

## Warrington Schools Forum

### Agenda

Tuesday 19 January 2016

5.15pm - 7pm

Conference Room 1 Floor New Town House

Car parking will be available from 5pm onwards.

	Item	Enc / Verbal	Decision; Discussion; Information	Entitled to vote	Lead
1	Apologies and Welcome				MB
2	Minutes From the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising	Enc			MB
3	Membership Nomination/Election of Members  WINN nomination – Ginny Taylor ( <i>Wind in the Willows Nursery</i> )	Enc			MB
4	Audit Update – Schools Annual Report	Enc	Info		SB
5	Living Wage	Verbal			SW
6	a) Update on Traded Services (New proposals for Attendance Service)  b) Update on Warrington Inclusion Hub and position on SEN places	Verbal			HS/TJ
7	Fair Schools Funding Campaign Update	Enc	Info		GB
8	Budget updates 2016/17		Info/Decision		GB
9	Formula Working Group Update	Verbal			GB
10	AOB				MB
11	<b>Meeting schedule</b> 22 March 2016, 5.15pm 7 June 2016, 5.15pm 27 September 2016, 5.15pm 6 December 2016, 5.15pm				MB



**Warrington Schools Forum**

**Membership**

Membership with differentiated voting rights ~ Total Membership of 24, of whom 21 are entitled to vote on funding formula issues															
Sector Representation (21)	Appointed by the Council following election by:	Member	Dates and Attendance										Tenure Ends		
			08.10.13	03.12.13	11.02.14	20.05.14	08.07.14	07.10.14	03.02.15	12.05.15	06.10.15				
Maintained Nursery School Senior Staff (1)	Primary Headteachers Group	Jane Wilkie (JW)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	Jan 2016		
Special School Staff (1)	Special School Headteachers Group	Mike Frost (MF)	X	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016		
Special School Governor (1)	Governors Forum	Mike Evans (ME)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	Jan 2016		
PRU (1)	PRU Management Board	Karen Thomson (KT)	P	A	X	A	P	P	S	S	S	S	Jan 2016		
Academy (4)	Academy Schools	Andrew Moorcroft (AM)	-	P	A	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016		
		Moira Bryan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Jan 2016	
		Ben Dunne (BD)	-	X	A	P	P	A	P	P	P	A	P	Jan 2016	
		Andrew Bent (ABe)	-	P	A	P	A	P	X	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
Maintained Primary School Sector (9)	WAPH (5)	Andrew Redman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	Jan 2016		
		Chris Metcalfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Jan 2016	
		Gary Cunningham (GC)	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
		Nick Toyne (NT)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Jan 2016
		Lyndsey Glass (LG)	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
	Governors Forum (4)	Geoff Weston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
		David Hart (DH)	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	A	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
		Janet Lazarus									P	P			
		Peter Ashurst (PA)	P	P	P	P	P	A	X	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
Maintained Secondary School Sector (3)	WASCL (2)	Julie Warburton (JW)	P	A	X	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016		
		Tim Long (TL)	X	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016	
	Governors Forum (1)	Vacancy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				Jan 2016	

Private Voluntary and Independent Providers (1)	PVI Providers Forum	Maureen Banner (MB) (Chair)	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	Jan 2016
4 members entitled to vote on matters NOT relating to funding formula issues												
<b>Representing</b>	<b>Member</b>		08.10.13	03.12.13	11.02.14	20.05.14	08.07.14	07.10.14	03.02.15	12.05.15	06.10.15	<b>Tenure Ends</b>
<u>Non-Schools Members (4)</u>												
Anglican Diocese (1)	Jacqui Wightman (JW)		P	P	P	A	P	P	A	P	P	Jan 2016
Roman Catholic Diocese (1)	Tim Warren (TW)		P	P	X	P	A	P	X	P	P	Jan 2016
16-19 Institutions (1)	TBC		-	-	-	-	-	-	-			Jan 2016
Parent Governor (1)	TBC											Jan 2016
In attendance												
<b>Representing</b>	<b>Name</b>		08.10.13	03.12.13	11.02.14	20.05.14	08.07.14	07.10.14	03.02.15	12.05.15	06.10.15	
<u>Warrington Borough Council</u>												
Director of Families and Wellbeing	Sarah Callaghan (SC)		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	tbc											
	Louise Cooper (LC)									P	P	
Chief Finance Officer	James Campbell (JC)		P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	
	Garry Bradbury (GB)		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services	Cllr Jean Carter (CllrJC)		-	-	-	-	-	A	P	A	A	

**Key**

**P** ~ Present;

**A** ~ Apologies;

**X** ~ Absent with no apologies;

**S** ~ Substitute;

- ~ Vacancy

**Substitutes:**

Ruth Gee for Karen Thomson

Chris Metcalfe representing Keith Greenwood

**Observers:**

Shaun Everett, Union Observer NUT

**Presenting an Item:**

Angela Conway

Dave Roberts

**Minutes:**

Louise Cooper

## Warrington Schools Forum

---

### Minutes

**Tuesday 6 October 2015**

**5.15pm - 7pm**

**Conference Room 1 Floor New Town House**

**Car parking will be available from 5pm onwards.**

	Item
1	<p><b>Apologies and Welcome</b></p> <p>The chairperson welcomed members to the group.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Mike Evans, Cllr Jean Carter and Ben Dunne.</p>
2	<p><b>Minutes From the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</b></p> <p>Jacqui Wightman had agreed to be deputy chairperson. The chairperson thanked Jacqui for her support.</p>
3	<p><b>Membership</b></p> <p>Chris Metcalfe will replace Keith Greenwood from January 2016 representing WAPH.</p> <p>Moira Bryan will replace Anne Bright from January 2016 representing WASCL.</p> <p>Tim Long will represent academy schools.</p>
4	<p><b>Academy service buyback</b></p> <p>Dave Roberts presented the report and discussed income performance. Income from academies for SLAs and services not related to training for 2015/16 is currently £584,186 compared with £648,450 worth of services from the council in the previous year.</p> <p>Major negative deviations above £1000 were detailed in the report. Positive deviations were also detailed.</p> <p>Income from training has increased.</p> <p>Members discussed recommendation 6.2 which states that a further interim report will be</p>

	<p>produced for the next schools forum in relation to the sustainability of traded services that are not cost neutral, particularly in relation to the Attendance Service and Governor Support Services.</p> <p>SC noted that the focus should be on value for money rather than solely covering costs and this approach should be applied to all services. DR explained that these services in particular had been highlighted because they are not cost neutral. SC suggested that without a transparent and consistent process, we could not be certain of the true costs of all services. DR will be looking at services across the council.</p> <p>A discussion took place about the possibility of merging services that are well received to allow them to continue.</p> <p>Not all members felt that services should be merged as schools may only want to purchase specific services.</p> <p>The forum <b>noted</b> the content of the report.</p>
5	<p><b>EY 2-year old spend update – per June EYSFF</b></p> <p>Angela Conway presented the report and discussed the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve the continuation of additional staff resources funded via the surplus place funding</li> <li>• Approve the allocation of £6,561 from the surplus funding to support two year olds with complex SEN</li> <li>• Approve the carry forward and allocation of the place and trajectory under spend for a 3 year period.</li> </ul> <p>The early years sub group had discussed this in detail and supported the proposals.</p> <p>Schools forum <b>approved</b> the recommendations.</p>
6	<p><b>Balance Challenge – feedback from schools’ return</b></p> <p>It was agreed at the last meeting that the balance challenge would continue.</p> <p>All schools challenged provided appropriate information about how the surplus balance would be spent. A summary of responses received was provided for forum members.</p> <p>All schools apart from two currently challenged should fall out of the challenge process next year.</p> <p>SC asked if in the interest of transparency this process could be applied to academies.</p> <p>AB advised that this information would be in the annual report and available from Companies House.</p> <p>SC asked when considering sustainability and a collaborative approach could there not be a sustainable commissioning pot that would be fed by both sectors. AM said that the concern would be the amount of scrutiny that academies are already under. AB felt that this was worth</p>

	<p>exploring through a separate group.</p> <p>PA highlighted that 16 schools have used their budget to sustain next year’s budget. GB noted that there were increasing financial pressures for schools.</p> <p>JW noted that budgets reduce each year and some schools may need to carry this forward in order to stand still.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>Schools Forum is requested to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. note the contents of this report; and</li> <li>II. consider whether any actions should be taken regarding the balance challenge, including clawback if deemed appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b> that no action would be taken regarding balance challenge or clawback.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> options to be explored for sustainability of a system led model for school improvement picked up in the Warrington Education Board.</p>
<p><b>7a</b></p> <p><b>7b</b></p>	<p><b>F40 update – funding proposal’s effect for Warrington</b></p> <p><b>DSG 2016/17: update on School Block units of funding</b></p> <p>GB noted that the purpose of the report was to Update Schools Forum members with the latest information affecting Warrington’s Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for the next financial year, 2016/17.</p> <p>The level of funding is phase-neutral and most authorities find that this is a greater amount than the average per pupil funding through their formulae for primary schools, but much less than the average per pupil funding for secondary stage students.</p> <p>Future Tech Studio and Kings Academy have been included in the funding for 2016/17.</p> <p>JW asked if there would be enough money to fund the current bulge in primary pupils once they move to secondary. GB noted that this was a concern and overall funding needs to be addressed before this happens.</p> <p>Section 3 provided an update on the fair funding proposals from f40. The f40 group has been encouraged by the DfE to develop suggestions as to how the funding of Local Authorities and their schools can be made fairer.</p> <p>GB will keep schools forum updated on any findings.</p> <p>The forum agreed to enlist the support of MPs and Cllr Jean Carter to present a Warrington Response to the fairer funding proposals.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> MB to write to Cllr Jean Carter and the Warrington MPs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>

Schools Forum is asked to note the content of this report. **Noted.**

## 8 Financial Regulations

GB briefed the forum members on the report. The DfE has launched a consultation process regarding changes in regulations for financial year 2016/17. The deadline for submission of comments is 13<sup>th</sup> November 2015, and the DfE suggests that LA finance officers and Schools Forum members should consider contributing.

