-officially recognised observers will be asked to leave the meeting.

5. **STANDING ITEM - DSG GROWTH FUND ALLOCATIONS (a)** 15 - 16

Members will be asked to consider, in **Document FX**, newly proposed allocations to schools and academies from the established DSG Growth Fund in 2016/17.

Recommended –

That the Schools Forum is asked to agree the proposed Growth Fund allocations shown in Document FX.

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

6. **STANDING ITEM - BRADFORD EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT COMMISSIONING BOARD (i)**

The minutes of the most recent Bradford Education Improvement Commissioning Board meetings will be presented for information and consideration along with written responses to questions submitted by members by email since the last report on BEICB activities.

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

7. **SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS - VICE CHAIR (a)**

Members will be asked to approve the proposed approach to the election of the Vice Chair of the Schools Forum for 2016.

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

8. **UPDATE ON THE OUTDOOR EDUCATION CENTRES (i)** 17 - 20

A report will be presented, **Document FY**, which provides an update on the re-development of the Outdoor Education Centres.

Recommended –

That as a key stakeholder, the Schools Forum is asked for its views concerning the options in this paper in order to inform the Council's considerations and decision making.

(Terry Davies – 01274 437170)



9. REVIEW OF SEND & BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT PROVISIONS (i) 21 - 30

A report will be presented, **Document FZ**, which provides a detailed update on SEND provision and Behaviour strategy matters, responding to the action points and requests for information that have made by the Schools Forum and that are recorded in the minutes of previous meetings. The written report summarises the key discussion items in Schools Forum meeting since September 2014. A presentation will be delivered to the meeting, which provides an update on the current position of reviews and other activities.

Recommended –

That Members are asked to consider and respond to the report and the presentation.

(Judith Kirk – 01274 439238)

10. SCHOOLS' OUTTURN (REVENUE BALANCES) 2015/16 (i) 31 - 40

The Business Advisor (Schools) will present a report, **Document GA**, which shows the position of revenue balances held by maintained schools at 31 March 2016. The report also provides initial information on schools' reporting of surplus balances and a response to request made by Members for information on the anticipated volume of conversions of maintained schools to academy status in Bradford and the likelihood of liabilities resulting from the conversion of schools holding deficit budgets.

Recommended –

That the Schools Forum is asked to note the information provided on school balances. Members are asked then to consider further the issues raised in the report concerning the financial implications of the academisation of maintained schools. Members are to form a view in response to the questions posed about possible financial liabilities created by the conversion process.

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

11. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (a)

The Schools Forum will be asked to consider if the item relating to a contract settlement should be considered in the absence of the public and, if so, to approve the following recommendation:

Recommended –

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the following item (item *12) on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if they were present exempt information within Paragraph 3 (Financial or Business Affairs) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) would be disclosed and it is considered that, in all the circumstances, the public interest in allowing the public to remain is outweighed by the public interest in excluding public access to the relevant part of the proceedings for the following reason: "commercial confidentiality".

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)



12. **CONTRACT SETTLEMENT (a)**

The Schools Forum will be asked to consider and take a decision on a specific contract settlement matter, details of which will be presented to the meeting.

**Note: The Schools Forum will have previously considered excluding the public from consideration of this matter under item 11 above.*

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

13. **OTHER SCHOOLS FORUM STANDING ITEMS (i)**

Updates on the following Forum standing items will be provided verbally where these have not been covered within other agenda items:

- Update on Single Status
- Update from the Schools Financial Performance Group (SFPG)
- Update from the Early Years Working Group (EYWG)
- Update from the Formula Funding Working Group (FFWG)
- Update on Primary School Places
- Update on Academies & Free Schools

Recommended –

That the Schools Forum be asked to note the information provided.

(Andrew Redding – 01274 432678)

14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AOB)**

Members will be asked for any additional items of business, for consideration at a future meeting.

15. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Please see the published schedule of meetings – Wednesday 6 July 2016.

Please be aware that the dates of meetings for the 2016/17 academic year have been established as follows:

- Wednesday 21 September 2016
- Wednesday 19 October 2016
- Wednesday 7 December 2016
- Wednesday 11 January 2017
- *Wednesday 18 January 2017 - PROVISIONAL MEETING*
- Wednesday 15 March 2017
- Wednesday 17 May 2017
- Wednesday 5 July 2017

Please note all meetings will commence at 0800 in Committee Room 1 at the City Hall, Bradford.

agenda 16-17AG18MayAG

(a) Denotes an item for action
(i) Denotes an item for information



Response ID ANON-TEB1-7WA4-F

Submitted to **Schools national funding formula**

Submitted on **2016-04-15 12:10:51**

Introduction

A Name

First name::

Andrew

Last name::

Redding

B Email address

Email address:

andrew.redding@bradford.gov.uk

C Response type

Please select your role from the list below::

Local authority representative

Please select your organisation type from the list below::

Local authority

Organisation name::

City of Bradford MDC

Local authority area::

Bradford

D Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

Please give your reason for confidentiality::

Principles for a reformed funding system

1 Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

No

Please provide any further comments::

We wish to make the following comments:

Supporting the needs of vulnerable learners must be placed at the heart of the new funding system and must not be 'lost' in the technical detail or in transitional arrangements. We will be watching for this very closely in our assessment of the detail of the 2nd stage consultation.

Also critical to fairness is that the correct weighting (uplift) is applied to the funding of pupils with additional educational needs, recognising in particular the clear correlation between levels of deprivation, lower pupil outcomes and higher costs. We argue very strongly against a NFF, which takes away Schools Block funding from the Bradford District by reducing the weighting that is given to additional educational needs.

The principle of 'robustness' is stated several times in the consultation document. One of our significant issues with the proposals for the NFF is the absence of a pupil mobility factor, which we believe will significantly underfund the additional needs of pupils in schools and academies in the Bradford District relative to those in the majority of other areas that do not experience high levels of mobility and migration. We understand, from talking with regional EFA colleagues, that one of the reasons the proposed NFF does not include a mobility factor is a concern about the robustness of the data, and how the conversions of schools to academies could distort the census start dates of pupils. We do not believe this is a satisfactory reason not to adopt a mobility factor, as, for example, the mobility data from the maintained school can be used during the academy transition period and specific guidance can be given to schools on how to correctly complete their censuses so that levels of turbulence are accurately recorded. There are also other ways of using the census data to record mobility e.g. year on year ins and outs based on the UPNs of pupils. It is also not satisfactory to argue that, as the pupil mobility factor is not currently 'widely' used, it should not be included as a formula factor in the NFF. Most areas do not experience the high levels of mobility found in Bradford and their perspectives on this as a funding issue are very different. Bradford's current funding formula allocates an average sum of £18,500 to 37 eligible schools and academies for mobility. Our formula development modelling has demonstrated previously that the incidence of mobility in Bradford does not fully correlate with other proxy measures of need because of the geographic nature of migration into the District and the lack of access new arrivals have to income support and other benefits. We would conclude therefore, that the absence of a specific mobility measure is very likely to not provide a fair level of funding for our schools and academies.

We wish to make the point that the comparative current rates of per pupil funding that are quoted in the consultation document (as a rationale for change) are misleading in that we do not see that these comparisons factor in where a local authority spends more of its High Needs Block resources in the Schools Block because its distribution of children with SEND. Put simply, because Bradford has been a very inclusive authority, a larger number of children with SEND are educated in mainstream settings (funded by the Schools Block primary / secondary formula) and we have fewer places in specialist provisions (funded by the High Needs Block) than in other authorities. It is incorrect to conclude that our rates of funding in the Schools Block are 'unfairly' higher than in other authorities; we are simply allocating more of our High Needs funding in the Schools Block because this is where a greater number of higher cost (and higher funded) children are educated. We are concerned to ensure that the DfE, in setting the weightings of funding factors, understands this.

We are concerned that, alongside the reform of the formula, the increased rate of conversion to academies raises the risk that complex and uncertain liabilities may give rise to the need for greater contingencies for individual schools, groups of schools, and/or local authorities than has historically been the case. The funding mechanism in totality will need to have regard to those potential liabilities.

The structure of the funding system

2 Do you agree with our proposal to move to a school-level national funding formula in 2019-20, removing the requirement for local authorities to set a local formula?

No

Please provide any further comments::

We can clearly see that the adoption of a NFF aligns with the Government's aim for the cessation of local authorities maintaining schools.

We clearly understand however, from our own development work, that the aims of formulae simplicity and consistency at school-level must be balanced against the necessity for formulae to put the right amount of money in the right places and a single formula approach does not always successfully achieve this. Meaning, that an effective funding system needs to continue to have some scope for flexibility and we would argue strongly that this is best retained at a local level. This is recognised by the DfE and is being applied in the proposals for the funding of high needs provision. We question then why this principle is ignored for the proposals for the Schools Block. Complete removal of the ability of the Authority, schools and academies in a local area to manage DSG funding 'at source' (before it is allocated to delegated budgets) and to set and fund local strategic priorities in collaboration, is not a positive step.

We argue that consistency can be achieved in ways other than the total removal of all local-decision making on Schools Block formula funding e.g. in further tightening of Regulations and setting ranges between which funding rates must be calculated.

We believe that the DfE may struggle to successfully replicate in a NFF the sensitive, effective, arrangements that are currently in place for supporting places growth and PFI costs. We note that the DfE has not yet found a formula solution for these. Both these issues are massive for Bradford. We are immediately concerned about the transitional arrangements for the next 2 years for these factors.

Unless funded by national toplice, with an additional sum added to the new NFF DSG allocation (clarity is required on this), funding on the basis of the previous year's growth fund costs means that Bradford's DSG continues to be required to absorb the additional cost of in year places growth, which will become even more expensive for us as growth moves into the secondary sector from September 2016. The cost of places growth is not even across areas. Bradford's DSG currently absorbs £1.7m (in 2016/17) of in year places growth cost, plus a further £1.4m in cost of the pupil number adjustments associated with the establishment of non-recoupment academies and free schools that have been recently transferred into the DSG; a total of £3.1m of cost not found in many other authorities. We argue that a formula for the allocation of a correct additional amount of DSG for places growth (including pupil number adjustments for establishing academies and free schools) must be implemented from April 2017. We further raise this issue later in our response.

Building block A: per-pupil costs

3 Do you agree that the basic amount of funding for each pupil should be different at primary, key stage 3 and key stage 4?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - our current formula approach, which is calculated on a detailed activity-led model, allocates funding differentiated on this basis.

Building block B: additional needs factors

4a Do you agree that we should include a deprivation factor?

Yes

4b Which measures for the deprivation factor do you support?

Pupil- and area-level

Please provide any further comments::

Our formula development work has always concluded that a combination of pupil-led and area-based factors are more effective in measuring pupil-need than using only one type in isolation.

However, we are concerned about the impact of the Universal Infant Free School Meals entitlement on the FSM measure in the primary sector. Despite our work

to counter this, Bradford's October 2015 Census has recorded a reduction in FSM numbers in primary schools and academies (to the extent that we would have spent £530,000 less out of a budget of £18.9m on this formula factor). For this reason, unless other national action is taken e.g. automatic FSM enrolment, we would like the DfE to consider a greater weighting of the total pot towards area-based measures in the primary sector NFF and would like to see the impact of this in the 2nd stage consultation detail.

We would strongly prefer the NFF to use the full Index of Multiple Deprivation measure, rather than IDACI. This is a point we have made in our responses to previous consultations. Prior to April 2013, we used the IMD as a more comprehensive measure of the full extent of pupil need from deprivation. The refresh of IDACI at 2015 indicates that Bradford's rank of deprivation vs. other local authorities is broadly comparable with that measured by IDACI 2010. IMD 2015 however, indicates that Bradford's pupils are comparatively more deprived than measured by IMD 2010.

To emphasise the point made in the answer to question 1, most critical to fairness in the deprivation element of the NFF is that the correct weighting (uplift) is applied. We argue very strongly against a National Funding Formula, which takes away Schools Block funding from the Bradford District by reducing the weighting that is given to additional educational needs. We will be watching for this very closely in the 2nd stage consultation.

5 Do you agree we should include a low prior attainment factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - and also refer to the critical point made in the answer to question 4b - it is essential that the correct weighting (uplift) is applied to the funding of pupils with additional educational needs. We argue very strongly against a National Funding Formula, which takes away Schools Block funding from the Bradford District by reducing the weighting that is given to additional educational needs. We will be watching for this very closely in the 2nd stage consultation.

6a Do you agree that we should include a factor for English as an additional language?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - and also refer to the critical point made in the answer to question 4b - it is essential that the correct weighting (uplift) is applied to the funding of pupils with additional educational needs. We argue very strongly against a National Funding Formula, which takes away Schools Block funding from the Bradford District by reducing the weighting that is given to additional educational needs. We will be watching for this very closely in the 2nd stage consultation.

6b Do you agree that we should use the EAL3 indicator (pupils registered at any point during the previous 3 years as having English as an additional language)?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - Bradford currently uses the EAL3 factor as we see significant merit, in terms of stability, calculating funding on data taken over a 3 year period, rather than a 1 year snapshot.