### Schools Forum is requested to:

- a) consider the proposals and what response may be necessary; and
- b) resolve what form the response should take

**Agreed:** that Families & Wellbeing Accountancy will submit a response.

## 9 FWG Recommendations & October EFA submission – decisions in principle :

- a) SEN topslice
- b) EAL: Formula topslice

### SEN

The formula working group examined a fairer way to fund low cost high incident SEN. The group considered options to address the ‘underfunded’ schools across the two sectors. It was recognised that manipulating proxy indicators through the main formula would never in itself target funding to those particular schools with problems in support funding. The group discussed creating a contingency reserve from which the LA could issue funding for those with statement numbers inconsistent with their mainstream funding.

### Recommendation for the secondary sector:

- a) Forum agrees to create a SEN sufficiency reserve of £159, 000 by topslicing the funding formula by £7,000 lump sum and £5.897 AWPU. **AGREED**
- b) Forum agrees a policy to be implemented for 1) underspent contingency and 2) overspend on contingency. **AGREED**

### Recommendation for the primary sector:

- a) Amend the low cost incidence proxy, as below:

	Lump Sum	AWPU
Now	£24,394	£19.41
Recommended	£11,135	£44.54

This will have the following effect:

Reduce the total formula funding taking around £500k out of the formula. This will increase the shortfalls from £241k to £381k, but reduce the overfunding by a similar amount. The funding removed can then be used as a targeted SEN sufficiency contingency of £318k, with the remainder being returned to schools through the basic per pupil element of the formula.

Recommendation for the primary sector (a) was **agreed** by the forum members.

b) Forum to agree on policy to be implemented 1) underspent contingency and 2) overspend on contingency.

These proposals address the issue where some primary settings are receiving in their base budgets low cost SEN funding highly disproportionate to their actual statement incident.

The contingency would be used to make up the funding gap for those schools who have high statements no schools would receive inadequate funding.

This was discussed in detail at the formula working group meeting.

This was presented and approved by WAPH. JW raised concerns about how schools would prove that they had spent the initial £6000. It was noted that the ISOS report outlines ways that schools can do this.

It was **agreed** that if the contingency was not sufficient, the amount taken out of the formula would be reduced. If there was surplus money this would be retained and used appropriately.

#### **EAL**

English as an Additional Language is one of the elements which is permitted to be used within the primary and secondary sectors' school formulae. However, if specific funding is calculated, it must be based on numbers of EAL1, EAL2 or EAL3 students (i.e. students recorded as EAL in the last one, two, or three years) – no further refinement is possible. Although EAL numbers overall in Warrington are not high (EAL3 is about 3% of total), there are several schools where the numbers of such pupils represent a significant proportion of number on roll.

As the Working Group did not wish to exaggerate EAL as an issue, it was decided that a funding level in line with an average of our statistical neighbours, and using EAL3 data as a trigger would be appropriate.

On current data, this means the following:

	Total EAL funding £	EAL value per student £
Primary Sector	£284,750	£370.45
Secondary Sector	£99,941	£992.75



	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Schools Forum agrees to the introduction of a EAL formula in primary and secondary mainstream formulae for 2016/17, allocating £370.45 for EAL3 numbers in primary settings, and £992.75 for EAL3 numbers in secondary settings. <b>AGREED</b></p> <p><b>b)</b> Forum agrees to accommodate this by a lump sum reduction of £2,064 in the primary sector and £3,844 in the secondary, and an AWPU topslice of £8.25 in the primary sector &amp; £4.31 in the secondary (splitting the effect equally between the two factors). <b>AGREED</b></p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Development Fund update</b></p> <p>Sarah Callaghan reported that the Warrington Education Board was established to support all Warrington Schools and education providers to be good and outstanding. The principles underpinning the approach were outlined to forum members.</p> <p>A full analysis of the impact will be presented to schools forum.</p> <p>SC proposed that a small core group was set up to make the WEB fit for purpose and that the process was revised so that ‘success in the system’ can be guaranteed so where six schools collaborate, there are always more good/outstanding practice within the mix.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b>  Task group meets before scheduled WEB meeting on December 2<sup>nd</sup>  No bigger than 5 people  Develops proposal re above process to Schools Forum and WEB at the beginning of November for endorsement/review.  Endorsed at WEB December meeting  Endorsed at January Schools Forum meeting</p> <p>The following membership of the task group was <b>agreed</b>:</p> <p>Chris Metcalfe  Tim Long  Andy Bent  Jane Wilkie  Mike Frost</p> <p><b>Action:</b> SC to produce terms of reference for the task group.</p> <p>GC highlighted that this way of working happens alongside the WEB, challenged by governing bodies and there is an ethos in Warrington of small groups working together.</p> <p>SC noted that through this group there will be the opportunity to commission differently, enable a more joined up approach and embed good practice.</p>

<b>11</b>	<b>Isos SEN research paper summary</b>  Garry Bradbury presented the paper to the forum.  In the Summer of 2014, the Department for Education (DfE) commissioned Isos Partnership to undertake research into SEN funding arrangements and practices, to analyse how well the current SEN funding system was working, and suggest ways in which it could be improved in future.  <b>Recommendations:</b>  Schools Forum is asked to consider the issues raised by the research report, and consider how it might respond if DfE was to consult on implementation of the national recommendations. Forum is also requested to consider the impact on future debate within Warrington Inclusion Hub. <b>NOTED</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>  There was no other business to discuss.
<b>13</b>	<b>Meeting schedule</b>  <b>Next meeting:</b> 19 January 2016 at 5.15pm 22 March 2016 at 5.15pm

# REPORT

**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 4

**Date:** 19th January 2016

**For:** Information

**Title:** Schools Annual Report

**Author:** Simon Bleckly

**Presenter:** Simon Bleckly

---

---

## Internal Audit Service

---

### FAMILIES AND WELLBEING DIRECTORATE

### REVIEW OF SCHOOLS AUDITS 2014-15

JANUARY 2016

Internal Audit  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor Quattro  
New Town House  
Buttermarket Street  
Warrington  
WA1 2NH  
<http://w2kwebint/audit>

**WARRINGTON**  
Borough Council



---

# CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Main findings – audits</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. The Schools Financial Value Standard</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. The Audit testing programme, 2015-16 and planning for 2016-17</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Reducing the risk of fraud in schools</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. Conclusion and audit opinion on schools’ systems of internal control</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appendix One: Assurance opinions and risk definitions for schools reports</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendix Two: Draft Internal Audit Schools Programme, 2016-17</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix Three: Schools Information Governance Checklist</b>	<b>9</b>

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the main findings from the school audits carried out by Internal Audit in 2014-15 and provides an overall opinion on the governance and control frameworks in place in schools, supporting the completion of the Council's Annual Governance Statement for 2014-15.

## 2. MAIN FINDINGS - AUDITS

Six schools were audited in 2014-15, all with a "Substantial" assurance rating. This is a lower number than in previous years, mainly owing to differences in the timing of school audits in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 financial years. The table below provides a comparison of the assurance ratings with previous years. Appendix One contains the definitions for the audit assurance opinions and recommendation risk ratings.

### Summary of Audit Opinions, 2012-13 to 2014-15

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Total
High	2	3	0	5
Substantial	7	8	6	21
Limited	0	1	0	1
Minimal	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>27</b>

The table below summarises the number of recommendations made in 2014-15, by priority, in each area of the schools testing programme. It was pleasing to note that there were very few High priority recommendations made during the year.

### Recommendations made in school audits in 2014-15

	Critical	High	Medium	Low
Leadership & governance	0	0	7	7
Financial management and control	0	0	8	5
Orders and payments	0	2	6	0
Bank imprest and petty cash	0	0	2	0
People management	0	1	6	0
Income and banking	0	0	11	0
Asset and security management	0	0	4	15
Unofficial funds	0	0	2	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>32</b>

The following are the most common issues identified during the audits. It should be noted that these are the same issues that we tend to find year after year within the schools we visit, even though most are matters that could be addressed without too much difficulty.

- Governors' financial skills not formally assessed / assessment out of date
- Manual of Internal Procedures out of date / incomplete (e.g. doesn't set out procedures / limits for quotations and tenders, write-off of debts, disposal of assets)
- School Improvement Plan does not contain sufficient detail on cost / resource requirement for planned actions
- Lack of independent scrutiny of debit card transactions
- Expenditure incurred without official orders being raised
- Inappropriate purchases / lack of documentation to support petty cash expenditure
- Lack of separation of duties / poor audit trail for orders / payroll / income and banking
- Asset register not subject to independent check
- Governing Body not provided with updates on significant movement in unofficial funds
- Lack of independent check on school fund transactions

---

We review the information that schools provide and publish in relation to their use of pupil premium; effective use of this funding is seen by OFSTED as a key factor in schools closing the attainment gap between pupils. From our reviews we found that all schools were publishing information about how they were using this funding, although there was some variance between the level of detail and the clarity of use of the funds in these statements and some published information required updating. We were able to verify that schools were using the funding for the stated purposes, although we do not review delivery of outcomes.

During 2014-15 we carried out an authority-wide programme of payroll testing, which focused on process relating to fixed term appointments and included a random sample of payroll transactions from schools. In most cases, the payments were correct and had been accurately processed, although two recommendations were made of relevance to schools, as follows:

- Authorising officers should ensure that they are aware of the processes in place in relation to Fixed Term Appointments, including the need to submit a leavers form at the end of each contract.
- Where a Fixed Term Contract is extended beyond the period initially authorised on the appointment form, authorising officers should submit the appropriate forms to employee services to demonstrate that the extension of contract has been appropriately authorised.

It should be noted that these issues were also identified last year and the recommendations included in our 2013-14 Annual Report.

In 2014-15 we also undertook an authority-wide review of ICT governance arrangements in schools. This covered schools' arrangements for managing information, including training, information security, records management and compliance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act. The review identified a number of areas of good practice in the schools visited as part of the review, namely:

- Schools have a good appreciation of a number of information governance risks and mitigation actions
- Records management practices from the creation of a record to disposal are good
- There are good mechanisms in place ensuring that both paper and electronic information is secure on site

During the audit, however, a number of recurring themes were identified in most schools, as follows:

- No encryption of mobile devices containing personal and sensitive data e.g. laptops, USB pen drives
- Insufficient staff training and awareness, particularly in relation to subject access requests, freedom of information requests and data breaches
- No consideration of the risks of allowing staff to use their own mobile devices on the school's network

We have attached an information governance checklist at Appendix Three for schools to use to check their own controls in this area.

### **3. THE SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD**

The Standard is a list of formal questions that school governing bodies are required to discuss with their head teacher and other senior staff in order to gain assurance that funds delegated to the school are safeguarded and spent effectively. Consideration of the questions can be

---

delegated to a Finance Committee or equivalent, but the completed assurance statement must be signed by the Chair of Governors and considered by the Governing Body.

The completed statements have to be sent to the Council's section 151 Officer who will use this information to inform the schools audit programme and other financial assessments. The section 151 officer will also have to submit a statement each year confirming the deployment of Dedicated Schools Grant.

All eligible Warrington schools submitted signed statements for 2014-15 and no major areas of concern were identified, although many schools included improvement actions in their statements. This enabled the section 151 officer to submit his DSG statement on 20 May 2015. We carry out a brief review of each school's latest SFVS as part of our audit visits, to ensure that the self-evaluation and any improvement actions identified are broadly in line with the results of our own testing. This was the case for the schools that we audited in 2014-15.

#### **4. THE AUDIT TESTING PROGRAMME, 2015-16 AND PLANNING FOR 2016-17**

In order to ensure that our audits remain as effective as possible, we regularly review the content of our testing programme. No significant changes to the programme were made in 2014-15 and none are planned for 2015-16.

We have started planning for 2015-16. Appendix Two sets out the schools we intend to audit next year: these have been selected in consultation with staff in Families and Wellbeing and in line with our rolling programme of planned visits. In addition, we will carry out a pre-conversion review of any school intending to become an Academy.

#### **5. REDUCING THE RISK OF FRAUD IN SCHOOLS**

In the current economic climate, schools and other public bodies can face an increased risk of fraud, both from internal and external sources. The Audit Commission's most recent report on fraud in the public sector states that in 2013/14 there were 206 cases of fraud reported involving maintained schools nationally, with a total value of £2.3 million. In 54% of cases school staff were involved in the fraud; this is a higher proportion than for other local government services.

Schools also continue to be a prime target for external fraudsters – in Warrington, schools have reported the following in the past 12 months:

- Letters or emails purporting to come from suppliers, requesting that their bank account details be changed.
- Phishing e-mails, often asking you to enter your bank account details or passwords in order to "unlock" an account with your bank or a supplier (e.g. Amazon, Apple).
- Emails stating they are from HMRC regarding tax refunds.
- Bogus calls or visits from people pretending to work for companies that schools deal with, e.g. photographers, cash collection firms, asking to pick up income held by the school.

We regularly brief schools on national alerts issued by the National Anti-Fraud Network and other agencies, containing details of frauds and attempted scams. In October 2015, we started to issue alerts of relevance to schools via My School Services website.

To help governors' oversight of the financial management of their school, we have created a Schools Anti-Fraud Toolkit, containing information on identifying fraud behaviours and other potential indicators, as well as recent national fraud cases in schools. The Toolkit also has a checklist that will assist with the completion of the SFVS. This was circulated to all schools in December 2013 via School News: we are currently looking to update and reissue this checklist.



---

We have included an item on the Governors' Agenda for Spring Term 2016 on managing the risk of fraud to schools. The article highlights the resources available to governors, including training, awareness-raising and e-learning. These services are available from the Internal Audit My School Services site.

Effective whistleblowing procedures are a key part of schools' measures to identify and counter fraud. We have participated in a pilot project with Public Concern at Work (PCaW), the national whistleblowing charity, to review our policy and reporting arrangements against best practice. As part of the project, we received a whistleblowing e-learning package which we are looking to make available to all council staff. The completed SFVS returns for 2014-15 indicate that there is currently a high level of awareness of whistleblowing and fraud reporting in schools and the relevant policies are effectively publicised (e.g. displayed in staffroom, staff required to acknowledge in writing that they have read them).

## **6. CONCLUSION AND AUDIT OPINION ON SCHOOLS' SYSTEMS OF INTERNAL CONTROL**

The Council's Annual Governance Statement has to include assurances that there are effective controls and governance arrangements in place in all schools.

For 2014-15, the assurance for the AGS has been largely provided from the programme of school reviews and other relevant work, as summarised in this report. This report is submitted as part of the evidence to support the AGS and therefore includes a conclusion and audit opinion below giving our assessment of the overall control framework in operation in schools. Assurance has also been obtained from the submission of SFVS statements from all schools.

Our audit and assessment work continues to provide assurance that schools in Warrington have effective systems of financial management. The reviews that we have carried out in the last five years, covering the majority of the Council's schools, have identified no significant risks or control issues that would require disclosure in the Council's Annual Governance Statement.

We are satisfied that there is an effective framework for reporting our findings and recommendations to governors and senior managers and for appropriate action to be taken to improve existing controls.

**We therefore conclude that there is **Substantial Assurance** that Warrington schools have effective systems of governance and internal control in place.**

The Forum is asked to note and comment on the contents of the report.

**Simon Bleckly**  
**Audit Manager,**  
**Audit Services**  
**January 2016**

---

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Assurance Opinions for Audits**

<b>Opinion</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<b>High Assurance</b>	Key controls are being applied consistently and effectively. This means that the key risks in the terms of reference are being properly managed and our review did not identify any weaknesses that would impact on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives.
<b>Substantial Assurance</b>	Key controls exist but there is some inconsistency in their application and some of the key risks in the terms of reference may need attention. The likely impact of these weaknesses on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives is not expected to be significant.
<b>Limited Assurance</b>	A number of key controls do not exist and/or are not applied consistently or effectively. This means that a number of the key risks in the terms of reference need attention. These weaknesses in the design and/or operation of key controls could impact upon achievement of key system, function or process objectives.
<b>Minimal Assurance</b>	A significant number of key controls do not exist and/or there are major omissions in the application of key controls. This means that a significant number of risks in the terms of reference are not being managed properly, which may put the achievement of the Council's objectives at risk.

**Recommendation Risk Definitions**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Critical</b>	A top priority owing to a control weakness that has or could have a significant impact on the achievement of key system, function, or process objectives, and also the Council's objectives.
<b>High</b>	An important issue owing to a control weakness that has or could have a significant impact on the achievement of key system, function, or process objectives.
<b>Medium</b>	A control weakness that has or could have an impact on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives. An issue, which, if addressed, would contribute towards raising the standard of internal control.

---

---

**Low**

A minor issue which does not impact upon the achievement of key system, function or process objectives. However implementation of the recommendation would improve overall control or help to reduce a minor level of non-compliance with an existing control process.

---

---

## **APPENDIX TWO**

### **Draft Internal Audit Schools Programme, 2016-17**

Evelyn Street Primary School

Grappenhall Heyes Primary School

Great Sankey Primary School

Locking Stumps Community Primary School

Penketh Community Primary School

St Elphin's CE Primary School

Warrington St Ann's CE Primary School

St Margaret's Catholic Primary School

St Philip (Westbrook) CE Aided Primary School

New Horizons School

Cardinal Newman Catholic High School

St Gregory's Catholic High School

## APPENDIX THREE

### Schools Information Governance Checklist

Data Protection	Control in Place Y/N
Does the school have a current Data Protection notification with the Information Commissioner?	
Does the school have a privacy policy which explains how individual's information will be handled?	
Have all parents and other relevant individuals (including staff) been notified of the school's privacy notice (Privacy Policy)?	
Does the school have a comprehensive suite of policies/procedures relating to information governance which is reviewed annually? This may include access and security of records, records management, use of email and Internet, communication and sharing information, security of mobile devices/removable media, use of social media, taking/use of photographic/video images, physical security (buildings/equipment), data protection, privacy policy freedom of information, information disclosures (including subject access requests), use of personal ICT equipment in school, information security incidents/data and subject access requests.	
Is a monitoring system in place to ensure the school's information governance policies are being adhered to?	
Are the Head Teacher and Governing Body aware of their responsibilities in relation to Information Governance?	
Have all relevant individuals agreed to comply with relevant policies, particularly the use of ICT equipment and facilities including email and the Internet?	
Has a designated person and deputy been appointed to co-ordinate information management and deal with requests for information?	
Is a system in place to ensure all Freedom of Information/Subject Access Requests are received, logged and responded to within appropriate deadlines	
Have all relevant staff received training/instruction on collection and use of personal data and reporting to the designated member of staff/their deputy when requests for information are received?	
Is personal data kept up to date where necessary and pupil/staff contact details checked on an annual basis?	
Does the collection of biometric data adhere to DFE guidance?	
Are there contracts/service level agreements in place to govern the work of third party providers of ICT services (including CCTV) and do they provide assurance of compliance with the Data Protection Act? Are these contracts monitored for compliance by the school?	
Are information sharing protocols in place where necessary with other data controllers (e.g. data sharing agreements)?	
Is there a mechanism in place for reporting, investigating and responding to information security incidents/breaches?	
Does the school's website make visitors aware of its use of cookies and offer an opt-out, where necessary?	
Does the school's use of CCTV comply with the Information Commissioner's Code of Practice?	

<b>Freedom of Information</b>	<b>Control In Place Y/N</b>
Are the Head Teacher and Board of Governors aware of and are they fully able to meet their specific responsibilities under the Fol Act?	
Does the school have an up to date Publication Scheme, in line with the Information Commissioner's model?	
Is a system in place to ensure all requests for information received are logged and responded to within the appropriate deadlines?	