Building block C: school costs

7 Do you agree that we should include a lump sum factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments:

We strongly agree that a NFF should include a lump sum. We would see that this is essential for the primary sector in particular.

The lump sum in Bradford is £175,000, which is at the maximum permitted value. We believe that this is a reasonable level of lump sum, balancing the need to support smaller schools (that are not eligible for the sparsity factor but that are still essential in maintaining a sufficiency of places) with fixed costs whilst encouraging efficiencies and allowing the majority of funding to follow the pupil.

We do not believe that the lump sum value for either primary or secondary should be set lower than £175,000.

8 Do you agree that we should include a sparsity factor?

No

Please provide any further comments::

This is an example where it is proposed that a NFF will recognise specific higher / additional costs and needs incurred in / by some areas and some schools.

Referring to our earlier answers, we would expect that this principle is applied so that a NFF includes a pupil mobility factor so that the higher cost and impact of mobility in schools in Bradford is funded. We also expect that DSG funding for authorities is adjusted from April 2017 to recognise the additional cost of in year places growth met by the DSG in some authorities but not in others.

Building block C: other school costs

9 Do you agree that we should include a business rates factor?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Our answer is no as the implications of this proposal are currently unclear.

Will the cost of rates for each area a) be topsliced specifically from each area's pupil-led NFF allocation (would this be possible under a school-level NFF?) or b) will this be taken as a national topslice before the calculation of the pupil-led elements?

If b (which is what is assumed), to separately fund rates will further compound the area-cost weighting within a NFF at the expense of non-London / fringe weighted authorities. If this is the case then we would expect a reduction to the overall area-cost weighting calculation to compensate for this.

Please can the 2nd stage consultation clarify this.

On this point more generally, greater clarity is required on how all the non pupil-led additional elements (growth funding, PFI, rates, split sites, exceptional premises factors etc) will be funded at DSG level - in the transition period and from April 2019 - by specific area topslice or by national topslice before the pupil-led NFF is calculated? For example, would Bradford's school continue to pay for Bradford's rates or would our cost of rates be met through a bigger national topslice?

Critically, for places growth funding, would Bradford's schools continue to pay for Bradford's growth fund?

10 Do you agree that we should include a split sites factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree under current school circumstances. This is probably a time limited factor however, and will need to be reviewed prior to April 2019 in the light of the development of closer school collaboration and Multi Academy Trusts i.e. what operational differences will warrant differentiation in funding levels between a MAT operating a number of schools and a split site school on 2 campuses?

The criteria for the access to this funding must be very clearly determined as this factor creates deviation from a clean NFF and will be open to challenge around fairness.

11 Do you agree that we should include a private finance initiative factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree with the principle asserted in the consultation document that there are circumstances where schools face significant additional costs where the impact of the school meeting these costs from its general budget would have an unfair impact on the teaching and learning for its pupils.

£6.38m of Bradford's DSG is allocated in 2016/17 in support of Building Schools for the Future (PFI) costs. This cost increases by RPIX each year (as it is a contractually-linked contribution).

12 Do you agree that we should include an exceptional premises circumstances factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree with the principle asserted in the consultation document that there are circumstances where schools face significant additional costs where the impact of the school meeting these costs from its general budget would have an unfair impact on the teaching and learning for its pupils.

However, the criteria for the access to this funding must be very clearly determined as this factor creates deviation from a clean NFF. Many schools raise cases for why they must receive additional funding.

13 Do you agree that we should allocate funding to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend for these factors?

Yes/No - Business rates:

Yes

Yes/No - Split sites:

Yes

Yes/No - Private finance initiative:

No

Yes/No - Other exceptional circumstances:

No

Please provide any further comments::

On balance agree, as a cash flat DSG currently either is required to meet year on year increases in these costs or gains from savings, but with 1 general and 2 specific reservations.

Specific - we would wish our 2016/17 PFI allocation (£6.38m), at least, to be uplifted for inflation in 2017/18 and 2018/19 e.g. RPIX as this cost is contractual and will increase by RPIX year on year. We are certain now that funding on the basis of the previous year's cost will under fund us.

Specific - there should not be any automatic roll over of exceptional circumstances funding during the transition period. This should be applied for and vetted by the EFA on an annual basis.

General - authorities that will lose from NFF in their Schools Blocks from April 2017 will be required to meet increases in these 4 costs from their reducing allocations, plus (as in the case of Bradford) the additional cost of places growth. The proposed flexibility to be able to set a different value of Minimum Funding Guarantee will be essential to practically enable Schools Block funding to be released to meet these costs. However, we are concerned about the impact of this on individual school and academy budgets, and on pupil outcomes, which is the level at which the pressure will finally sit. We expect the DfE to factor this into thinking about the level of protection / pace of change within the Schools Block in 2017/18 and 2018/19 and we would expect the DfE to proceed with caution.

Building block C: growth

14 Do you agree that we should include a growth factor?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Strongly agree. This is a massive issue for Bradford and a major cost pressure.

However, we are concerned that the DfE may struggle to successfully replicate in a NFF the sensitive, effective, local arrangements that are currently in place for supporting places growth. We would argue that local authorities are well placed to continue to exercise this function.

We are also immediately concerned about transitional arrangements. See below.

15 Do you agree that we should allocate funding for growth to local authorities in 2017-18 and 2018-19 based on historic spend?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Unless funded by a national toplice (and clarity on this is needed), funding on the basis of the previous year's growth fund costs means that Bradford's DSG continues to be required to absorb the additional cost of in year places growth, which will become even more expensive as growth moves into the secondary sector from September 2016. The cost of places growth is not even across areas. Bradford's DSG currently absorbs £1.7m (in 2016/17) of in year places growth cost, and a further £1.4m in cost of pupil number adjustments associated with the establishment of non-recoupment academies and free schools that have been recently transferred into the DSG; £3.1m in total.

We argue that a formula for the allocation of a correct additional amount of DSG for in year places growth, including pupil number adjustments for establishing academies and free schools, must be implemented from April 2017.

On a very simple basis, the cost of pupil number adjustments for establishing academies and free schools that has been recently transferred into the DSG can be allocated to each authority's DSG on an actual cost basis, as this cost can be identified in the EFA Pro-formas collected in October and January each year.

AND / OR we would propose that the DfE employs a DSG adjustment, akin to the operation of the Early Years Block, where the Schools Block DSG sum is re-calculated e.g. for 2017/18, where the number of pupils recorded in an authority's October 2017 census is (significantly) higher than the number recorded in October 2016.

We would expect, at the very least, for an EFA vetted retrospective adjustment (e.g. in the 2018/19 DSG for 2017/18 spending) to compensate local areas where their spending on growth has been substantially in excess of their allocation in that year. For 2017/18 reimbursement, this could be completed alongside the 2018/19 Pro-forma submission process in October 2017. However, this would not deal with the fundamental issue that Bradford's NFF calculated Schools Block is required to continue to absorb c. £3.1m of cost of in year growth that is not found in many other authorities. This needs to be resolved from April 2017.

Building block D: geographic costs

16a Do you agree that we should include an area cost adjustment?

Yes

16b Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

hybrid methodology

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - as a methodology with a closer relationship to costs incurred by schools

Factors not included in the formula

17 Do you agree that we should target support for looked-after children and those who have left care via adoption, special guardianship or a care arrangements order through the pupil premium plus, rather than include a looked-after children factor in the national funding formula?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

In regularly reviewing our formulae arrangements for Looked After Children with our Schools Forum, we have continued to conclude that the Pupil Premium LAC, recently significantly increased in value, provides sufficient specific resource and that children on the edge of care (identified within formula proxy measures) can be very vulnerable and can be very resources intensive for schools.

We have not had a LAC factor in our formula since April 2013 for this reason.

18 Do you agree that we should not include a factor for mobility?

No

Please provide any further comments::

The absence of a pupil mobility factor we believe will significantly underfund the additional needs of pupils in schools and academies in the Bradford District relative to those in the majority of other areas that do not experience high levels of mobility and migration.

We understand, from talking with regional EFA colleagues, that one of the reasons the proposed NFF does not include a mobility factor is a concern about the robustness of the data, and how the conversions of schools to academies could distort the census start dates of pupils. We do not believe this is a satisfactory reason not to adopt a mobility factor, as, for example, the mobility data from the maintained school can be used during the academy transition period and specific guidance can be given to schools on how to correctly complete their censuses so that levels of turbulence are accurately recorded. There are also other ways of using the census data to record mobility e.g. year on year ins and outs based on the UPNs of pupils.

It is also not satisfactory to argue that, as the pupil mobility factor is not currently 'widely' used, it should not be included as a formula factor in the NFF. Most areas do not experience the high levels of mobility found in Bradford and their perspectives on this as a funding issue are very different.

Bradford's current funding formula allocates an average sum of £18,500 to eligible schools and academies for mobility. 37 schools are eligible above the thresholds. Our formula development modelling has demonstrated previously that the incidence of mobility in Bradford does not fully correlate with other proxy measures of need because of the geographic nature of migration into the District and the lack of access new arrivals have to income support and other benefits. We would conclude therefore, that the absence of a specific mobility measure is very likely to not provide a fair level of funding for our schools and academies.

19 Do you agree that we should remove the post-16 factor from 2017-18?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - this is a legacy factor that should be removed

Transition to the reformed funding system

20 Do you agree with our proposal to require local authorities to distribute all of their schools block allocation to schools from 2017-18?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Our lack of agreement here is linked to our concerns about the possibility of a different paces of change between the Schools and High Needs Blocks and the significant difficulties we anticipate Schools Block ringfencing will create for us during the transition period.

We would also ask that the 2nd stage consultation clarifies what the position would be where a cumulative High Needs Block overspending cannot be met by DSG reserves nor by taking a contribution from the Schools Block. Where would the liability for this deficit sit?

Bradford expects to gain from the new formularisation of the High Needs Block (but also to see a reduction in the Schools Block) simply because of our current profile of spending, as explained in our answer to question 1 (our inclusive model). However, that the impact of change in the High Needs Block is proposed to be ameliorated for at least 5 years is of immediate concern if this rate of transition is slower than the rate by which transition in the Schools Block is completed i.e. we lose funding out of our Schools Block faster than we gain it in the High Needs Block. In our view, if this is the case, our transition to new arrangements will be made much harder than in another authority that may have the same final funding result but is currently spending more in the High Needs Block. Ringfencing of the Schools Block will create added difficulty in preventing us from quickly releasing resources from the Schools Block to re-shape our High Needs provisions.

Firstly then, we argue strongly that the pace of change needs to be the same for both the Schools and High Needs Blocks.

Secondly, we argue that having the ability locally to transfer Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block more quickly over the transition period than the basic NFF is essential. We strongly argue therefore, for provision to be made during the transition period for authorities that are both losing from the Schools Block NFF and gaining from the High Needs Block NFF to be given the flexibility to transfer Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block, subject to the agreement of their Schools Forum and EFA vetting. The value of transfer could be limited to the values of gains / losses within the respective Blocks.

21 Do you believe that it would be helpful for local areas to have flexibility to set a local minimum funding guarantee?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - this will be essential, not just helpful, especially where e.g. the cost of in year places growth / pupil number adjustments for establishing academies and free schools continues not to be funded appropriately during the transitional period.

Linking to our answer to question 20, flexibility on the level of the MFG will be an essential part of enabling authorities that are both losing in the Schools Block and gaining in the High Needs Block to more quickly re-finance their high needs provisions.

Funding remaining with local authorities

22 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing responsibilities as set out in the consultation according to a per-pupil formula?

No

Please provide any further comments::

Although the overall basis of funding should be pupil-led, it is not the case that the costs of responsibilities are the same across all authorities as the pressures are not the same.

The proposal to move the funding of responsibilities, including for admissions, within the new Central Schools Block to a flat rate per pupil, without any reference to levels of places growth, new arrivals / migration and mobility, will not fund Bradford fairly for its responsibilities. We would expect the formula for the allocation of the on-going elements of the Central Schools Block should include a weighting for levels of places growth, in year mobility and migration.

23 Do you agree that we should fund local authorities' ongoing historic commitments based on case-specific information to be collected from local authorities?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - no additional comments (the vetting process is already being progressed by the EFA)

The education services grant

24 Are there other duties funded from the education services grant that could be removed from the system?

Please provide your comments::

No comment is made on this.

25 Do you agree with our proposal to allow local authorities to retain some of their maintained schools' DSG centrally – in agreement with the maintained schools in the schools forum – to fund the duties they carry out for maintained schools?

Yes

Please provide any further comments::

Agree - this proposal provides for sensible local arrangements for / discussion on the funding of duties.

Equality analysis

26 Please provide any comments on the equality analysis.

Please provide any further comments::

Supporting the needs of vulnerable learners must be placed at the heart of the new funding system and must not be 'lost' in the technical detail or in transitional arrangements.

We are concerned that the proposal to ringfence the Schools Block during the transition period will significantly hamper our re-shaping and re-financing of SEND and alternative provisions and will directly impact on the provision available for pupils with SEND. We have set out in our response an argument that authorities that see both a reduction in Schools Block and an increase in High Needs Block funding must be permitted to transfer Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block more quickly than the NFF protection system will allow.