<b>Information Security</b>	<b>Control In Place Y/N</b>
Have protocols on the creation, storage and security of information been issued to all relevant staff, governors and other authorised users?	
Are personal or sensitive records held securely when not in use?	
Are the admin and curriculum servers/pcs backed up in accordance with the backup schedule, daily?	
Is data removed from old computers/laptops and servers prior to being disposed of?	
Are recordings on digital cameras and other peripheral devices uploaded or deleted from the device after use?	
Has each user a different ID and password (no generic accounts)?	
Are procedures in place to ensure passwords are kept confidential?	
Are passwords for computer access changed at regular intervals?	
Is all access to the school management system (SIMS) reviewed at least annually?	
Is all sensitive or personal information carried offsite on laptops and removable media encrypted?	
Does the school provide staff with advice on how to keep information and devices secure when offsite?	
Are protocols in place to ensure that personal/confidential information is kept secure where it is shared or communicated with a third party?	
Inappropriate mechanisms e.g. unencrypted email/file sharing (only applies outside the Authority's network), social media/blogs should not be used to send/receive confidential/personal information.	
Does the school clearly inform individuals including staff that personal devices cannot be connected to the school network or any school equipment?	

<b>Records Management (Paper and Electronic Records)</b>	<b>Control In Place Y/N</b>
Does the School have a policy for managing both its physical and electronic records?	
Are records being managed in accordance with the school's policies?	
Is there a records retention and disposal schedule in place and are records (both paper and electronic) destroyed routinely in accordance with it?	
Are records (both paper and electronic) containing personal/sensitive information disposed of securely?	

# REPORT

WARRINGTON  
Borough Council



<b>Report to:</b>	Schools Forum	<b>Item:</b>	6
<b>Date:</b>	19th January 2016	<b>For:</b>	Information / Decision
<b>Title:</b>	Sustainability of Traded Services provided to schools		
<b>Author:</b>	Dave Roberts	<b>Presenter:</b>	Dave Roberts

## 1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide Schools Forum with an update on the sustainability of council services traded with schools and provide details of a more strategic approach in line with wider council strategies.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The way in which the council provides services for schools has evolved significantly since 2010. The increasing delegation of school budgets has allowed greater choice for schools to purchase from an evolving marketplace. The relationship between Council service teams and schools has, in most cases, moved toward a more competitive client focused arrangement with that freedom of choice.
- 2.2 Schools have generally continued to purchase council services through SLAs at broadly the same rate between 2012 and the present financial year. A small number of services have experienced a significant decline in income for various reasons including quality of provision, customer relationship management and specification issues. The largest decline has been seen in the Building Cleaning Service and has been a loss of income in excess of £1m per annum.
- 2.2.1 The council has recognised that there are services that need to be co-designed and/or co-produced with schools in order to ensure that the quality and specification more closely match school needs and are taking steps to make improvements.
- 2.2.2 A survey of all services provided to schools was opened in December 2015 via [www.myschoolservices.co.uk](http://www.myschoolservices.co.uk) and via email. This survey will help the Council prioritise the services most in need of review based on satisfaction levels amongst schools. As of 07/01/2016 only 10 schools

have completed the survey, and therefore does not currently provide a large enough data set to make decisions from. We urge all those involved in schools in Warrington to make sure that each school submits at least one completed survey before the end of January 2016.

### **3.0 BALANCING THE BUDGET**

3.1 In addition to more client focused services, the council needs ensure it delivers a balanced budget for the residents of Warrington. The reduction in central government grants means that the council must find an additional £22m of savings by the end of 2017/18. This means that providing a subsidy for discretionary or traded services with little or no statutory obligation will be unachievable and these services must begin to move toward a position of cost neutrality.

3.2 The council is currently in the process of developing a 'Commerical and Trading Strategy' that aligns with the key themes in the corporate plan and supports the improvement of financial outcomes to help meet the pledges outlined in the current corporate plan.

3.3 It was highlighted in the SLA revenue report to Schools Forum in October 2015 that a small number of these discretionary services provided to schools were being heavily subsidised. It was agreed that the LA would bring back proposals for the future of these services to the next schools forum. (Attendance Service and Governor Support Services)

3.4 In addition, the Council have agreed to implement the National Living Wage, as recommended by the Living Wage Foundation (as opposed to the governments National Living Wage.) The Living Wage at Warrington Borough Council will be set at £8.25 per hour and will affect all Council employees currently paid below that amount from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016. This has a significant impact on the cost of services delivered by the lowest paid members of staff such as Building Cleaning. As the Living Wage is likely to be increased in the coming years, other services such as Grounds Maintenance and School Meals are likely to be affected. This will mean an increase in the charges for Building Cleaning from April 2016 onwards.

3.4.1 Increased charges will be provided to schools for affected services by early February 2016 in order to help make timely decisions around individual budgets in 2016/17.

### **4.0 PRINCIPLES OF A MORE COMMERCIAL STRATEGY**

4.1 Although the new strategy is in development, it will contain three key themes plus an overall focus on supporting the client. These themes are:





4.1.1 Maximising Resources: Reducing the amount of effort expended in order to deliver the same or improved outcomes.

4.1.2 Accountability: Taking ownership of performance at every level of the organisation and encouraging, challenging and supporting others to be successful.

4.1.3 Developing the organisation: Actively seek new ideas and ways of working that are forward looking and support individual and collective improvement through step change and a cycle of continuous improvement. Taking the opportunity to build capacity, resilience and retain valuable skills through trading and charging.

4.2 A 'Commercial Warrington' would be one which:

“Continually improving the use of resources and taking personal and collective accountability for the quality of services provided to our customers and in improving our financial outcomes. Constantly assessing the landscape and building the skills to seek out, evaluate and maximise opportunities which improve the organisation.”

4.3 This strategy will underpin all areas of commercial activity that the council undertakes including trading with social enterprise spin outs, social care partners, the private sector as well as a review of charges and fees for statutory services to ensure all costs are being recovered.

## 5.0 MAXIMISING RESOURCES (EFFICIENCIES)

5.1 As well as developing more client focused service design, the council has a responsibility to ensure that all services are periodically reviewed for efficiency purposes, particularly when there is no material effect on the service received by the customer or when more can be delivered using the same resources.

5.2 As highlighted in the previous report, the relevant heads of service have carried out efficiency reviews of the Attendance and Governor Support Services and they are outlined in Sections 8 and 9. These are

a synopsis of more detailed reports presented to Families and Wellbeing DMT in late 2015.

## **6.0 CLIENT LED SERVICE DESIGN**

- 6.1 In line with the new strategy, the Council remains responsible for continually seeking to improve efficiencies through better management of resources, implementation of new technologies and working process that mean schools receive improved value for money.
- 6.2 In addition to improving efficiency and maximising resources, services need to be designed to meet the needs of clients within the abilities of the organisation. This process will strengthen the relationship between schools and council service teams as well as providing the opportunity to view things from each other's perspective and offer all parties a greater understanding of
- 6.3 The next stage in the process is to co-design services with schools, where appropriate, with a view on meeting the needs schools but with a fully funded financial envelope. This will involve consultation with a group of schools who have purchased the service for at least one of the previous five years, a review of the local marketplace, the ability of the Council to provide the required specification, the cost of provision and seek out the agreement of a price point that is mutually viable.
- 6.4 In addition to a traditional SLA, where each school opts in to a service based on need, quality of service, specification, price and value for money, and where the Council can prove that it has made significant efforts to improve the efficiency of the service, School's Forum can choose to de-delegate monies to protect essential or highly desirable services that are unlikely to be sustainable via the traditional method.

## **7.0 ATTENDANCE SERVICE REDESIGN**

- 7.1 The Attendance Service comprises two key elements:
- delivery of statutory functions that the Local Authority (LA) has for all schools; and
  - support services in managing pupil attendance at individual schools delivered on a traded basis through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) to the schools that choose to buy-in support.
- 7.2 Responsibility for the Attendance Service passed to the Head of Service (Access and Assets), Hilary Smith on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2015. Therefore, in order to become familiar with the service in relation to how effectively it is operating and school views on meeting need, the Head of Service decided to undertake a short engagement exercise with a sample of 13 schools representing all categories of schools (primary, secondary, special, community, voluntary aided and

academy) across all regions receiving services from all Attendance Officers.

7.2.1 The feedback from schools was that the service was of generally good quality and well received by the schools who purchased it.

7.3 In the case of the Attendance Service the level of income from buy-back in 2015-2016 is **£92,000** although the cost of the team is approximately **£205,000** (excluding any contribution for overhead or administration) even though the level of statutory activity is estimated to be about 20% of the team's workload. However the team also includes the legal duty for monitoring employment of children, which is not part of the traded offer with schools.

7.4 Taking all of this into account it would not be unreasonable to expect schools to contribute a higher proportion of the total cost for the service they are receiving currently. This means that in order to sustain an Attendance Service in the future it will be necessary to either increase income from schools; or reduce cost, and therefore potentially a reduction in what is on offer; or a combination of the two.

7.5 As a consequence of the recent opportunity for staff to submit expressions of interest for voluntary redundancy (VR) 4 Attendance Officers have submitted expressions of interest as follows:

- AO/ELO x 1FTE has requested VR with effect from 1 April 2016
- AO x 1 has requested VR with effect from 1 October 2016
- AO x 1.9 have requested VR with effect from 1 April 2017

7.6 It is the case that all members of the team currently work across the whole calendar year even though, in respect of support to schools, there is very little, if any, requirement for support during school holidays. Therefore one option, which would reduce cost, would be to propose term-time only working.

7.6.1 However, one member of the team has responsibility for Employment Licensing, which involves the statutory duty placed on the LA for monitoring activity of children and young people of statutory school age when they are engaged in employment, for example in modelling and entertainment industries. This activity can be undertaken at any time of the year including school holidays and therefore requires monitoring across the whole year.

7.7 Therefore, in relation to activity that should continue post any redesign and in the absence of any change to the existing statutory duties, the following apply:

- Statutory duties placed on the LA for Attendance (approximately equivalent to 1FTE AO/Attendance Manager);

- Targeted support at schools where there are significant issues (supported by income from schools);
- Statutory duty in relation to Employment Licensing (approximately equivalent to 0.5 FTE).

- 7.8 All other posts across the team are school support posts, assisting schools with day-to-day attendance issues and the costs of these should be supported entirely by income from the schools.
- 7.9 It is clear that the schools are unlikely to want to commit to additional payments and therefore it would be sensible to take advantage of the opportunity to reduce the size of the team by agreement to VR requests.
- 7.10 Therefore, additional future recruitment to the team will be determined solely by the income from schools unless there is a significant change in statutory duties.

## **8.0 GOVERNOR SUPPORT SERVICES**

- 8.1 The Governor Support Services is managed by Senior Adviser, Stephen Drury who is delegated responsibility for the service by the Head of Service (0-11), Lisa Morgan.
- 8.2 The Governor Support Service retains no statutory duties and is an entirely traded service, reliant on income from schools. It comprises of a team of clerks who support governing body meetings, respond to queries and enquiries from governors of Warrington schools. They also facilitate a number of governors' forums.
- 8.2.1 Governor Training is facilitated by the Schools CPD team at St. Werburgh's Development Centre, headed by Sonya Redford.
- 8.3 In the case of the Governor Support Service the level of income from buy-back in 2015-2016 is **£96,000** although the cost of the team is approximately **£156,000** (excluding any contribution for overhead or administration – although one significant cost which is entirely attributable to the running of the service is the cost of printing minutes for governing body meetings for distribution at approximately **£15,000** per annum)
- 8.4 There is currently no issue with the Voluntary Redundancy opportunity within this team and no other significant event to consider.
- 8.5 It is the case that all members of the team currently work across the whole calendar year even though, in respect of support to schools, there is very little, if any, requirement for support during school holidays. Therefore one option, which would reduce cost, would be to propose term-time only working.

8.5.1 The introduction of term time working, if agreed would have little or no material effect on the service provided to schools and governing bodies.

8.5.2 Term time working would reduce the cost of providing the service by approximately **£17,500** per annum. Further consultation could then take place with schools about future service design and ways in which the remaining subsidy could be reduced to reach cost neutrality.

## **9.0 STAFF CONSULTATION**

9.1 Any changes to staff terms and conditions must go through the proper consultation process and channels. Therefore references can only be currently made to proposed changes as there is a live period of consultation ongoing with staff in these services.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that Schools Forum;

10.1 note the proposed changes to the Attendance Service and Governor Support Service and that they approve of the Council continuing to seek out further efficiencies in traded services before adopting a new pricing model.

10.2 lobby their respective networks to make sure every school has a say in the current SLA survey that runs until the end of January 2016.

10.2.1 approve that, upon closing the survey, and with a large enough data set, that the council and schools create a task and finish group to review each service with a materially low score. This would currently be proposed for services with a score of less than 3.5 out of 6 in terms of satisfaction with quality and value for money.

10.3 consider the effects of the Living Wage and whether they will support and encourage schools to remain engaged with the affected Council services in the immediate future in order that the Council are able to invest in redesigning a highly efficient, customer focused service that offers good value for money for schools along with the ethical Living Wage pay structure for staff delivering the service.

10.3.1 communicate their position on this matter to governing bodies, headteachers and the Council Head of Traded Services Strategy.

# REPORT

**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 7

**Date:** 19th January 2016

**For:** Information

**Title:** Fair Schools Funding Campaign  
Update

**Author:** Garry Bradbury

**Presenter:** Garry Bradbury

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In Item 7 Funding Update at the last Schools Forum meeting, we updated Members with details of the f40 group's proposals around revisions to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Schools Block unit of funding, which would deliver a fairer funding settlement benefitting Warrington schools. Forum also discussed its involvement in the general campaign as it ramped up to encompass both the political lobby, and grassroots action as exemplified by local petitioning. The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress of the campaign since the last meeting of Schools Forum.

## 2. POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

- 2.1 111 Members of Parliament were signatories on a letter to the Prime Minister (delivered 21<sup>st</sup> October) restating the case for funding reform. The text of the letter is reproduced below:

*Dear Prime Minister,*

*We write as MPs supporting the f40 group to call for urgent action to deliver fairer schools funding.*

*It is widely acknowledged that the existing school funding model is a muddle and that funding for individual schools with similar pupil characteristics is arbitrary and unfair. As a result, schools around the country that are similar can get very different budgets and children with the same needs can receive very different levels of financial support depending on where they go to school.*

*The ten best funded areas will receive an average grant of £6,297 per pupil this year, compared to an average of just £4,208 per pupil in the ten most poorly funded areas.*

*F40, a group made up of poorly funded local authorities, of which all the signatories to this letter are supporters, has been making the case for a fairer funding system for nearly two decades and the arguments they make for greater equity are overwhelming.*

*Ministers have recognised the problem and promised to address it. We welcome this, together with your confirmation that the additional £390 million awarded in 2015/16 as a “down payment” towards fairer funding will be included in the funding baseline for future years.*

*We are now looking to the Government to deliver a truly fair funding settlement.*

*At a time of spending restraint it is more important than ever that funding is allocated based on need. F40 has come up with a formula which would see the funding cake shared much more fairly. This has received a positive response from funding experts at the Department for Education.*

*The f40 proposals would:*

- Introduce a new national formula, based on a clear rationale and geared towards improving educational standards across the country;*
- Include core entitlement at a pupil level, reflecting different needs and costs at various key stages;*
- Use factors to reflect pupil level needs beyond the core entitlement, including deprivation and special educational needs, and reflect the needs of small schools that are necessary in a local authority’s structure; and*
- Continue to use Dedicated Schools Grant, with blocks for mainstream schools, high needs and early years. Local authorities would be free to move funding between the blocks.*

*We believe this formula can help deliver a solution. We want the children in our schools to continue to have a broad range of subjects to study, good resources to use, well maintained buildings, reasonably sized classes and excellent pastoral support. Fairer funding is integral to all of this, and we urge you to deliver it.*

*We would be grateful for the opportunity to meet you to discuss this issue.*

*Sincerely, etc.*

This response represented 21% of all English MPs, broken down as follows:

Conservatives	96	(86%)
Labour	13	(12%)
Lib Dem	1	(1%)
Speaker (non-aligned)	1	(1%)

The letter was signed by Warrington South MP David Mowat, who has also corresponded with the Chair of Warrington Schools Forum on the issue of fair funding. In correspondence with the Chair, the town’s other MP Helen Jones expressed support for the campaign.

The Prime Minister replied officially on 5<sup>th</sup> November, confirming the intention to address funding issues.

### 3. **WARRINGTON PETITIONING**

- 3.1 The Schools Accountancy team, with the approval of Schools Forum, provided all schools with copies of the petition document created by the f40 group, with the intention being for schools in each of the town's two constituencies to collect signatures (parents, staff, governors) which would then be presented, in coordinated fashion, to Parliament at a specially convened session.
- 3.2 We received petitions from 43 Warrington schools (20 North, 23 South) which included 3,278 signatories (1,068 North, 2,210 South). During the presentation process (see overleaf), a higher figure was quoted for the South petition, so it is possible that some documents were submitted direct.
- 3.3 The official presentation of petitions took place in the House on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> December. This followed a backbench debate on the issue on 5<sup>th</sup> November at Westminster Hall. It was launched by Graham Stuart MP, Chair of f40, who restated the many arguments in favour of funding reform, and presented petitions on behalf of MPs who were unable to attend. He said:

I am grateful for the time we have been given to present petitions calling for fair school funding from more than 100 constituencies right across England and the House. The current funding system is arbitrary and unfair. It penalises urban and rural alike, affecting both Labour and Conservative constituencies. We welcome the announcement of the new national funding formula for schools that the Chancellor mentioned in the comprehensive spending review last week, and we will continue, across the House, to make the case for reform, as the Government consult on their proposals. I will read out the full text of the petition, but, as you have said, Madam Deputy Speaker, other Members need not do so.

In addition to presenting a petition on behalf of 2,287 people in Beverley and Holderness, I am also presenting petitions from the constituencies of Aylesbury, Bethnal Green and Bow, Buckingham, Central Devon, Chelsea and Fulham, East Devon, Forest of Dean, Grantham and Stamford, Haltemprice and Howden, Kingston upon Hull North, Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle, Ipswich, Lewisham, Deptford, Loughborough, Meon Valley, New Forest West, Newton Abbot, Oxford East, Penrith and The Border, South Holland and The Deepings, North Swindon, South Swindon, Tatton, Thornbury and Yate, Wantage, West Suffolk, Wimbledon and York Central. In addition, I am presenting a petition on behalf of the shadow Home Secretary, the right hon. Member for Leigh (Andy Burnham), who gave me his petition earlier. He was unable to be here, but would have liked to have been. I thank all those who have signed from across the country.

The petition states:

The petition of residents of Beverley and Holderness,



Declares that the petitioners believe the existing school funding model in England is arbitrary and unfair; further declares that the ten best funded areas of England have on average received grants of £6,300 per pupil this year, compared to an average of £4,200 per pupil in the ten most poorly funded areas of England; and further declares that the petitioners welcome the Government's commitment to introduce fairer school funding.

The petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons supports the earliest possible introduction of a new National Funding Formula for schools in England.

And the petitioners remain, etc.

The town's MPs presented their constituents' petitions in a similar manner:

**Helen Jones (Warrington North) (Lab):** I rise to present a petition on behalf of many hundreds of people in Warrington North in the same terms as the hon. Member for Beverley and Holderness.

**David Mowat (Warrington South) (Con):** I rise to present a petition on behalf of 2,916 constituents in Warrington South in the same terms as my hon. Friend the Member for Beverley and Holderness.