We are concerned about the impact on Bradford's most vulnerable children of proposals that reduce the weighting of additional educational needs elements within the NFF and that reduce the value of spending on High Needs Block provision relative to the Schools Block. We are disappointed that the 1st stage

consultation does not provide the detail for us to assess this. We expect to respond on this at the 2nd stage.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16 MARCH 2016 AT CITY HALL, BRADFORD

Commenced 0800
 Adjourned 0945
 Reconvened 1000
 Concluded 1035

PRESENT

School Members

Bev George, Brent Fitzpatrick, Chris Quinn, Dianne Rowbotham, Dominic Wall, Dwayne Saxton, Helen Williams, Kevin Holland, Lesley Heathcote, Michele Robinson, Nick Weller, Nicky Kilvington, Sue Haithwaite, Tahir Jamil, Trevor Loft and Wahid Zaman.

Nominated Sub School Member

Irene Docherty

Non School Members

Ian Murch
 Donna Willoughby

Local Authority Officers

Andrew Redding	Business Advisor (Schools)
Dawn Haigh	Principal Finance Officer (Schools)
Michael Jameson	Strategic Director, Children's Services
Raj Singh	Business Advisor
Stuart McKinnon-Evans	Director of Finance

Observers

Alison Kaye	Director Business and Finance, Ilkley Grammar School
Councillor Hinchcliffe	Portfolio Holder, Education, Skills and Culture
Lynn Murphy	Business Manager, Feversham College

Apologies

Emma Ockerby, Ian Morrel, Maureen Cairns, Nigel Cooper, Phil Travis, Ray Tate and Sami Harzallah

DOMINIC WALL IN THE CHAIR

142. CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

The Chair welcomed Helen Williams (Ilkley Grammar School) and Lesley Heathcote (Merlin Top Academy Primary School) as new members of the Schools Forum (Academy Primary and Secondary Representatives). Also welcomed was Alison Kaye (Director Business and Finance, Ilkley Grammar School).



143. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest in matters under consideration.

144. MINUTES OF 6 JANUARY 2016 AND MATTERS ARISING

The Business Advisor (Schools) reported on Matters Arising items following the meeting of 6 January 2016, as below:

- The Council's Executive has approved the recommendations from the Schools Forum for the allocation of the 2016/17 Dedicated Schools Grant that were made at the meeting held on 6 January 2016. We still await final confirmation from the DfE of our 2016/17 DSG funding.
- Budgets have been published for schools and the Primary and Secondary Formula Pro-forma has been submitted and approved by the Education Funding Agency.
- From an action point recorded from the January meeting, further discussion regarding the proposals for the control of place-led funding in the High Needs Block has taken place and agreement has been reached with the District Achievement Partnership for the funding of additional places to be allocated in real time during the year and for an end of year reconciliation to be actioned, which will mean that a school's place funding will be reduced (negative adjustment) if the school has been allocated too much additional places funding for its annual composite occupancy.
- From an action point recorded in the December meeting, a conversation has been had with Beckfoot Upper Heaton Academy regarding their approach to raising standards whilst securing maximum intake of pupils. The Local Authority is very satisfied that the Academy has a clear focus and a clear action plan, which includes a detailed risk register covering all aspects of the Academy's performance (standards and financial).
- The Government had published draft legislation on the introduction of the apprenticeship levy. This draft has confirmed that from, April 2017, single employers with an annual wage bill in excess of than £3 million will be liable for a 0.5% levy and that public sector employers are included. We expect to bring a more detailed agenda item to the Schools Forum in the autumn term.
- A very small number and value of settlements relating to equal value (single status) pay claims have been charged to schools for the 2015 calendar year. Relevant schools have been contacted.
- Since the January meeting there has been 1 conversion of a maintained school to academy status. The Authority is aware of a number of planned conversion up to and including 1 September 2016. The Business Advisor explained that a response to the request made at the January meeting for further information on possible liabilities resulting from the conversion of schools (including deficit budgets) will be presented to the Forum in May. Doing so will enable the report to include information in the light of the balances held by maintained schools at the end of the 2015/16 financial year.

- Regarding the 2 key outstanding matters to be reported back to the Schools Forum, the Business Advisor confirmed that a report on the progress of the redevelopment of the outdoor education centres, and a detailed update on SEND and behaviour provision and review matters, will be presented to the May meeting.

The Chair of the Forum also informed Members that he and the Vice Chair have written to the Education Improvement Strategy Board and the Partnership Priorities and Joint Working Board on SEND matters. They will be attending a meeting of the EISB on 18 April.

Resolved –

- (1) **That progress made on Matters Arising be noted.**
- (2) **That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 January 2016 be signed as a correct record.**

ACTION: Interim City Solicitor

145. MATTERS RAISED BY SCHOOLS

There were no matters raised by schools to report.

No resolution was passed on this item.

146. NATIONAL FUNDING FORMULA CONSULTATION

The Chair introduced this item, explaining that this was a single agenda item meeting to consider the proposals of the DfE's 1st stage consultation on the introduction of a National Funding Formula (NFF). The Chair also explained that, from the presentation and subsequent discussion, we are looking to see if we can identify areas of agreement for inclusion in our response to the consultation.

The Business Advisor (Schools) delivered a presentation, which was based on Documents FV and FW. It was agreed that the PowerPoint slides be sent to Members and be published for schools on Bradford Schools Online. The presentation focused on the key aspects of the consultation document and what is understood by these, seeking to identify risks and matters that we would wish to raise in our response. First and foremost, it was explained that the 1st stage consultation gives no indication (or figures) on which to assess the impact on funding levels for the Bradford District or individual schools and academies. However, it does give a very clear steer on the reducing role of the Local Authority and Bradford's Schools Forum in deciding on local funding matters. It was also explained that a consultation on Early Years Funding has not yet been published, but that a 'parallel' process will be published in due course. As a result, it is clear that there is still much for the Schools Forum to consider regarding the impact of the NFF and our response to this.

These minutes do not repeat the content of the presentation. Please see the PowerPoint slides, which are available online.

In considering the presentation, Members asked the following questions and made the following comments. The recorded below includes the key points for inclusion in our response to the consultation to be submitted to the DfE that were agreed:

- The Strategic Director, Children's Services stated that the needs of vulnerable learners must remain central and he expressed his concern that this focus is missing in the consultation document and may be lost in technical complications and transitions. A holistic investment model is required, working with other agencies e.g. the Police. He also stated that the critical conversations on raising standards in the District's schools must not be lost as the funding system changes and the pace of academy conversion accelerates. He also explained that the issue of commercial liabilities resulting from academy conversions is an area that requires more investigation.
- The Director of Finance explained that our response at this stage has to be about the principles on which more detailed proposals (2nd stage consultation) are to be based. For example, are there elements that we observe in school funding that the NFF proposals do not cover? How do we feel about the protection that the proposed transitional arrangements will bring?
- Members expressed an immediate concern that the NFF is proposed not to include a mobility factor. Our case for the inclusion of mobility must feature strongly in our response back to the DfE.
- There is likely to be a difference in views between schools and the Local Authority regarding the size of the new Central Schools Block. Greater value for money needs to be achieved where the Local Authority continues to deliver services for schools. The Strategic Director, Children's Services agreed. The Chair added that, clearly, the Authority's ambition for the District will step beyond what is funded within the small Central Schools Block. How the Authority works with schools and its partnerships then will be critical.
- That further consideration needs to be given to how financial collaboration will operate in the future e.g. following the cessation of de-delegation. A question was asked whether Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) can collaborate in purchasing. The Director of Finance confirmed that MATs can join together as group purchasers. An Academy Member also added that MATs do currently find ways to achieve economies of scale and deliver buying efficiencies.
- Members expressed a general concern about the position of the High Needs Block, also expressing a good understanding of the relationship between mainstream formula change and how this has implications for High Needs provision. Our response to the DfE must explain our concern about the possibility of different transition timescales in the different Blocks and the difficulties that this is likely to cause in our re-shaping of provisions. The Vice Chair added how important it is for our SEND and Behaviour review groups to complete their work to aid this re-shaping. The Chair stated that the Authority must respond quickly to access additional capital / spend to save monies that will be allocated by the DfE as details of these are announced. Members also expressed the need, once figures on impact are available, to model the High Needs Block on a longer-term basis, looking ahead to what our High Needs Block funding is likely to be post-transition and re-shaping our provisions now in the light of this longer-term view about affordability.

- The NFF will only be fair where the weighting for deprivation is correct. This message needs to be very clear in our consultation response. A Member added however, that people will have different views about what constitutes a fair weighting.
- That the DfE must be made aware in our response of the ‘flaws’ in their explanation of the differences in levels of per pupil funding allocated to schools in different authorities; in that this ignores that differences in the nature of SEND provision (inclusion) affect levels of per pupil funding allocated through mainstream formulae. We are concerned that the DfE understands this context before it finalizes its detailed proposals.
- The Executive Member for Children’s Services stated that we need to engage all ‘levers’ that are available to us, including MPs, to ensure our concerns and views influence the development of the DfE’s final proposals. The Chair also added that the Forum has previously agreed for Members to disseminate information and key messages via their networks and partnerships.

Resolved –

- (1) **That Documents FV and FW be noted.**
- (2) **That the School Forum’s responses to the consultation proposals, that were agreed by consensus and that are recorded in the minutes, be submitted to the DfE before 17 April 2016 deadline.**

LEAD: Business Advisor (Schools)

147. OTHER SCHOOLS FORUM STANDING ITEMS

There were no further updates presented on the Forum’s standing items:

No resolution was passed on this item.

148. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AOB)

No additional items of business for consideration were tabled.

No resolution was passed on this item.

149. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Schools Forum is Wednesday 18 May 2016.

The Business Advisor (Schools) gave advance notice for schedule of meeting for the 2016/17 academic year, as follows:

- Wednesday 21 September 2016

- Wednesday 19 October 2016
- Wednesday 7 December 2016
- Wednesday 11 January 2017
- *Wednesday 18 January 2017 - PROVISIONAL MEETING*
- Wednesday 15 March 2017
- Wednesday 17 May 2017
- Wednesday 5 July 2017

All meetings would commence at 0800 in Committee Room 1, City Hall, Bradford.

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Forum.

minutes\SF\16Mar

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA ITEM

For Action

For Information

Brief Description of Item

Members are asked to consider and agree newly proposed allocations to schools and academies from the established DSG Growth Fund in 2016/17.

Date (s) of any Previous Discussion at the Forum

The criteria for funding expanding schools and bulge classes in 2016/17 were included as part of the consultation on Primary and Secondary funding in 2016/17, and were agreed by members prior to submission of our final pro-forma to the EFA in January 2016. Individual allocations from the 2016/17 Growth contingency fund for new bulge classes and expansions have not yet been discussed by Forum members.

Background / Context

As was the case in 2015/16, the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2015 allow for a Growth fund to be held and managed centrally within the DSG. The regulations require that this fund is:

- ringfenced i.e. cannot be spent on any other purpose. Any unspent growth funding remaining at the year-end should be reported to the Schools Forum. Funding may be carried forward to the following funding period, and can be used specifically for growth if the authority wishes.
- available to be accessed by both maintained schools and recoupment academies across the District (with both maintained school and recoupment academy budgets contributing to the cost of this fund prior to new delegation).

The Regulations also require that local authorities consult their Schools Forum before incurring any expenditure due to a significant growth in pupil numbers as a result of the local authority's duty under section 13(1) of the 1996 Act to secure that efficient primary education and secondary education are available to meet the needs of the population of their area.

Other than these main restrictions, how the Growth fund operates is for local determination.

The criteria for allocating funding from the Growth fund were agreed by Forum members following the consultation process in October 2015, and were part of our final funding pro-forma submitted to the EFA in January 2016. Funding has already been allocated for existing expansions and bulge classes; this funding is included in 2016/17 Section 251 Budget statements (and in Authority payments to academies).

The agreed criteria and mechanism for allocating funding are as follows:

- Where a school / academy is expanding or admitting a bulge class for the first time in September 2016, the school / academy is allocated 80% of the value of the base amount per pupil for the additional planned intake number, for the remaining proportion of the year. i.e. $80\% \times \text{£Base APP} \times \text{additional planned intake number} \times 7/12$.
- In the following financial year, funding is then allocated as follows:
 - A permanently expanding school / academy would receive funding calculated on the difference between the October Census pupil numbers and a calculation of the composite 5/12 + 7/12 numbers, based on an estimate of the following year September intake. The school / academy will then be allocated 80% of the value of the additional base amount per pupil, for the additional number of calculated pupils.
 - No additional funding is necessary or allocated for a school / academy that has a bulge class of 30 pupils from the previous year; this additional class is automatically funded within the normal budget as the full class will be included in the October Census.
 - Additional funding is allocated, however, for a school / academy that has a half bulge class in each year for the lifetime that half class is at the school / academy. An additional sum is allocated based on 80% of the value of the base amount per pupil for the difference between 30 and the actual number of children in the half class. E.g. For an existing half class of 15 pupils the funding would be calculated as $(30-15) \times \text{£Base APP} \times 80\%$.