#### 4. AUTUMN SPENDING REVIEW

- 4.1 When the Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed the House on 25<sup>th</sup> November, it was to confirm that a review of school spending would indeed take place, with a view to implementation for 2017/18. There will be a consultation 'in the new Year'. To that extent, therefore, the campaign has been successful.
- 4.2 All the work on specifics of formula review undertaken thus far has been based on an assumption that the overall level of DSG remains at the per capita level pledged at the recent election i.e. no overall growth other than for pupil numbers. Consequently, gainers will be subsidised by reductions in higher-funded authorities elsewhere. There is a suggestion that some modest growth in the overall Schools Block could be accommodated by compensatory reductions in the overall High Needs Block aggregate, but DfE is making noises which suggest opposition to this suggestion.
- 4.3 Nevertheless, the promise of a consultation process has inevitably resulted in the beginnings of a contra-campaign to maintain the *status quo*, and the obvious fear is that these voices will successfully balk, or dilute, the eventual outcome of the review.

To illustrate:

London boroughs, which comprise the majority of the very highest funded Authorities, have found an advocate in the Labour Party's mayoral candidate Sadiq Khan, who has tweeted 'The Government must urgently rethink plans to

cut millions from school budgets in London' and that their schools are being 'hammered' amidst 'fears of £787m budget cuts'.

Liverpool councillors earned a front page of the *Echo* to criticise 'Osborne's £20m cuts to city schools'. (One might imagine Liverpool to be lowly-funded, but its School Block unit of funding is the 25<sup>th</sup> highest in the country, and £813 per pupil higher than Warrington's).

Bradford councillors have suggested that the proposals are a 'direct assault on the life chances' of its pupils. (Bradford's unit of funding is £609 higher than ours, ranking 31<sup>st</sup> in the country)

The National Union of Teachers has described the proposals as a 'Conservative campaign' which is 'seeking to redistribute money from inner cities to outer regions'.

It is virtually guaranteed that there will be many more instances over the coming weeks.

- 4.4 It will be imperative, therefore, for Warrington to submit comprehensive and widespread responses to the consultation when it is launched. We do not have a timetable as yet, but the Schools and Academies Funding Group is scheduled to meet on 22<sup>nd</sup> January, so more details may emerge then. It is already known that there will be also be proposals to recast Early Years funding on a national formula basis; High Needs may not be, but there will certainly be proposals for change. Schools Forum may wish to consider whether the current Formula Working Group arrangements should be the primary mechanism to construct our responses.

## **5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 Schools Forum is asked to note the contents of the report.
- 5.2 Schools Forum is asked to reaffirm its support for the principles underpinning the f40 group proposals, and the fair funding campaign more generally.
- 5.2 Schools Forum is asked to decide whether to continue the function of the Formula Working Group, and if agreed, what its role relating to the consultation, and formula development generally, should be.

# REPORT

**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 8

**Date:** 19th January 2016

**For:** Information /  
Decision

**Title:** Budget Update 2016/17

**Author:** Garry Bradbury

**Presenter:** Garry Bradbury

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is the funding stream which supports individual school budgets, plus funding for many non-school educational activities. This grant is accounted for on a financial year basis, and is received by Local Authorities in 25 instalments. Since the 2013/14 settlement, DSG has been determined in specific blocks, although Authorities are at liberty, with Schools Forum agreement, to transfer funding between blocks if the notional allocations are inappropriate for locally determined priorities. These blocks are:

- i) Schools Block – intended to support mainstream activities in primary and secondary schools (i.e. basic school delegated budgets)
- ii) Early Years Block – intended to support nursery provision in dedicated nursery schools, nurseries attached to mainstream schools, and private, voluntary or independent nursery providers within the Authority's boundaries.
- iii) High Needs Block – intended to support special school budgets, Pupil Referral Units, designated/specialist provision in mainstream schools, pupil placement in independent schools or non-mainstream special schools outside of the home Authority. It also funds all Special Educational Needs requirements for Warrington pupils. Any other whole-school activities should likewise be funded by this block, as there is no specific allocation for central education functions.
- iv) Additions/Amendments  
Adjustments for induction of Newly Qualified Teachers, Early Years Pupil Premium.

- 1.2 The Schools Block is determined by a flat rate (different for each Authority) for each mainstream student on roll at the October census prior to the funding year e.g. October 2015 for the 2016/17 settlement. Early Years funding is similar, except that the total pupil numbers from the previous January Early Years census are taken. Because moderated and validated figures from the newest census are not available in time, year-old data are used, with the actual allocation modified some months later (June, generally) to reflect the updated pupil count. Thus, the initial 2016/17 Early Years block notification is an indicative figure based upon pupil numbers from January 2015.
- 1.3 High Needs Block allocations are incremental, with a baseline, flexed for pupil number growth, taken from an aggregate of historic funding allocations from previous years (drawn from s.251 budgetary returns of Authorities).
- 1.4 This initial announcement includes the notional funding for Academy schools because their individual budget formula calculations are cast on the same basis as the maintained schools sector (although their financial years are not contiguous). The value of their budget allocations, plus a determined amount from High Needs, will subsequently be recouped from the funding coming into the Local Authority, and passed directly to the Academies in their GAG (General Annual Grant).

## **2. INDICATIVE DSG ALLOCATION FOR 2016/17**

- 2.1 Indicative Block allocations (and therefore an overall DSG settlement) for individual Local Authorities were revealed by the Education Funding Agency (EFA, the funding arm of the Department for Education) on 17th December 2015.
- 2.2 As mentioned, the Early Years Block allocation is not yet updated for the January census; consequently this allocation was pegged at 2015/16 levels. The Schools Block was revised to reflect updated pupil numbers and the baselined increase to per pupil allocations for low-funded Authorities agreed, initially, for 2015/16.
- 2.3 The table overleaf shows the individual block allocations, and for comparative purposes, the equivalent figures for 2015/16.

	£ value	16/17		15/16	
		CENSUS NOR	ALLOCATION £	CENSUS NOR	ALLOCATION £
Schools Block	£4,244.36	29,048	123,290,000	28,423	120,179,000
Schools Block addition for former NRAs*					1,959,000
Early Years Block (3/4 year olds)	£3,333.72	2,025	6,751,000	2,028	6,761,000
Early Years Block (2 yr olds)	£4,683.50	418	1,958,000	418	1,958,000
<b><u>High Needs Block</u></b>					
Baseline			<b>20,480,000</b>		<b>20,080,000</b>
Growth			352,000		<b>359,000</b>
Residency adjustment			21,000		<b>41,000</b>
HN places direct funding			-826,000		-826,000
Non Maintained Special Schools adjustment			-320,000		-297,000
			<u>19,707,000</u>		<u>19,357,000</u>
<b><u>Additions</u></b>					
NQT induction			42,000		43,000
Early Years Pupil Premium			140,000		140,000
			<u>182,000</u>		<u>183,000</u>
Total DSG (before Academy recoupments)			<b>151,888,000</b>		<b>150,397,000</b>

2.4 Pupil numbers have increased, mostly in the primary sector - 232 FTE for primaries. There is a bottom line increase of 393 in the secondary sector compared to last year, but NOR of 367 for King's Academy and Future Tech Studio was not included last year as these were treated separately, at actual cost, in the 2015/16 settlement. Their numbers are now included directly in Warrington's calculation, and consequently their budgets must now be contained within the overall funding envelope.

2.5 There has been a small amount of growth in High Needs funding, resulting from an additional £92.5m added to the national baseline figure. Pupil number increases and High Needs growth are therefore responsible for the uplifted DSG settlement.

### 3. SCHOOL BUDGETS 2016/17

3.1 A draft proposal for the mainstream school budget funding formula was required in October by the EFA, and this was discussed at that month's Schools Forum meeting, as well as the Formula Working group session preceding it.

3.2 Schools Forum agreed to the introduction of two refinements from the previous year's formulae:

- i) include an English as Additional Language (EAL) formula factor for both primary and secondary sectors, using the EAL 3 dataset
  - ii) create a 'SEN contingency' reserve for additional funding for schools to reflect incidences of statementing or EHCPs inadequately funded by the existing low-cost SEN proxies.
- 3.3 The funding model incorporating these changes was submitted to the EFA, and received approval on 13<sup>th</sup> November. It will therefore form the basis of the proposed final submission, due with EFA by 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016.
- 3.4 In finalising the 2016/2017 school budgets, small modifications have been made to reflect:
- a) the overall Schools Block settlement, and
  - b) the variation in data (Numbers on Roll, Free School Numbers, KS2 prior attainment levels) when using the updated October 2015 census information:
    - In the primary sector, overall Free School Meal numbers are down by about 8% from last year, and 2% down on the estimated numbers included in the draft submission (likely, partly the consequence of a reduction in registrations following the introduction of universal infant entitlement). This means that the level of funding delivered through the deprivation formula factor has reduced, both in absolute terms and proportionately. The level of deprivation funding is keenly debated in Warrington, with our funding levels slightly above national average, so rather than increase unit levels to drag funding back to the previous level, we have recirculated the 'freed-up' resource through the basic per pupil entitlement. Consequently deprivation funding falls from 9% of primary delegated budgets in 2015/16 to 8.2% for 2016/17.
    - In the secondary sector, Free School Meal numbers have fallen by around 5%. Deprivation funding reduces slightly from 6.40% of secondary delegated budgets to 6.0%.
  - c) Increased estimates for rates have been accommodated by reducing the per pupil unit value, with the effects restricted to the individual sectors. In the secondary sector, this adjustment eliminates the initial small increase due to recirculated deprivation funding.
- 3.5 With the exception of revisions in the following elements:
- a) High Cost Low Incidence SEN to reflect current status,
  - b) SEN contingency 'top up' reflecting current position
  - c) Early years funding for schools with nurseries, recalculated for 2016/17 (see section 5.2)

these recalculations will now represent the **actual** budgetary allocations to Warrington schools in 2016/17. The amendments described above will be made from the High Needs Block and Early Years Block, rather than the Schools Block, and so do not form part of the final submission required by the EFA by its deadline of 21st January. As a precursor to submission, these budgets will be discussed and approved by Directorate Management Team.

- 3.6 The individual school budgets are shown in **Appendix 1**. The models aggregate to £72,683,397 in the primary sector, and £57,111,925 in the secondary sector (both before recoupment and dedelegation).