Details of the Item for Consideration

This paper asks members to consider allocations from the Growth fund to **3** primary schools that are expanding for the first time from September 2015; the funding will support an increase in provision as follows:

- **Barkerend Primary School** will increase in admission number from 60 to 90 pupils from September 2016, resulting in an allocation of **£40,197** in 2016/17
- **Stocks Lane Primary School** will increase in admission number from 15 to 30 pupils from September 2016, resulting in an allocation of **£20,099** in 2016/17
- **Lidget Green Primary School** will increase in admission number from 60 to 75 pupils from September 2016, resulting in an allocation of **£20,099** in 2016/17

There are currently no bulge classes planned for September 2016, but a further update will be given at the July meeting, once all reception class applications have been made.

There are currently no confirmed allocations for expansions or bulge classes in secondary schools for September 2016, but a further update will be given at the July meeting.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

If agreed, the total sum of £80,395 will be funded from the Growth fund set aside as a contingency for 2016/17; a sum of £250,000 is set aside for growth in Primary and £300,000 for growth in Secondary. £169,605 will remain in the Primary Growth fund after these new expansions have been funded. Any unspent funding from the Growth contingency at the end of the year would be released back into the DSG in 2017/18.

How does this item support the achievement of the District's Education Priorities

The Bradford District has one of the fastest growing populations in the country leading to an increased demand on the available places. This increase in demand is being addressed through a phased expansion of a number of primary schools and academies across the district. The Local Authority has a duty to ensure that sufficient high-quality provision is available to meet the needs of all Bradford District children.

Allocations of funding from the Growth Fund are necessary to support schools and academies throughout their expansion in order that the District meets the demands of the local population.

Recommendations

Primary Forum members are asked to agree to allocate a total of £80,395 from the Primary Growth fund to the following schools in 2016/17:

- **Barkerend Primary School £40,197**
- **Stocks Lane Primary School £20,099**
- **Lidget Green Primary School £20,099**

List of Supporting Appendices / Papers

None.

Contact Officer (name, telephone number and email address)

Sarah North, Principal Finance Officer
01274 434173
sarah.north@bradford.gov.uk

SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA ITEM

For Action



For Information



Brief Description of Item (including the purpose / reason for presenting this for consideration by the Forum)

The Schools Forum is asked to consider the progress being made in securing the future sustainability of all three outdoor education centres and meeting the value for money criteria for the Forum's investment.

Date (s) of any Previous Discussion at the Forum

On 11 July 2012 the Schools Forum recommended the allocation of £1m of DSG one-off monies to support the re-development of the 3 outdoor learning centres (Buckden House, Ingleborough Hall and Nell Bank). The Forum also received updates subsequently of the progress of redevelopment work, including on 11 December 2013. In December 2014, a report updated the Forum on the progress of the redevelopment of the outdoor education centres with an assessment of the impact of this redevelopment and of the Forum's DSG contribution of £1m. The Forum was asked to consider further financial support from the DSG to capital redevelopment cost.

Background / Context

On 11 July 2012 the Schools Forum recommended the allocation of £1m of DSG one-off monies to support the re-development of the 3 outdoor learning centres (Buckden House, Ingleborough Hall and Nell Bank). This capital redevelopment alongside a subsequent increase in usage and revenue from the centres was seen as essential in meeting the long term goal of the future financial sustainability of the centres. This was to be achieved within the rigour of a new business plan and ownership (Trust) model for the governance of Ingleborough Hall and Buckden House. At the request of the Local Authority, within the recommendations on the 2014/15 DSG, the Schools Forum earmarked £500,000 that had not been allocated to the 2 year old capital projects as a further contribution to the capital redevelopment costs of the outdoor learning centres, which was supported by the Secretary of State. The Forum also transferred the financing of the DSG's existing annual £228,000 revenue contribution to the outdoor centres to one off monies. This commitment was to continue for 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17. This commitment will cease at April 2017.

The status of the building programme and allocation of capital resources

The refurbishment works at both Ingleborough Hall and Buckden House have been completed. The new build at Nell Bank started in December 2015, progressing to an expected end date of 27 May 2016. It was agreed by the Outdoor Learning Project Board that the works to Ingleborough Hall and Buckden House be undertaken first and remaining funds utilised for Nell Bank on completion of the other schemes. The tenders were offered under the agreed scheme operated by the Local Authority. However, during works at Ingleborough and Buckden in 2014 and 2015 it became apparent costs would exceed the provisional budgets for both schemes and on this basis the successful request for £500,000 extra funds for Nell Bank was made to Schools Forum. The table below outlines the capital expenditure:

	Buckden	Ingleborough	Nell Bank	Total
	£	£	£	£
Capital Spend to 31/1/2016	462,358	619,396	92,523	1,174,277
Further Capital Spend	0	0	779,769	779,769
Total Capital Spend	462,358	619,396	872,292	1,954,046
Total Capital Resources				1,773,000
Forecast Capital Overspend				181,046

Ingleborough and Buckden are listed and in a National Park, which has resulted in considerably more work and time to achieve consents. As works commenced it also became clear that additional works would be required due to structural issues which became evident as the works progressed. In addition, the work for Nell Bank was returned with a significantly higher than expected tender price. This has resulted in a capital overspend of approximately £180,000, which is currently being underwritten by the Local Authority.

Background / Context (continued)**Financial position:****Buckden and Ingleborough.**

Recent interim managerial arrangements across the two centres have proved to be beneficial in terms of income generation. Expertise is now being shared across the two centres, and there are encouraging signs of recovery. Whereas significant deficit budgets existed in previous years, the current position is encouraging. The capital investment has enabled the two completed centres to meet financial targets for the financial year 2015/16, and a budget is now being set which will reflect this increased income expectations in future years.

At the end of the financial year 2014/2015 the two centres were operating at a deficit of £139,108. From the beginning of April 2015 to date the financial turnaround has been significant. Where the refurbishment has now been completed a great deal of progress is being made. The centres are now predicted to generate significantly more income than expenditure by 31 March 2016 and therefore, will not draw on support from the revenue funding support pot.

Nell Bank

Nell Bank has experienced a loss of income in 2015/6 due to the building works on site which affected the centre from the beginning of the autumn term. However, the new residential facility will significantly increase the revenue capacity at the centre, and, as has been the case at Ingleborough and Buckden, there is every confidence in a healthy prediction of future income from the end of May 2016 which will return the budget above a break even situation.

Table A provides the Forum with financial information from the past two years and predicted information relating to the income, expenditure and support costs from the Council. All overspends have been supported from the revenue support funding provided by the Schools Forum from the DSG (the annual sum of £228,000), which is due to cease on 31 March 2017.

Table A : Outdoor Education Centres: Income, Expenditure and Council support

Centre	Running costs	2013/14 actual	2014/15 actual	2015/16 Forecast
Nell Bank	Expenditure	273,436	277,833	313,083
	Income	-191,620	-215,136	-174,046
	Council revenue support	-67,100	-27,400	0
Over / under spend		14,716	35,297	139,037
Ingleborough Hall	Expenditure	472,493	497,235	443,310
	Income	-359,275	-356,127	-449,128
	Council revenue support	0	0	0
Over / under spend		113,218	139,108	-5,818
Buckden House	Expenditure	220,540	242,121	217,073
	Income	-199,073	-173,353	-176,217
	Council revenue support	0	0	0
Over / under spend		21,467	68,768	40,856

Details of the Item for Consideration (continued)

A Business Plan will now be prepared which will take into account the need to ensure financial sustainability following the removal of the annual revenue support from the Forum after March 2017. Consideration is now being given to a range of options. A Task and Finish Group is being established which will report on potential future Trust arrangements, including the possibility of moving towards a single Trust. Representatives from the Council's Human Resources, Finance, and Legal Services Departments will advise on future options, which include the potential to recoup current overspend from anticipated future revenue receipts or unallocated reserves. In addition, there are options to work with commercial partners to ensure that future independent Trust arrangements are more viable. The Council's deliberations will seek the views of all key stakeholders to ensure that the District retains the appropriate level of facility to support a sustainable outdoor learning offer.

How does this item support the achievement of the District's Education Priorities

There is clear evidence from some schools that pupils' skills in enquiry, observation, creativity and participation are honed and improved through structured outdoor learning opportunities. Outdoor activities both at school and on residential courses enable pupils to enjoy challenging and unfamiliar experiences that test and develop their physical, social and personal skills. They can be among the most memorable experiences for pupils of their school-days. Outdoor education thrives in schools where leadership with a vision that promotes a well-balanced PE curriculum and outdoors off-site, day or residential experience.

With the completion of this major capital investment and the attendant increase in visitor numbers, the strong management and governance arrangements now in place, the Centres are now ideally placed to develop a strong Outdoor offer. The planned work on Trust arrangements will allow increased access to wider funding, capacity development amongst staff, as well as the potential of securing independence from current financial and human resource systems. The Schools Forum, schools, pupils, and wider stakeholders can therefore have confidence that the Outdoor Centres will have a bright future as a direct result of the investment by the Schools Forum.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

None

Recommendations

As a key stakeholder, the Schools Forum is asked for its views concerning the options in this paper in order to inform the Council's considerations and decision making.

List of Supporting Appendices / Papers (where applicable)

None

Contact Officer (name, telephone number and email address)

Terry Davis
01274 437170
terry.davis@bradford.gov.uk

SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA ITEM

For Action

For Information

Brief Description of Item (including the purpose / reason for presenting this for consideration by the Forum)

This report provides a detailed update on the SEND provision and Behaviour strategy matters, responding to the action points and requests for information that have made by the Schools Forum and that are recorded in the minutes of previous meetings. The report summarises the key discussion items in Schools Forum meeting since September 2014. A presentation will be delivered to the meeting, which provides an update on the position of reviews and other activities.

Date (s) of any Previous Discussion at the Forum

As outlined in the report below and in Appendix 1.

Background / Context

The Schools Forum has been presented with, and has considered, a number of important strategic matters relating to High Needs funding and provision since September 2014. These matters are summarised in Appendix 1. Members have asked in recent meetings for an holistic detailed update on these matters. At the last meeting the Schools Forum began to consider the implications of the Government's proposals for a National Funding Formula on High Needs Funding.

Details of the Item for Consideration

Please see Appendix 1. The purpose of this report is to give Members a reasonably simple summary of what has been presented to the Schools Forum and what Forum Members have said and agreed on key High Needs funding and provision matters since September 2014. This summary has been taken from the minutes of Forum meetings. The Deputy Director, Education, Employment and Skills will present to the meeting (PowerPoint) an update on the position of reviews and other activities.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

Yes – as presented.

How does this item support the achievement of the District's Education Priorities

Ensuring appropriate resources are available, in the right places, to support the most vulnerable children across the District, must be a key focus for the Forum, building on current good practices. It is also vitally important that, alongside managing increasing cost pressures, that sufficient resources are available to the Local Authority and to schools to meet statutory responsibilities around SEN and meeting pupil need.

Recommendations

Members are asked to consider and respond to the report.

List of Supporting Appendices / Papers (where applicable)

Appendix 1 – SEND Timeline

Contact Officer (name, telephone number and email address)

Andrew Redding, Business Advisor (Schools)
01274 432678
andrew.redding@bradford.gov.uk

Schools Forum Document FZ Appendix 1 – SEND Timeline

Reminder of SEND and Behaviour Key Strategic Items Presented to and Discussed by the Schools Forum since September 2014

This is an abridged copy of the record from the minutes of Schools Forum meetings. The intention is to give Members a reasonably simple but detailed summary of what has been presented to the Schools Forum and what Forum Members have said and agreed on key High Needs funding and provision matters. Some of the more technical detail recorded in the minutes has been deliberately removed to aid clarity.

- **17 September 2014**

The Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion, presented Document DD, which provides a clear statement of how the provisions for secondary aged pupils have developed. It was agreed that the development of primary and secondary provisions needs to be brought together strategically.

- **22 October 2014**

The Senior Schools Finance Officer presented a report, Document DN, which asked the Forum to consider and agree the proposed consultation on the High Needs Block funding model for 2015/16, and which provided further information on review items that had been progress by the SEN Reference Group and proposed new bids for funding from the 2015/16 DSG. The Forum's discussion around cost pressures on the High Needs Block focused, in particular, on two specific funding issues:

- Firstly, the Authority's strategic response to the growth in the numbers of children presenting with autism (ASD). Appendix 4 alerts Members that a new Special school may be required by September 2018, which will have financial implications. Members agreed that the Multi Agency Strategic Group be established.
- Secondly, the benchmarking of values of Plus (top up) funding for places in alternative provisions.

- **7 January 2015**

The Senior School Finance Officer reported back to Members the information requested at the last meeting on the actual occupancy of places at the PRUs and Behaviour Centres since September 2013 (matters arising document 3). The Vice Chair expressed concern about the low levels of occupancy of the Behaviour Centres and said that she would be taking this forward with the established review group and with BPIP.

The following summarises the key strategic DSG recommendations made for the 2015/16 financial year relating to the High Needs Block:

- Agreed a Schools Block contribution for 2015/16 of £3.63m and an Early Years Block contribution of £0.34m to the High Needs Block.
- Agreed, in setting the DSG's High Needs Block planned spending for 2015/16, to initially ring-fence the planned spending on the Primary Behaviour Centres so that this sum is available in the re-development of primary-aged behaviour support strategies.
- Agreed, in setting the DSG's High Needs Block planned budget for 2015/16, to initially ring-fence spending on specific Early Years SEND budgets. The outcomes of the current review work in this area (to enable budgets to be deployed flexibly between different provisions in response to need) will be presented to the Forum for further consideration.

- Agreed that the principles to be established for Early Years SEND, that will enable the flexible allocation of budgets in year between place-led and centrally managed support services, are also established for support for visually and hearing impaired pupils.
- Agreed to expand the DSG's budget for specialist equipment to early years settings, at an annual cost of £25,000.
- Agreed to increase the value of the SEN Funding Floor for Primary schools / academies, at an estimated annual cost of £195,000.
- Agreed to fund a Specialist Teacher for early years within the Authority's ASD team, at an annual cost of £53,000, and an ASD Specialist Practitioner with the remit to support the work of the lead for early years, at an annual cost of £15,000.

A report was presented back to the Schools Forum on 7 January 2015 summarising the progress made on the review areas agreed by the Forum in March 2014 (as recorded in the 'DSG Reviews Matrix'). The Local Authority reported the following for High Needs Block review activities:

Review Area 2 – The High Needs Block Quality and Future Affordability

This area of review has been led by the Local Authority with input from the SEN Reference Group in particular, but also from other stakeholders e.g. early years. The main actions and outcomes from the review area are:

- We are clearer about the pressures on the High Needs Block and how these will map over the next couple of years. Our level of spend in 2015/16 is sustainable, if nothing changes, though only following contributions from the Schools and Early Years Blocks. However, we forecast that the growth especially in children presenting with ASD will exceed current support levels and a new provision (possibly a new school) is likely to be needed by September 2018, on top of additional provisions to meet the growth in SEND children that is resulting from demographic growth more generally. The Authority is currently developing new primary and secondary aged resourced provisions in 2015/16. A specific multi agency ASD group has been established to develop strategy and make recommendations on ASD provision. We identify that our DSG High Needs Block cannot fund such an increase in the level of provision in the future, without a significant injection of new money from Government. The outcomes of the DfE's call for evidence and holistic SEND funding review (expected for implementation April 2016) are critical for us in shaping our provisions.
- We have reviewed our Place-Plus Model and have consulted on this. This includes protection of smaller settings, which was a concern raised previously.
- The development of a holistic post 16 funding formula. The Authority is currently establishing a review group that will take this work forward and it is anticipated that a new model will be in place for August 2015.
- We have reviewed the relativity of levels of funding for SEN and for alternative provisions and have presented recommendations to the Schools Forum. This is an area that we will continue to monitor.
- We have identified where high needs budgets are not allocated in the right places to best meet (changing) demands and we are currently working on developing the principle, whereby high needs funding can be 'unlocked' from where it isn't needed and transferred to where it is e.g. moved from place-led funding at specialist settings that are under occupied to central support services that support mainstream provision where the children are. This in particular relates to the use of DSG resources for Early Years SEN and support for Hearing and Visually Impaired pupils. This is a mechanism that will help to manage (though to only a limited and probably short-term extent) growing cost pressures within the DSG.
- The Forum has received reports on how the additional resources allocated to HI / VI services and for Early Years this year have been used to raise quality. The Forum is currently being asked to consider additional resources in specific areas in 2015/16. In particular, the Forum is asked to consider increasing the value of the SEN Funding Floor for primary mainstream settings, in support of maintaining quality of provision for

children at School Action / School Action Plus, especially in settings that do not receive significant values of Pupil Premium.

Review Area 11 – Behaviour Support Services

This continues to be an area of focus for the Schools Forum and for headteachers / other strategic groups.

- In discussing the application of the Surplus Balances Protocol to District PRU, the Schools Forum received a report, which outlined clearly the different provisions within the District's strategy for secondary-aged behaviour support. A number of clear strategic themes emerged from discussions on this matter, including how the District's strategy responds to the increasing number of new arrivals. Bradford Partnership has nominated 3 secondary headteachers to act as strategic leads.
- A Primary Behaviour Strategy Group is currently meeting and is considering how the resources available within the DSG for supporting behaviour in the primary phase are most effectively utilised.
- The Schools Forum, via the SEN Reference Group, has further considered the relativity of levels of funding for alternative provisions. This has led to a strengthening of processes for the funding of non-statemented pupils in the PRUs for 2015/16 and is an area that will continue to be closely watched.
- The cost to the DSG of alternative provisions in Bradford is 'under control' through establishing a maximum number of funded places. The cost of out of authority placements must continue to be closely monitored.

• **11 March 2015**

The SEN Planning and Project Manager presented a report, Document EI, which provides the Schools Forum with further information on the development of the District's strategy in response to the growth in children presenting with ASD needs. Members were reminded that this item follows from the discussions in the meeting of 22 October 2014 and in the context of the Authority's current forecasting data, which strongly indicates the need for the creation of c. 84 additional high needs places for children with ASD needs by September 2018 and therefore, possibly the establishment a new special school. It was explained that this would have revenue and capital cost implications for both the DSG and for the Authority, which need to be considered as early as possible. Members were reminded that a specific multi-agency group has been established to explore options and to make recommendations on the delivery model for how this additional growing need will be most effectively met. Following the initial presentation of the report:

- A Member raised concerns that the forecast of growth may be too low, suggesting that more than an additional 84 places may be needed.
- It was clarified that any new school, under current Regulations, would need either to be an academy or a free school. It is important for Forum Members and the Authority to be aware / to recognise in planning that a new free school would established without capital cost to the Authority. Because of this, the options around a free school should be seriously explored.
- It was requested that more specific detail on the cost implications, both revenue and capital, of the different options be provided.

• **20 May 2015**

The Interim Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion, outlined the current position of the reviews of behaviour support services, explaining that she has initiated a fresh holistic review, recognising the amount of money spent in this area, the existence of some gaps in our provisions and in limitations in how responsive our existing provisions are in meeting pupil-need. Members understood the importance of getting this review work right. The Vice Chair added that, from her research, her immediate concerns about potential blockages in the system of referrals to the

Primary Behaviour Centres have been allayed. The Strategic Director, Children's Services gave his support to these reviews, recognising the time that is required to get provision right and also recognising the need for effective and sensitive communication and engagement.

A report was presented, Document EP, which provided the Schools Forum with an update on the development of the District's strategy in response to the forecasted future growth in children presenting with ASD needs. The report asked the Forum to initially consider the cost appraisal on the main options being developed by the Working Group. In presenting this update, the SEN Planning and Project Manager stressed that the Group has asked for wider consultation now to take place with stakeholders on the development of provision, and that this was a key next step. In responding to this report, Forum Members made the following comments:

- The needs of pupils should drive the strategy.
- That wider consultation is crucial and that the Authority needs to think carefully about how it consults effectively with parents, guardians and carers about their preferences (as these preferences may largely determine how provision needs to be delivered in the future).
- That the strategy and consultation has to seriously consider the development of a 'hybrid' model, where additional provision is delivered through the establishment of a new school / academy / free school but also additional resourced provisions that are dispersed across the District. Although a single stand-alone school may be the most cost effective model (though there would be transport costs to consider), a hybrid model is likely to be the reality of what will be required.
- That there is an opportunity to consider the development of a regional response. This is especially important in considering the possibility of the establishment of a new free school, which will have financial advantage to the District (in terms of capital set up costs and post opening budget support) but which may not provide the full solution and may not enable the Authority to fully control how it meets growing need (as the Authority is not the admissions body for a free school).
- That the Forum would like a detailed update on the outcomes of consultation.

- **21 October 2015**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document FI, which asked Members to agree the publication of the proposed consultation document on the High Needs Block funding model for 2016/17. It was explained that this document includes the number of places the Authority plans to commission and the arrangements for paying top up (Plus) funding. Members were also asked to begin to consider the issues the report raises regarding on-going affordability pressures within the High Needs Block. Members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- That it would be useful for the Forum to be provided with data, which shows the extent to which children move up the ranges funding model as they progress through primary to secondary provision, including those that may progress to be funded through an independent or out of authority provision.
- That the SEN Reference Group has identified, and is beginning to consider further, what benchmarking data highlights about how the number of specialist places provided in the Bradford District differs from the numbers in other authorities. This data will be presented in summary to the Schools Forum and the next meeting and that this will likely provide context to considerations around the 2016/17 DSG allocation and affordability pressures. The Vice Chair welcomed discussion on this data taking place in the full Schools Forum. Following the Chair's suggestion, the Business Advisor explained that it may be useful for a single item agenda / education select committee style Forum meeting to be arranged in the new year, specifically to consider evidence and comparative data concerning the District's SEND places provision, how the

District's places sufficiency strategy could develop and how this may be affected by developments nationally e.g. a national funding formula.

- That there are a number of issues previously raised with the Forum that are outstanding to be concluded or resolved, including the development of the District's strategy and provision for behaviour support and for ASD need.

- **9 December 2015**

The Strategic Director of Children's Services gave a PowerPoint presentation to Members of the Council's (Children's Services) budget position and the proposals for 2016/17 that are currently out for consultation across the District. Following from the information provided to the Schools Forum in October, the presentation included an overview of the individual Children's Services proposals for savings being consulted on by the Executive and explanation of the proposed establishment of a virtual school for vulnerable children and the proposed extension of the sector-led delivery model to SEND specialist teaching services. The Strategic Director outlined the 4 key blocks of the proposals and key think behind proposals in each of these: SEN and Inclusion, Skills, Safeguarding and Social Care and Early Help, and improvement in education outcomes

The Interim Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion, explained the basis of the proposals for the establishment of a single virtual school for vulnerable children; that there will be significant advantage, operationally and financially, in bringing together new to English, Education Social Work and Behaviour support services. She also explained further the proposal to re-align specialist teaching services with schools and stated that she has a number of meetings with colleagues arranged to further explore how these previously very traditionally managed support services could be delivered in a different way. It is understood that there is a large number of staff attached to these teams. In the subsequent discussion Members made the following comments and asked the following questions:

- Whether the Council's proposals result in 'bunting shunting' towards the DSG / delegated school budgets. The Strategic Director responded to say that this is not the intention and that we do not think that the proposals do this, but that we need to have clear impact measures in place. The Chair asked for further information to be provided to the Forum on what liabilities may transfer to schools following the establishment of a SEND sector-led model (including liabilities for central infrastructure and other costs).
- Referring to the information presented on the sufficiency of specialist SEND places, we know that pressures are already present and we need to think about the development of specialist teaching services in the context of the necessary growth in the number of places over the next 5 years. We should be looking strategically at where we want to be in 2020 and work back from this. We need to future proof the changes we make now.
- A timeline for implementation, with milestones both for the SEND strategy and for the development of the SEND sector-led delivery, is needed. In particular, it was necessary to have this so that school leaders can manage transition, messages and expectations. This was raised as an important matter by a number of Members and was accepted and agreed by the Strategic Director.
- Whether the voluntary sector, and the 0-7 pathway, will come into considerations about sector-led delivery? The Interim Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion, stated that all aspects of service delivery are 'on the table'.

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a report, Document FO, which asked Members to consider the outcomes of the consultation on the 2016/17 High Needs Funding Model and the planned number of high needs places to be commissioned by the Authority. Document FO also gave an update on the position of other strategic high needs funding matters, including benchmarking information on places provision. The Business Advisor focused on the proposals for 2016/17 listed on the second page of the report and on what the benchmarking information indicates

about the sufficiency of high needs places in Bradford. In the subsequent discussion Members made the following comments and asked the following questions:

- Whether capital funding was available to enable the growth in the number of available high needs places? The Business Advisor reported that capital funding is available through the EFA for Free School developments, but that there is little funding available through the Local Authority.
- The Vice Chair stated that she feels uncomfortable talking about a more 'segregated' education model and asked Members to be aware of the issues related to inclusion that are within these discussions. Bradford has developed a strongly inclusive model and we must be very careful to understand how such a model has helped secure 'social tolerance' regarding SEND.
- Parental preference and choice are important to consider in developing our future strategy. The Representative of the PRUs, stating that we should be proud of our inclusivity, also commented that he is coming across a greater number of families wishing to access more specialist provisions.

The Interim Assistant Director, Access and Inclusion, responded to say that she is heartened by the comments from Members on inclusion and that she has a sense that MLD children should be educated in mainstream settings. The issues raised relate to the pressures on provision for children with greater levels of need and there is a sense that our number of high needs places is insufficient. The Interim Assistant Director then presented Appendix 2, which provided Members with an update on the development of the District's behaviour strategy. In recognising the current pressures and challenges, the Interim Assistant Director emphasised the positive aspects of provision in Bradford, including our low (below average) rate of permanent exclusions and the strengths of the BACs model. It was explained that a strategic partnership has been established, which meets on a monthly basis, and work streams have begun with a 3 month outcome timeline. Two of our PRUs are effectively special schools in that they provide longer-term rather than turn-around provision and re-designation of these provisions is being considered. It is very likely that these review work stream will conclude that a greater number of behaviour support places are needed across the District.