Within these, the elements of funding from the Schools Block total £122,967,109:

£67,548,711 Primary Schools.  
£55,418,396 Secondary Schools

Also including the SEN contingency of £541,648, this is a commitment of £123,508,755.

Warrington's Schools Block is confirmed at £123,290,000, so this is ostensibly a shortfall of £218,755. However our submitted model is required to consider the in-year effect of new intakes at King's Academy (where in September the school will have 5 year groupings compared to the current 4), and Future Tech Studio. Warrington will receive an in-year addition to DSG to fund these additional pupils following confirmation of October census numbers. If LA estimates of pupil numbers are correct, the additional funding will cover this temporary shortfall (we have built in a 'zone of comfort' of around £96,000 in case numbers are materially higher). Disregarding this issue, we are passporting 100% of Schools Block funding to individual school budgets and the SEN contingency.

The model is summarised overleaf, with the agreed October draft version shown for comparison purposes.

	October Submission			January Submission		
	Funding unit	Nos.	£	Funding unit	Nos.	£
Prim AWPU	£2,769.12	<b>17,473.00</b>	£48,384,834	£2,788.03	<b>17,478.00</b>	£48,729,188
KS3 AWPU	£4,077.36	<b>6,898.08</b>	£28,125,955	£4,076.39	<b>6,976.17</b>	£28,437,576
KS4 AWPU	£4,140.95	<b>4,723.25</b>	£19,558,742	£4,139.98	<b>4,645.33</b>	£19,231,587
Prim FSM	£3,210.60	1,894.34	£6,081,953	£3,210.60	1,850.78	£5,942,105
Sec FSM	£3,023.58	1,206.80	£3,648,846	£3,023.58	1,140.19	£3,447,447
Prim EAL3	£370.45	788.19	£291,984	£370.45	868.84	£321,863
Sec EAL3	£992.75	100.25	£99,522	£992.75	114.57	£113,736
Sec Prior Attainment	£704.45	2,234.41	£1,574,030	£704.45	2,100.24	£1,479,514
Prim Lump Sum	£156,677.00	69.00	£10,810,713	£156,677.00	69.00	£10,810,713
Sec Lump Sum	£136,762.00	13.00	£1,777,906	£136,762.00	13.00	£1,777,906
Split Sites			£297,000			£297,000
Rates			£1,354,181			£1,421,786
MFG			£940,911			£956,686
SEN Contingency			£540,232			£541,648
			<u>£123,486,810</u>			<u>£123,508,754</u>
Assumed Schools Block	<b>29,094.33</b>	£4,244.36	£123,487,000	<b>29,099.50</b>	£4,244.36	£123,509,000
Initial Schools Block				29,048.00	£4,244.36	£123,290,000
Primary Budgets			£67,310,324			£67,548,711
Secondary Budgets			£55,636,253			£55,418,396
SEN Contingency			£540,232			£541,648
			<u>£123,486,809</u>			<u>£123,508,755</u>

*Note:* KS3/4 numbers not whole because of the averaging process following the in-year uplift to King's & Future Tech (see 3.6)

Other pupil data not integers because a proportion of the value is assumed to relate to Designated Provision pupils, who are not funded through the mainstream formula

#### 4. DEDELEGATION DECISIONS

- 4.1 Certain of the notional allocations for central services which must be now be delegated to schools in the first instance may, with Forum approval, be returned to the LA to continue service provision, via a process of 'dedelegation'. The range of services agreed for dedelegation must be reviewed annually by Forum members representing each of the maintained school phases. A majority decision for or against dedelegation is binding on each school in the respective phase. Phases may adopt a different decision for each of the potentially dedelegated items.



- 4.2 **Appendix 2** illustrates the current 'default' position of dedelegations, and shows the clawback effect on maintained school budgets for each setting. The SIMS licence dedelegation is shown for completeness, but schools have already committed to continued dedelegation for the lifetime of the new system contract with Capita. This item will not therefore be under review.
- 4.3 The individual dedelegated items are described briefly below.

#### Contingency budgets

Budgets that the LA holds centrally and distributes to schools on the basis of need. It should be noted that, following regulation changes, if any dedelegated contingency budgets are not spent by the end of the year the balance may be retained for the corresponding purpose in the new year. If the costs in any one year are greater than the budget that has been set aside (including any carry-forward) such an increase in costs will fall upon the schools themselves, as there will be no financial 'contingency' retained centrally as a hedge against such pressures.

- Pupil Number Increases: Following the annual October census on which budgets are calculated, pupils continue to come and go from schools during the year. This contingency allows those schools that admit exceptional numbers of additional pupils to receive additional funding (triggered by numbers increases of 2.5% and above, the additional pupils being funded at the basic per-pupil rate)
- Additional classes: Due to changes in pupil populations there are times at which a school needs to employ additional teachers, or at minimum, deploy additional learning resources. Schools Forum has established a methodology under which schools are reimbursed for above-normal admissions (a standard per pupil rate for up to 5 additional admissions, with funding for a teaching post for additional admissions of 5 and over)

#### Miscellaneous Licences

A range of smaller subscriptions and licences including some remaining copyright licences, Health Protection Radiation Protection Adviser Service, Fischer Family Trust, and other *ad hoc* arrangements.

#### CLEAPS

This pays for support to schools to ensure that the science curriculum is delivered safely.

#### Free School Meals Assessment

This budget funds the cost of assessing if a family is eligible for free school meals.

### Teachers' Panel and Union Duties

This budget funds the facilities time of union representatives in relation to the work they do with schools and on behalf of their members who are employed by schools. It ensures that union representatives are able to engage in consultation and policy development with the Council, covers the costs of individual casework and also covers the time that union representatives give to health and safety visits to schools. Many of these representatives have substantive roles in a number of schools, and this fund reimburses their opportunity costs.

### Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Costs

This budget covers the cost of staff members' salaries whilst on these forms of leave from school. By dedelegating this budget, schools pick up only the cost of cover arrangements, not the total of this **and** the substantive salary combined.

## 5. OTHER FUNDING COMMITMENTS

5.1 Priorities for High Needs Block (other than SEN top-ups required for mainstream school budgets) are presently being discussed, and will be presented to Schools Forum at the 22<sup>nd</sup> March session.

5.2 Indicative calculations in respect of Early Years provision indicate a total funding requirement for 2016/17 of £7,017,744, broken down as follows (2015/16 allocations are shown for comparison purposes):

	2016/17 Proposed Allocation	2015/16 Budgets
Maintained Nurseries	£2,528,414	£2,506,381
Sandy Lane Nursery Early Years function	£308,085	£302,976
Central Early Years Functions	£6,245	£6,245
Private, Voluntary & Independent providers	£4,175,000	£4,131,750
<b>TOTAL EARLY YEARS</b>	<b>£7,017,744</b>	<b>£6,947,352</b>

Therefore, compared with our indicative Early Years Block allocation of £6,751,000, Warrington has a shortfall of £266,744. That indicative, derived from 2015 census data, will be updated later in the year to account for the January 2016 census, but until this occurs, it is prudent to consider a requirement to vire funding from the High Needs block to cover the potential shortfall (a similar virement of £186,352 was agreed last year). Virements of this nature, to reflect local issues, are acceptable to the EFA, though they require Schools Forum consent.

5.3 The remaining element of confirmed DSG funding is the recurrent allocation for NQT induction. In the previous three years, Schools Forum has decided to allocate this funding proportionate to the numbers of NQTs currently in schools,

rather than attempt to predict transfers in/out and overall changes in numbers over the forthcoming year. The sums involved per teacher are relatively small.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 Schools Forum is asked to note the contents of the report.
- 6.2 Schools Forum is asked to approve the transfer of £266,744 from the notional High Needs Block to fully fund the current Early Years block overcommitment. If the subsequent confirmed notification materially affects the balance of funding, this will be reported back to Forum at the earliest opportunity.
- 6.3 Schools Forum is asked to approve a methodology for issuing the £42,000 Newly Qualified Teacher induction funding to schools
- 6.4 Schools Forum sector representatives from the maintained sectors are asked, for each phase, to decide which funding streams are to be dedelegated for 2016/17. If any existing dedelegations are to be set aside, Forum representatives are requested to suggest what alternative arrangements should be implemented.