Responding to the question asked in an earlier item about the SEND strategy review and the development of the sector-led SEND model, the Interim Assistant Director stated that this review will look at how provision will develop over the next 5 years. Members asked some questions on how this strategy (a final draft to be available on 17 December) will be in place to inform spending decisions and how this will be consulted on. It was explained that the work streams will be pulled together early next year. A Member expressed concern from this about the potential for the current lack of clarity about the timeline for the delivery of significant change to have a negative impact. Another Member stated that, given the information is telling us that we need more high needs places, and given that other local authorities are already approaching MATs in developing their provisions, we need to be working as a priority to identify possible sponsors and / or local partners to establish free schools.

In the discussion on the possible implications of a national funding formula, the Business Advisor (Schools) offered a view of the 3 key identified risks to the funding of the Bradford District: a) the anticipated reduction in the proportion of the national DSG pot that is allocation towards supporting additional education needs (which will reduce our level of funding compared with that of authorities that have a lower level of e.g. deprivation); b) as a greater proportion of children with high needs are educated in mainstream settings in Bradford, and as our DSG spending profile follows this, that any reduction in our Schools Block level of funding is likely to have a greater impact where our High Needs Block is not increased to compensate for this ; c) the movement away from supporting the budgets of smaller schools through lump sum funding, which may quite significantly affect the financial viability of small and stand-alone settings.

- **6 January 2016**

The Chair explained that he feels strongly that he has a role as Chair to talk directly to the Strategic Boards and Partnerships about the substantial issues that are being considered by the Schools Forum, especially the SEND reviews. A letter on this basis will be sent (from the Chair and Vice Chair) to the Strategic Boards.

The Chair also stated clearly that it is crucial the Schools Forum receives comprehensive updates on outstanding discussion matters. The Chair's final remarks to the meeting emphasised the importance of this to all in attendance that have responsibility in these areas.

It was reported specifically that, in confirming the DSG settlement for 2016/17, Bradford has been allocated an additional unexpected sum of £1.09m in High Needs Block funds, which helps substantially in the management of the overall cost pressure on the DSG. This allocation reduces the overall funding gap from the previously estimated £2.7m to £1.7m. It was explained that, as part of its recommendations, the Schools Forum will be asked to remove this funding gap by reducing rates of formula funding across all 3 DSG Blocks, which is the recommendation of the Formula Funding Working Group. The Business Advisor confirmed that a flat reduction of 0.42% in rates across the 3 Blocks was required to resolve this funding gap. The Business Advisor explained the continuation (and increase) in the subsidy of the High Needs Block costs by the other 2 DSG Blocks; Schools Block a £5.18m and the Early Years Block a £0.39m contribution. In summarising the Business Advisor's presentation, the Chair emphasised the subsidy of the Schools Block of High Needs Block costs and the further support of this position in the proposed use of one off monies (for behaviour).

The following summarises the key strategic DSG recommendations made for the 2016/17 financial year relating to the High Needs Block:

- Agreed a Schools Block contribution for 2016/17 of £5.18m and an Early Years Block contribution of £0.39m to the High Needs Block.
- Retain all current budget allocations within the High Needs Block in the 2016/17 financial year unless otherwise specifically stated. This is done on the understanding that the proposed re-commissioning of SEND teaching support services (proposed in the Council's budget consultation for 2016/17) may mean that centrally managed budgets are re-allocated (to schools) during the financial year. The Schools Forum will be further consulted on this.
- Calculate the initial planned cost of High Needs Block spending in 2016/17 (place-led and plus elements) on the allocation of places for Bradford-located settings at a total of 2,000 for the 2016/17 academic year. This is the same as presented to the Forum in December in Document FO Appendix 1 at individual institution level, but with an adjustment to increase the number of secondary-aged alternative provision places to 394.
- Increase the planned budget in the High Needs Block by £500,000 for the cost of placements in independent settings and non-maintained special schools.
- Continue to apply the established principle that the distribution of alternative provision places (394 places) can move flexibly with the needs of students as identified by the Local Authority and the BACs and that the total number of places can be exceeded where a clear mechanism is in place for the DSG to be reimbursed for the cost of these from the BACs.
- Continue the additional £180,000 allocated to Primary-aged behaviour support. How this funding is to be used (and allocated to places at individual settings) will be determined by the review.
- Add to the initial setting-identified planned places provision an additional, currently unallocated, budget for a further 10 places at April 2016 and 20 places at September 2016 (calculated at £20,000 per place and rounded to a total cost of £400,000), which is available to fund both SEND and alternative provision additional places.

- Allocate the £600,000 of secondary one off monies to help resolve the immediate pressure for places, especially at District PRU.
- The funding released from the reduction in places in the ARCs (places have been reduced by 18) to be transferred to be available a) to meet the cost of placements in other delegated settings and b) to ensure that the centrally managed teaching service has sufficient capacity to support children in mainstream settings.
- Control the growth in cost pressure / help support meeting the funding gap in the overall DSG that is the result of the growth in pressure in the High Needs Block (as outlined in Document FQ) by making the following adjustments:
 - Reduce the rates of Top Up in the HNB Funding Model for all Place-Plus calculated budgets by the same % that Early Years, Primary and Secondary variables are reduced by in order specifically to meet the funding gap. That the values of Top Up for each Range are reduced by the same %. This is a reduction of 0.42%. Funding values are shown in Document FT Appendix 3.
 - Apply the same % reduction (0.42%) to all centrally managed / non-Place-Plus High Needs Block budgets.
 - Reduce the specialist equipment budget for special schools and academies by 50% at 1 April 2016, to £37,500.
- Agreed to continue a budget, at a value of £100,000, in the High Needs Block to be available to contribute to capital costs associated with the expansion of existing, or the establishment of new, resourced provisions.

- **16 March 2016**

The Business Advisor (Schools) presented a briefing on the 1st stage consultation on the implementation of a national funding formula for schools and high needs provision. Critically:

- The NFF proposals do not introduce a provider-level national formula for HNB funded providers. Local authorities will continue to have responsibility for the management / formula funding of High Needs Block (HNB) provisions after April 2019.
- The continuation of Place-Plus
- The DfE expects much closer collaboration between local authorities in funding arrangements and in commissioning provision. The DfE also expects that local authorities will consider the organisation of their alternative provisions and how these are funded.
- The DfE sees the importance of local authorities (and high needs providers) finding significant efficiencies in their HNB provisions, including collaborative arrangements, but also using reserves within the DSG to support initial pressures and transition and accessing the capital support, which will be made available to reshape and increase places.
- The DfE is considering options for the review of alternative provision, to “make AP more rigorous” and will publish plans on this. This may affect how the different kinds of AP are funded.
- No formula solution has been put forward yet for the funding of Education in Hospital provision (still based on current levels of spending).
- Critically, during 2017/18 and 2018/19, it is proposed that 100% of the new Schools Block must be spent on primary and secondary formulae funding and cannot be diverted to support pressures in other Blocks i.e. the High Needs Block.
- In the future then, the cost of high needs provision must be met by the High Needs Block without call on other budgets or DSG blocks.

SCHOOLS FORUM AGENDA ITEM

For Action

For Information

Brief Description of Item (including the purpose / reason for presenting this for consideration by the Forum)

To update the Schools Forum on the position of maintained school revenue balances at 31 March 2016.

Date (s) of any Previous Discussion at the Forum

The Forum received information on the position of school balances held at 31 March 2015 on 20 May 2015.

Background / Context

The financial year runs from 1 April to 31 March. At the end of each financial year, schools are required to 'closedown' their accounts and to finalise the values of balances held at this point. This information is forwarded to the DfE and is publicly published. The Authority's Deficit Budget Protocol is in place to manage schools that hold (or forecast to hold) deficit revenue balances.

Maintained schools are permitted to carry forward surplus revenue balances. Currently, schools with revenue balances in excess of 4% (Secondary) or the greater of £60,000 or 6% (all other schools) of funding must comply with the Authority's Surplus Balances Protocol, which requires schools to assign the value of excess balances to spend on permitted schemes. With the School Forum's support, the Surplus Balances Protocol was reviewed (strengthened) during 2013.

Details of the Item for Consideration

Please see Appendix 1 for a full list of school balances at 31 March 2016. Unfortunately, we are not able at this time to separate within the figures the values of balances held by each school that relate to collaborative arrangements. This information will not be available until final CFR returns have been submitted by schools in early June. The table below summarises the overall positions for each phase and gives a comparison against the absolute positions at 31 March 2015.

	March 2016	March 2015	£ Difference
Nursery	£634,274	£865,874	- £231,600
Primary	£13,192,865	£13,280,694	- £87,829
Secondary	£3,306,510	£4,302,442	- £995,932
Special	£692,554	£773,431	- £80,877
PRUs	£1,041,564	£1,841,198	- £799,634
Total	£18,867,767	£21,063,639	- £2,195,872

Please note that the totals above are affected by the reduction in the number of maintained schools, as schools convert to academy status. Balances held by academies are not included within the Authority's reporting. At 31 March 2016, 2 fewer secondary schools were maintained by the Local Authority than at 31 March 2015. These 2 schools held revenue balances in total of £0.448m at 31 March 2015.

Surplus Balances Protocol

The revised Surplus Balances Protocol, which has been in place since March 2014, has been implemented with the main purpose of further supporting / encouraging schools to maximise the spending of their resources in support of raising standards. The two key aspects of the revised Protocol are:

- a) Thresholds of 4% (Secondary) and the greater of 6% or £60,000 (all other phases, but with additional flexibility for high needs providers) apply.
- b) The types of expenditure for which balances above the thresholds can be held are restricted to the following:
 - A revenue contribution to an agreed capital scheme, only where capital resources are not sufficient.
 - A revenue contribution to a 'spend to save' scheme, including energy efficiency schemes.
 - Balances earmarked to support the costs incurred by the review of contracts of a significant value, where expenditure is not even year on year, including Building Schools for the Future.
 - Managing the costs of expansion of pupil numbers.

Details of the Item for Consideration

- Managing financial difficulties associated with a budget reduction in the following financial year, resulting from either a significant reduction in pupil numbers or a loss or significant reduction of a specific funding stream.
- Managing exceptional circumstances in such a way as to avoid significant financial turbulence that may impact on standards. This may include, for example, outcomes of HR processes.

In terms of impact, firstly we might expect to see a reduction over time in the values of revenue balances held by schools. The table below shows an analysis of the balances positions by phase, having removed the 'distorting' effect of the conversion of maintained schools to academies:

	March 2016	March 2015	Difference
Nursery	£634,274	£865,874	- £231,600
Primary	£13,192,865	£13,280,694	- £87,829
Secondary	£3,306,510	£3,854,305	- £547,795
Special	£692,554	£773,431	- £80,877
PRUs	£1,041,564	£1,841,198	- £799,634
Total	£18,867,767	£20,615,502	- £1,747,735

The gross value of total surpluses held at 31 March 2016 is £20.03m. The gross value of deficits is £1.16m (6 schools). The gross value of deficits at 31 March 2015 was £0.51m (4 schools).

The table above, and Appendix 1, show a mixed picture *:

- A larger reduction in total balances held by Secondary schools. Within the Secondary schools' balances figures, as stated below, £1.12m of the £3.31m total is held to cover BSF contract liabilities. 3 secondary schools hold revenue deficits with a total value of £0.95m. At March 2015, 1 secondary school held a revenue deficit.
- A small reduction in the total value of balances held by Primary schools, but a mixed picture, with 67 schools reducing and 70 schools increasing their balances. 1 school holds a revenue deficit.
- A sizeable reduction in the total value of balances held by Nursery schools. This however, is mostly explained by the separation of accounting during 2015/16 of the external DfE funding held by 1 school as a Teaching Alliance School. 1 nursery school holds a small deficit balance. Please note that there is some continued 'distortion' of the balances figures for Nursery schools as the transformation of children's centre provision (and the movement of balances, including those relating to childcare provision) is completed.
- A sizeable reduction in the value of balances held by the PRUs, mostly explained by the reduction in the balance at 1 PRU with the progression of building works (and the related revenue contribution to capital).
- A small reduction in the total value of balances held by Special schools, but with 4 of the 6 schools increasing their balances. 1 Special school holds a revenue deficit.

* Further information will be presented verbally on any relationships between changes in value of balances during 2015 and types of school or characteristics of pupils.

The table below shows the number of school by phase by revenue balance as a % of funding at March 2016:

	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	PRUs
Deficit	1	1	3	1	0
Up to 1%	0	3	0	0	0
1% - 2%	0	9	1	0	0
2% - 4%	1	18	3	1	0
4% - 6%	0	68	3	0	2
6% - 8%	1	20	1	2	0
8% - 10%	0	9	2	1	1
10% - 20%	2	9	0	1	2
> 20%	2	0	0	0	2

This table shows how this position has changed from that at March 2015:

	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	PRUs
Deficit	+ 1	- 1	+ 2	Same	Same
Up to 1%	Same	+ 2	- 2	Same	Same
1% - 2%	Same	+ 5	- 2	Same	Same
2% - 4%	+ 1	- 10	+ 1	+ 1	Same
4% - 6%	- 2	+ 4	+ 1	- 2	+ 1
6% - 8%	+ 1	+ 4	Same	Same	- 2
8% - 10%	- 2		+ 1	+ 1	+ 1
10% - 20%	+ 1	- 2	- 1	Same	+ 2
> 20%	Same	- 1	Same	Same	- 2

Details of the Item for Consideration

The table below shows the median average value of balance by phase:

	Median Mar 2016	Median Mar 2015	Change
Nursery	£77,023	£47,162	+ £29,861
Primary	£79,196	£80,815	- £1,619
Secondary	£259,489	£247,123	+ £12,366
Special	£155,378	£143,993	+ £11,385
PRUs	£57,680	£73,747	- £16,067
Total	£82,657	£82,687	- £30

At 31 March 2015 (last year), 45 maintained schools held balances above their Intended Use of Excess Balances Thresholds, with a total value of balances above these Thresholds of £5.33m. After legitimate adjustments, such as for balances held on behalf of other schools, external ring-fenced grants and later notification of funding payments, 36 maintained schools held what the Council's Surplus Balances Protocol defines to be an 'excess' balance, at a total value of £3.71m. 45 schools returned schemes, with the total value of schemes adding up to £5.31m.

The equivalent position at 31 March 2016 is 51 schools (+6) are holding balances above their Thresholds, at total value of £4.13m (-£1.20m). After legitimate adjustments have been made, 33 schools (-3) are holding what the Council's Surplus Balances Protocol defines to be an 'excess' balance, at a total value of £2.38m (-£1.33m). 36 schools (-9) have returned 37 schemes, with the total value of schemes adding up to £3.66m (-£1.65m). A breakdown of schemes by type is shown in the table below:

Type of Scheme	No. of Schemes	Total Value of Schemes
1 Revenue Contribution to Capital Scheme	25	£1.977m
2 Revenue Contribution to Spend to Save	0	£0.000m
3 Contracts Review (including BSF)	4	£1.115m
4 Managing Places Expansion	2	£0.136m
5 Managing Budget Reduction	5	£0.412m
6 Managing Exceptional Circumstances	1	£0.020m
Total	37	£3.660m

Of these schemes, all but 3 are planned to be completed by 31 March 2016. Of the 51 schools holding an excess balance at 31 March 2016, all appear to have properly assigned the value of excess and therefore, there are currently no proposals for clawback.

Our initial conclusion from a simple analysis of the balances and Intended Use of Balances reporting positions at 31 March 2016 is that the Council's revised Surplus Balances Protocol continues to have an impact:

- No schools have breached their Thresholds without having assigned an appropriate value of balance to schemes, suggesting that the quality of financial planning and monitoring is continuing to improve.
- Although the number of schools above their Thresholds at 31 March 2016 has increased from 45 to 51, the value of balances held by these schools above their Thresholds has significantly reduced.
- The total value of balances held by all schools has reduced. It is expected that balances will reduce further during 2016, especially where the sums currently being held for specific commitments are spent.
- We must also recognise that the tighter financial climate is having / will have an impact on the values of balances held. The position of the secondary sector especially must be carefully monitored.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

General Context and Framework

- Deficit budgets on the closure of a maintained school revert back to the Local Authority and may be charged to the DSG if de-delegated arrangements operate to enable this. Surplus balances are credited to the DSG.
- Any claw back of surplus balances from maintained schools through the Intended Use of Balances process increases the amount of funding available for the Schools Budget in the DSG.
- On the conversion of a maintained school to academy status,
 - a surplus balance (irrespective of the type of conversion) is transferred to the academy trust (so there is no benefit to the Local Authority nor the DSG).
 - a deficit of a maintained school that is a 'converter' academy is also transferred to the academy trust (so there is no liability on the Local Authority nor the DSG).
 - a deficit of a maintained school that is a 'sponsored' academy reverts back to the Local Authority and may be charged to the DSG if de-delegated arrangements operate to enable this.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

For Further Information and Discussion

The Schools Forum agreed the following on 6 January 2016:

- “If it is necessary, and agreed by the Schools Forum, to write off to the DSG a deficit of a closing maintained school, or a maintained school that converts as a sponsored academy during 2016/17, where de-delegated budget provision has not been specifically made, this will be done retrospectively from the 2017/18 DSG or from any one off balances available at the end of 2016/17. That the Authority would anticipate using the DSG’s ‘resilience reserve’, allocated to enable de-delegation, to meet such costs.”
- “That additional information also be provided to the March meeting on the anticipated volume of conversions of maintained schools to academy status in Bradford and the likelihood of liabilities resulting from the conversion of schools holding deficit budgets.” It was reported to the March meeting that this information would be presented in May, as this would allow consideration of the balances held by maintained schools at the end of the 2015/16 financial year.

Members are reminded:

- That the DSG is financially supporting Beckfoot Upper Heaton Academy (former Belle Vue Boys School). A budget of £2.105m is held in the 2016/17 DSG allocation for this purpose.
- That a sum of £0.650m is held within the DSG (within one off monies) to support the cost of the deficit of a secondary school converting to academy status.
- A ‘resilience reserve’ of £3m continues to be held in the 2016/17 DSG. There are likely to be competing demands on this reserve (including from our review of high needs provision and the management of the transitional to the national funding formula). The final value of one off monies available from DSG underspends at 31 March 2016 has still to be confirmed / reported to the Forum.
- Of the warning given by the Director of Finance at the last meeting that, alongside the reform of the national funding formula, the increased rate of conversion to academies raises the risk that complex and uncertain liabilities may give rise to the need for greater contingencies for individual schools, groups of schools, and/or local authorities than has historically been the case (such as for liabilities related to school level services contracts).
- Of the warning given by the Business Advisor (Schools) at the last meeting that the opportunity for liabilities to arise relating to deficit balances is greater in 2016, due to the expected larger number of academy conversions and as budgets are becoming tighter due to the full year impact of increases in employer staffing costs (National Insurance and pension contributions).
- That critical to the potential for liability related to deficit balances is the type of academy conversion. There should be no budget deficit liability on the Local Authority nor the DSG from ‘converter’ academies. The definitions from the DfE’s guidance are: “converter academies are those that convert (whether as a standalone academy or as part of a multi academy trust) by means of an academy order (AO) made after an application by the governing body of the school. Schools which are eligible for intervention, within the meaning of Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, and underperforming schools which the Secretary of State judges are not strong enough to become an academy without a strong sponsor are treated as sponsored academies, even where their route to becoming an academy is through an application for an AO by the governing body.”
- Financial provision from the DSG for meeting the cost of the deficits of maintained schools that convert as ‘sponsored’ academies, and for meeting the cost of any other contractual liabilities associated with any type of conversion, is made through de-delegation from maintained schools. Although DSG reserves can be used to facilitate this, it is important for Members to be aware that as the numbers of maintained schools reduce and conversions increase, the potential for liabilities grows as the numbers of maintained school budgets that are still able to contribute to meeting the cost of these liabilities reduces.
- That the timing of conversion is an important factor in the potential for liability related to deficit budgets of sponsored academies. For example, a school that has an in year deficit budget in 2016/17, and converts on 1 September 2016, may respond to this in year, but savings from staffing restructure may only be implemented at the start of the new academic year. So, although the school’s budget will balance in the full year, it is the academy’s budget post 1 September that will benefit from these savings. The maintained school’s budget may fall into cumulative deficit if the value of the school’s balance held at the end of 2015/16 is not sufficient to meet the value of overspending in the first half of the year.
- Of the information that has previously been presented to the Schools Forum on how the Local Authority (School Funding Team) supports and challenges schools on their budget positions and works to identify and resolve issues early. The Authority also has published a detailed guidance document for schools, which sets out expectations in preparation for financial close on academy conversion.
- The deadline for the submission of governor approved budgets for 2016-2019 from maintained schools is 15 May 2016. It is these submissions that give the Authority a clearer view of the position of school budgets.
- An update on the position of academy conversions is a standing item on School Forum agendas.
- Prior to meetings becoming public, balances information was presented quarterly to the Schools Forum.
- As a result of expectations on the speed of conversions in Bradford, the Authority has effectively ceased to offer the capital loans scheme to maintained schools, which is funded by the DSG reserve.

Implications for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) (if any)

There have been 3 conversions since 1 January 2016; 2 secondary schools and 1 primary school. All 3 are expected to close with surplus balances. At the time of writing this report, the Local Authority is 'formally' aware of 36 schools that are likely to convert to academy status before or on 1 September 2016. One of the sources of information for planned conversions is the list published by the DfE on a monthly basis on its website of open academies and projects in development. This list enables us to identify which conversions are 'sponsored' and which are 'converters'. We currently estimate that 6 of the 36 are sponsored conversions. 1 of these schools currently holds a deficit budget, for which the Schools Forum has made £0.650m provision. Based on most recent budget information, we expect the other 5 to be in surplus at the point of conversion.

The position is fluid. The Authority is informed of new applications for academy conversions on a very regular basis and the timescale between notification and application and actual conversion can be relatively short. It is not possible at this stage to 'put a number' on the potential value of deficit budgets that may come back to the Local Authority / the DSG over the next 12 to 18 months. The detail earlier in this report shows that vast majority of maintained schools hold surplus balances but that some schools are facing significant financial pressure.

In discussing this matter, it will be helpful for Members to form a view on the following:

- Should the DSG be the source of funds for accumulated deficits of 'sponsored' converting schools?
- What is the appropriate role for the Local Authority?
- What is the appropriate role of the future Academy Trust?
- What additional controls and incentives can be put in place to avoid the risk that in the run up to conversion, converting schools do not manage their finance adequately such that a liability is created for?
- In view of the potential increase in academisation, should the Forum set aside a fund within the DSG to pay for non-recurrent conversion costs?
- In parallel to the above, clearly we would want to look at all conversions on a case by case basis. What is the mechanism for doing so, and is the approach taken in the past (discussion at full Forum level) viable in the new environment?

How does this item support the achievement of the District's Education Priorities

Schools maximising their resources in support of raising standards.

Recommendations

The Schools Forum is asked to note the information provided on school balances. Members are asked then to consider further the issues raised concerning the financial implications of the academisation of maintained schools and to form a view in response to the questions posed in the report about possible financial liabilities created by the conversion process.

List of Supporting Appendices / Papers (where applicable)

Appendix 1 – Summary of Maintained School Revenue Balances at 31 March 2016

Contact Officer (name, telephone number and email address)

Andrew Redding, Business Advisor (Schools)
01274 432678
andrew.redding@bradford.gov.uk

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Abbey Green Nursery School	102,037	22.8%	42,037	15,872	86,165
Canterbury Children's Centre and Nursery School	77,023	11.6%	17,023	73,242	3,780
Hirst Wood Nursery School	135,388	30.6%	75,388	102,359	33,029
Lilycroft Nursery School	21,036	3.1%	(38,964)	30,296	(9,261)
Midland Road Nursery School and Children's Centre	(3,101)	-0.5%	(63,101)	33,818	(36,919)
St Edmund's Nursery & Children's Centre *	266,694	32.6%	206,694	565,940	(299,246)
Strong Close Nursery School and Children's Centre	35,197	7.8%	(24,803)	44,347	(9,150)
TOTAL NURSERY SCHOOLS	634,274	15.5%		865,874	(231,600)

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Addingham Primary School	40,514	4.8%	(19,486)	48,308	(7,794)
Aire View Infant School	57,386	4.6%	(16,608)	37,012	20,373
All Saints' CE Primary School (Bradford)	168,570	5.6%	(14,514)	176,342	(7,772)
All Saints' CE Primary School (Ilkley)	105,633	8.3%	28,719	173,960	(68,327)
Allerton Primary School	116,713	5.4%	(12,898)	97,383	19,329
Ashlands Primary School	86,540	4.9%	(19,313)	47,984	38,556
Atlas Community Primary School	64,764	5.3%	(9,375)	43,523	21,242
Baildon CE Primary School	145,679	8.7%	44,442	132,338	13,341
Bankfoot Primary School	164,614	10.8%	73,880	166,336	(1,722)
Barkerend Primary School	105,854	4.4%	(38,302)	331,741	(225,887)
Ben Rhydding Primary School	41,015	4.5%	(18,985)	37,153	3,862
Blakehill Primary School	100,563	6.0%	7	93,126	7,438
Bowling Park Primary School	188,537	5.4%	(23,588)	203,483	(14,946)
Brackenhill Primary School	127,626	5.9%	644	100,585	27,041
Burley & Woodhead CE Primary School	43,762	4.9%	(16,238)	34,618	9,144
Burley Oaks Primary School	85,614	5.5%	(7,711)	85,547	67
Byron Primary School	256,568	7.7%	57,139	233,980	22,587
Carrwood Primary School	214,007	8.3%	56,432	281,682	(67,675)
Cavendish Primary School	24,270	1.1%	(113,889)	23,367	902
Clayton CE Primary School	111,738	5.9%	(2,462)	54,705	57,033
Clayton Village Primary School	59,178	5.7%	(3,514)	77,295	(18,117)
Copthorne Primary School	106,345	4.8%	(28,122)	85,487	20,857
Cottingley Village Primary School	100,944	5.5%	(9,170)	76,236	24,708
Crossflatts Primary School	297,016	15.6%	184,786	216,479	80,537
Crossley Hall Primary School	223,318	7.3%	52,262	131,383	91,935
Cullingworth Village Primary School	56,324	5.4%	(5,942)	40,495	15,828
Denholme Primary School	56,185	4.9%	(13,676)	46,132	10,053
East Morton CE Primary School	47,651	5.4%	(12,349)	48,948	(1,297)
Eastburn Junior and Infant School	27,578	3.1%	(32,422)	30,164	(2,586)
Eastwood Primary School	156,342	6.8%	20,878	124,756	31,586
Eldwick Primary School	85,300	4.9%	(17,686)	96,224	(10,924)
Fagley Primary School	48,478	3.2%	(34,243)	65,707	(17,229)
Farfield Primary School	304,634	13.7%	170,926	229,810	74,824
Farnham Primary School	17,973	0.7%	(117,690)	50,259	(32,286)
Fearnville Primary School	174,225	8.3%	47,457	168,390	5,835
Foxhill Primary School	53,854	5.5%	(6,146)	43,801	10,053
Frizinghall Primary School	117,703	5.7%	(5,024)	126,267	(8,564)
Girlington Primary School	119,745	4.9%	(26,995)	245,126	(125,380)
Glenaire Primary School	58,235	5.1%	(11,411)	80,815	(22,581)
Green Lane Primary School	44,468	1.2%	(163,339)	66,167	(21,699)
Greengates Primary School	19,765	1.8%	(48,784)	18,487	1,278
Grove House Primary School	384,324	19.1%	263,947	445,948	(61,624)
Haworth Primary School	64,349	5.2%	(11,047)	84,229	(19,880)
Heaton Primary School	326,196	8.9%	113,023	211,382	114,814
Heaton St Barnabas' CE Primary School	86,157	4.6%	(26,699)	87,674	(1,517)
High Craggs Primary School	184,693	8.0%	49,109	233,256	(48,563)
Hill Top CE Primary School	74,255	7.0%	10,600	63,368	10,887
Hollingwood Primary School	31,282	1.6%	(89,203)	89,796	(58,514)
Holybrook Primary School	109,281	7.6%	23,620	76,460	32,821
Holycroft Primary School	117,942	5.6%	(8,475)	116,607	1,335
Home Farm Primary School	98,943	4.9%	(23,939)	123,028	(24,085)
Horton Grange Primary School	228,773	6.8%	31,056	398,766	(169,993)
Horton Park Primary School	120,510	5.0%	(23,561)	111,177	9,334
Hothfield Junior School	65,682	5.6%	(5,203)	68,802	(3,119)
Hoyle Court Primary School	32,550	2.8%	(36,038)	33,842	(1,291)
Idle CE Primary School	40,885	4.0%	(19,115)	19,970	20,915
Ingrow Primary School	284,971	15.7%	177,237	173,156	111,815
Keelham Primary School	58,940	10.2%	(1,060)	46,272	12,667

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Keighley St Andrew's CE Primary School	107,709	5.2%	(17,322)	112,978	(5,269)
Killinghall Primary School	137,140	4.5%	(44,668)	159,851	(22,710)
Knowleswood Primary School	146,325	5.8%	(5,924)	144,448	1,876
Lapage Primary School and Nursery	21,542	0.6%	(183,805)	(290,088)	311,630
Laycock Primary School	86,001	12.9%	26,001	125,404	(39,403)
Lees Primary School	36,379	4.1%	(23,621)	56,978	(20,599)
Ley Top Primary School	82,801	4.5%	(27,344)	82,049	751
Lidget Green Primary School	147,525	5.3%	(17,994)	89,762	57,763
Lilycroft Primary School	109,264	5.0%	(21,555)	101,024	8,240
Lister Primary School	75,745	3.6%	(51,314)	113,235	(37,490)
Long Lee Primary School	125,929	7.3%	22,366	125,848	81
Low Ash Primary School	108,881	5.7%	(5,757)	43,206	65,674
Low Moor CE Primary School	97,083	5.6%	(7,707)	90,663	6,420
Lower Fields Primary School	110,875	4.9%	(25,660)	91,718	19,157
Margaret McMillan Primary School	234,918	8.3%	64,201	203,031	31,887
Marshfield Primary School	139,722	6.9%	17,269	207,718	(67,996)
Menston Primary School	49,301	3.4%	(37,688)	64,131	(14,830)
Miriam Lord Community Primary School	37,043	1.9%	(80,789)	60,535	(23,492)
Myrtle Park Primary School	46,997	4.7%	(14,511)	32,904	14,094
Nessfield Primary School	28,918	1.5%	(86,651)	93,949	(65,031)
Newby Primary School	144,878	6.6%	11,900	80,849	64,029
Newhall Park Primary School	103,562	5.2%	(17,952)	104,438	(876)
Oakworth Primary School	152,215	9.0%	51,036	107,491	44,724
Oldfield Primary School	68,606	16.2%	8,606	55,592	13,014
Our Lady & St Brendan's Catholic Primary School	60,654	6.0%	(185)	39,347	21,307
Oxenhope CE Primary School	21,080	2.4%	(38,920)	37,239	(16,158)
Parkland Primary School	62,255	4.5%	(20,665)	69,151	(6,896)
Parkwood Primary School	52,132	3.9%	(28,962)	79,810	(27,678)
Peel Park Primary School	164,826	5.4%	(18,303)	284,711	(119,885)
Poplars Farm Primary School	48,345	4.5%	(15,088)	56,861	(8,516)
Priestthorpe Primary School	57,803	6.0%	(2,197)	55,107	2,696
Princeville Primary School and Children's Centre	92,454	3.1%	(80,471)	37,318	55,136
Reevy Hill Primary School	79,196	6.3%	3,013	53,353	25,843
Riddlesden St Mary's CE Primary	49,167	2.7%	(61,175)	70,548	(21,381)
Russell Hall Primary School	47,756	4.4%	(15,337)	28,088	19,668
Saltaire Primary School	77,345	4.6%	(25,551)	83,324	(5,979)
Sandal Primary School and Nursery	124,654	7.5%	25,614	95,104	29,550
Sandy Lane Primary School	21,439	1.5%	(62,723)	45,641	(24,201)
Shipley CE Primary School	82,664	7.5%	16,104	64,149	18,514
St Anthony's Catholic Primary School (Clayton)	73,699	6.9%	9,945	56,245	17,454
St Anthony's Catholic Primary School (Shipley)	16,444	2.4%	(43,556)	22,443	(5,999)
St Clare's Catholic Primary School	56,416	6.4%	(3,584)	53,293	3,123
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	85,792	4.2%	(36,248)	107,579	(21,787)
St Cuthbert & the First Martyrs' Catholic Primary	49,056	4.8%	(12,394)	68,361	(19,305)
St Francis' Catholic Primary School *	159,934	16.1%	99,934	97,114	62,821
St James' Church Primary School	10,089	0.5%	(107,905)	43,009	(32,920)
St John The Evangelist Catholic Primary School	52,170	5.7%	(7,830)	50,629	1,541
St John's CE Primary School	135,745	6.3%	7,244	112,582	23,163
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School (Bingley)	58,210	6.6%	(1,790)	72,694	(14,484)
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School (Bradford)	93,525	5.0%	(20,078)	85,108	8,417
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School (Keighley)	67,701	4.3%	(26,487)	77,161	(9,460)
St Luke's CE Primary School	60,226	5.8%	(1,088)	53,271	6,955
St Matthew's Catholic Primary School	67,200	5.4%	(8,696)	57,860	9,340
St Matthew's CE Primary School	86,010	4.0%	(47,543)	109,896	(23,886)
St Paul's CE Primary School	50,542	5.3%	(9,458)	37,297	13,245
St Peter's & St Mary's Catholic Primary School	33,782	2.8%	(40,535)	69,753	(35,970)
St Stephen's CE Primary School	130,700	5.9%	4,906	97,980	32,720
St Walburga's Catholic Primary School	46,348	4.9%	(13,652)	19,346	27,002
St William's Catholic Primary School	40,535	3.8%	(25,111)	135,338	(94,803)
St Winefride's Catholic Primary School	74,153	4.1%	(36,526)	76,314	(2,161)
Stanbury Village School	6,664	1.2%	(53,336)	12,949	(6,285)
Steeton Primary School	48,885	4.0%	(24,779)	39,761	9,125
Stocks Lane Primary School	(45,465)	-7.6%	(105,465)	(12,180)	(33,285)
Swain House Primary School	80,251	3.1%	(69,112)	100,448	(20,197)
Thackley Primary School	115,458	6.7%	15,005	52,250	63,208
Thornbury Primary School	162,918	5.0%	(31,602)	283,921	(121,002)
Thornton Primary School	154,040	5.9%	(1,111)	140,757	13,283
Thorpe Primary School	16,291	1.6%	(44,079)	22,284	(5,992)
Trinity All Saints CE Primary School	145,470	9.0%	48,389	136,847	8,623
Victoria Primary School	71,673	5.6%	(5,807)	94,382	(22,709)
Wellington Primary School	79,158	3.9%	(42,078)	158,840	(79,682)
Westbourne Primary School	111,059	5.1%	(20,243)	132,357	(21,299)
Westminster CE Primary School	156,202	5.2%	(23,092)	168,197	(11,996)

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Wibsey Primary School	185,090	6.2%	8,760	121,646	63,444
Wilsden Primary School	65,568	4.2%	(29,372)	68,811	(3,243)
Woodlands CE Primary School	51,532	9.5%	(8,468)	57,809	(6,278)
Worth Valley Primary School	62,203	5.1%	(5,400)	71,843	(9,640)
Worthinghead Primary School	62,747	6.4%	2,747	56,857	5,890
Wycliffe CE Primary School	38,759	3.2%	(32,900)	56,847	(18,089)
TOTAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS	13,192,865	5.6%		13,280,694	(87,828)

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Bingley Grammar School *	369,834	4.1%	12,703	356,434	13,400
Buttershaw Business & Enterprise College	409,495	4.3%	35,139	299,462	110,033
Carlton Bolling College	206,041	2.2%	(164,204)	160,082	45,959
Hanson School	(799,985)	-7.3%	(1,231,292)	(97,805)	(702,180)
Laisterdyke Business and Enterprise College	75,117	1.1%	(186,974)	124,093	(48,977)
Oakbank School	339,281	3.8%	(10,745)	2,407	336,874
Parkside School	150,834	2.8%	(63,042)	67,599	83,235
Queensbury School	259,489	4.6%	36,137	247,623	11,866
St Bede's and St Joseph's Catholic College	(38,493)	-0.3%	(479,629)	303,229	(341,722)
The Holy Family Catholic School	(111,230)	-2.2%	(309,730)	14,581	(125,811)
Thornton Grammar School	795,641	9.4%	462,081	530,191	265,451
Titus Salt School *	669,069	7.4%	308,773	751,742	(82,673)
Tong School *	981,419	9.3%	564,691	1,094,668	(113,249)
TOTAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS	3,306,510	3.0%		3,854,305	(547,795)

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Beechcliffe Special School	224,011	10.4%	58,630	215,211	8,800
Chellow Heights Special School	115,278	3.0%	(156,127)	261,371	(146,093)
Delius Special School	176,663	8.0%	(483)	127,938	48,725
High Park Special School	206,563	7.5%	3,274	160,048	46,515
Phoenix Special School	134,093	8.5%	2,646	121,915	12,178
Oastler School	(164,054)	-8.2%	(331,293)	(113,053)	(51,001)
TOTAL SPECIAL SCHOOLS	692,554	4.8%		773,431	(80,877)

School	Total Revenue Balance March 2016	Total Balance as a % of Funding	Value Above or Below IUB Threshold	Total Revenue Balance March 2015	Cash Growth / Reduction in Balance
Central PRU	82,650	8.3%	(7,612)	76,535	6,115
District PRU	695,930	23.0%	454,393	1,304,259	(608,330)
Education in Hospital Airedale	57,680	38.1%	(2,320)	71,000	(13,320)
Education in Hospital BRI	45,538	17.0%	(14,462)	178,668	(133,130)
Ellar Carr	55,118	4.6%	(38,441)	65,462	(10,344)
Primary PRU	61,391	5.9%	(38,179)	73,776	(12,385)
Tracks	43,257	14.8%	(16,743)	71,498	(28,241)
TOTAL PRUS	1,041,564	14.9%		1,841,198	(799,634)

TOTAL ALL MAINTAINED SCHOOLS

18,867,767 5.1%

20,615,502 (1,747,735)

Summary of 31 March 2016 Balances

	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	PRUs
No. of schools in deficit at March 2016 (Total Balances)	1	1	3	1	0
Total value of deficits at March 2016 (Total Balances)	(3,101)	(45,465)	(949,709)	(164,054)	0
No. of schools surplus > Thresholds at March 2016 (Total Balances)	4	37	6	3	1
Total value of surpluses > Thresholds at March 2016 (Total Balances)	341,142	1,849,204	1,419,523	64,549	454,393

* please note that these schools are identified as holding monies on behalf of school collaborative activities - their balances are larger as a result of this

This page is intentionally left blank