**Appendix 2: Effect of current dedelegation decisions**

		<b>Pupil No</b>	<b>Classes</b>	SIMS Licence	Misc Lic	CLEAPS	FSM Ass	Tchrs' Panel	Maternity	TOTAL	FSM
<b>CC</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>£24.69</b>	<b>£3,077.35</b>	<b>£1,453.60</b>	<b>£2.19</b>	<b>£0.35</b>	<b>£2.47</b>	<b>£3.67</b>	<b>£22.32</b>	DE- DELEGATION	<b>£353.10</b>
35001	Bewsey Lodge	5,876.22	3,077.35	1,453.60	521.22	83.30	587.86	873.46	5,312.16	<b>£17,785</b>	<b>£25,277</b>
35002	Dallam	4,641.72	3,077.35	1,453.60	411.72	65.80	464.36	689.96	4,196.16	<b>£15,001</b>	<b>£26,616</b>
35003	Evelyn St	5,258.97	3,077.35	1,453.60	466.47	74.55	526.11	781.71	4,754.16	<b>£16,393</b>	<b>£18,008</b>
35004	Meadowside	5,086.14	3,077.35	1,453.60	451.14	72.10	508.82	756.02	4,597.92	<b>£16,003</b>	<b>£24,030</b>
35005	Oakwood Avenue	12,838.80	3,077.35	1,453.60	1,138.80	182.00	1,284.40	1,908.40	11,606.40	<b>£33,490</b>	<b>£42,503</b>
35006	St Elphin's	9,283.44	3,077.35	1,453.60	823.44	131.60	928.72	1,379.92	8,392.32	<b>£25,470</b>	<b>£17,302</b>
35007	St Andrew's	4,814.55	3,077.35	1,453.60	427.05	68.25	481.65	715.65	4,352.40	<b>£15,391</b>	<b>£25,776</b>
35008	St Ann's	4,666.41	3,077.35	1,453.60	413.91	66.15	466.83	693.63	4,218.48	<b>£15,056</b>	<b>£11,299</b>
35009	St Barnabas'	4,691.10	3,077.35	1,453.60	416.10	66.50	469.30	697.30	4,240.80	<b>£15,112</b>	<b>£14,124</b>
35010	St Margaret's	10,517.94	3,077.35	1,453.60	932.94	149.10	1,052.22	1,563.42	9,508.32	<b>£28,255</b>	<b>£27,542</b>
35011	Our Lady's	4,567.65	3,077.35	1,453.60	405.15	64.75	456.95	678.95	4,129.20	<b>£14,834</b>	<b>£10,240</b>
35012	Sacred Heart	4,814.55	3,077.35	1,453.60	427.05	68.25	481.65	715.65	4,352.40	<b>£15,391</b>	<b>£9,534</b>
35013	St Alban's	4,863.93	3,077.35	1,453.60	431.43	68.95	486.59	722.99	4,397.04	<b>£15,502</b>	<b>£5,297</b>
35014	St Augustine's	3,382.53	3,077.35	1,453.60	300.03	47.95	338.39	502.79	3,057.84	<b>£12,160</b>	<b>£14,830</b>
35015	St Benedict's	5,160.21	3,077.35	1,453.60	457.71	73.15	516.23	767.03	4,664.88	<b>£16,170</b>	<b>£6,003</b>
35016	St Stephen's	5,160.21	3,077.35	1,453.60	457.71	73.15	516.23	767.03	4,664.88	<b>£16,170</b>	<b>£13,065</b>
35017	Appleton Thorn	5,135.52	3,077.35	1,453.60	455.52	72.80	513.76	763.36	4,642.56	<b>£16,114</b>	<b>£1,059</b>
35018	The Cobbs	6,394.71	3,077.35	1,453.60	567.21	90.65	639.73	950.53	5,780.88	<b>£18,955</b>	<b>£6,003</b>
35019	Broomfields	9,209.37	3,077.35	1,453.60	816.87	130.55	921.31	1,368.91	8,325.36	<b>£25,303</b>	<b>£8,828</b>
35020	St Monica's	4,715.79	3,077.35	1,453.60	418.29	66.85	471.77	700.97	4,263.12	<b>£15,168</b>	<b>£3,178</b>
35021	Grappenhall St Wilfrid's	10,246.35	3,077.35	1,453.60	908.85	145.25	1,025.05	1,523.05	9,262.80	<b>£27,642</b>	<b>£706</b>
35022	Bradshaw	4,617.03	3,077.35	1,453.60	409.53	65.45	461.89	686.29	4,173.84	<b>£14,945</b>	<b>£3,531</b>
35023	St Thomas'	5,184.90	3,077.35	1,453.60	459.90	73.50	518.70	770.70	4,687.20	<b>£16,226</b>	<b>£3,531</b>
35024	Stockton Heath	8,789.64	3,077.35	1,453.60	779.64	124.60	879.32	1,306.52	7,945.92	<b>£24,357</b>	<b>£6,709</b>
35025	Stretton St Matthew's	5,012.07	3,077.35	1,453.60	444.57	71.05	501.41	745.01	4,530.96	<b>£15,836</b>	<b>£1,766</b>
35026	Thelwall Jnrs	3,999.78	3,077.35	1,453.60	354.78	56.70	400.14	594.54	3,615.84	<b>£13,553</b>	<b>£2,119</b>
35027	Thelwall Infants	2,913.42	3,077.35	1,453.60	258.42	41.30	291.46	433.06	2,633.76	<b>£11,102</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35028	Statham	4,814.55	3,077.35	1,453.60	427.05	68.25	481.65	715.65	4,352.40	<b>£15,391</b>	<b>£3,884</b>
35029	Cherry Tree	5,283.66	3,077.35	1,453.60	468.66	74.90	528.58	785.38	4,776.48	<b>£16,449</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35030	Ravenbank	9,777.24	3,077.35	1,453.60	867.24	138.60	978.12	1,453.32	8,838.72	<b>£26,584</b>	<b>£6,356</b>
35031	Oughtrington	10,221.66	3,077.35	1,453.60	906.66	144.90	1,022.58	1,519.38	9,240.48	<b>£27,587</b>	<b>£2,472</b>
35032	Glazebury	2,419.62	3,077.35	1,453.60	214.62	34.30	242.06	359.66	2,187.36	<b>£9,989</b>	<b>£4,237</b>
35033	Culcheth	5,258.97	3,077.35	1,453.60	466.47	74.55	526.11	781.71	4,754.16	<b>£16,393</b>	<b>£6,356</b>
35034	Newchurch	5,258.97	3,077.35	1,453.60	466.47	74.55	526.11	781.71	4,754.16	<b>£16,393</b>	<b>£2,119</b>
35035	Twiss Green	5,258.97	3,077.35	1,453.60	466.47	74.55	526.11	781.71	4,754.16	<b>£16,393</b>	<b>£3,884</b>
35036	St Paul of the Cross	4,542.96	3,077.35	1,453.60	402.96	64.40	454.48	675.28	4,106.88	<b>£14,778</b>	<b>£6,003</b>
35037	Burtonwood	5,061.45	3,077.35	1,453.60	448.95	71.75	506.35	752.35	4,575.60	<b>£15,947</b>	<b>£8,474</b>

35038	Christ Church	7,555.14	3,077.35	1,453.60	670.14	107.10	755.82	1,123.02	6,829.92	<b>£21,572</b>	<b>£14,830</b>
35039	St Oswald's	5,160.21	3,077.35	1,453.60	457.71	73.15	516.23	767.03	4,664.88	<b>£16,170</b>	<b>£3,531</b>
35040	Brook Acre	5,357.73	3,077.35	1,453.60	475.23	75.95	535.99	796.39	4,843.44	<b>£16,616</b>	<b>£33,191</b>
35042	St Bridget's	5,234.28	3,077.35	1,453.60	464.28	74.20	523.64	778.04	4,731.84	<b>£16,337</b>	<b>£15,890</b>
35043	St Lewis'	4,592.34	3,077.35	1,453.60	407.34	65.10	459.42	682.62	4,151.52	<b>£14,889</b>	<b>£5,297</b>
35044	Croft	5,135.52	3,077.35	1,453.60	455.52	72.80	513.76	763.36	4,642.56	<b>£16,114</b>	<b>£4,943</b>
35045	Locking Stumps	8,443.98	3,077.35	1,453.60	748.98	119.70	844.74	1,255.14	7,633.44	<b>£23,577</b>	<b>£15,890</b>
35046	Penketh	5,135.52	3,077.35	1,453.60	455.52	72.80	513.76	763.36	4,642.56	<b>£16,114</b>	<b>£2,119</b>
35047	St Joseph's	7,555.14	3,077.35	1,453.60	670.14	107.10	755.82	1,123.02	6,829.92	<b>£21,572</b>	<b>£706</b>
35048	St Vincent's	6,641.61	3,077.35	1,453.60	589.11	94.15	664.43	987.23	6,004.08	<b>£19,512</b>	<b>£5,297</b>
35049	Penketh South	4,493.58	3,077.35	1,453.60	398.58	63.70	449.54	667.94	4,062.24	<b>£14,667</b>	<b>£2,119</b>
35050	St Peter's	5,382.42	3,077.35	1,453.60	477.42	76.30	538.46	800.06	4,865.76	<b>£16,671</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35051	Woolston CP	5,629.32	3,077.35	1,453.60	499.32	79.80	563.16	836.76	5,088.96	<b>£17,228</b>	<b>£6,140</b>
35052	Woolston CEP	5,283.66	3,077.35	1,453.60	468.66	74.90	528.58	785.38	4,776.48	<b>£16,449</b>	<b>£0</b>
35053	Great Sankey	7,752.66	3,077.35	1,453.60	687.66	109.90	775.58	1,152.38	7,008.48	<b>£22,018</b>	<b>£5,650</b>
35054	Chapelford	11,875.89	3,077.35	1,453.60	1,053.39	168.35	1,188.07	1,765.27	10,735.92	<b>£31,318</b>	<b>£4,590</b>
35055	Park Road	4,962.69	3,077.35	1,453.60	440.19	70.35	496.47	737.67	4,486.32	<b>£15,725</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35056	Barrow Hall Lane	13,431.36	3,077.35	1,453.60	1,191.36	190.40	1,343.68	1,996.48	12,142.08	<b>£34,826</b>	<b>£5,297</b>
35057	Sankey Valley St James'	4,913.31	3,077.35	1,453.60	435.81	69.65	491.53	730.33	4,441.68	<b>£15,613</b>	<b>£13,771</b>
35058	St Helen's	3,259.08	3,077.35	1,453.60	289.08	46.20	326.04	484.44	2,946.24	<b>£11,882</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35059	Winwick	4,765.17	3,077.35	1,453.60	422.67	67.55	476.71	708.31	4,307.76	<b>£15,279</b>	<b>£3,531</b>
35060	Birchwood	4,394.82	3,077.35	1,453.60	389.82	62.30	439.66	653.26	3,972.96	<b>£14,444</b>	<b>£22,598</b>
35061	Gorse Covert	7,530.45	3,077.35	1,453.60	667.95	106.75	753.35	1,119.35	6,807.60	<b>£21,516</b>	<b>£2,825</b>
35062	Cinnamon Brow	7,505.76	3,077.35	1,453.60	665.76	106.40	750.88	1,115.68	6,785.28	<b>£21,461</b>	<b>£13,418</b>
35063	Old Hall	10,246.35	3,077.35	1,453.60	908.85	145.25	1,025.05	1,523.05	9,262.80	<b>£27,642</b>	<b>£6,003</b>
35064	Callands	7,579.83	3,077.35	1,453.60	672.33	107.45	758.29	1,126.69	6,852.24	<b>£21,628</b>	<b>£4,590</b>
35065	St Philips	11,184.57	3,077.35	1,453.60	992.07	158.55	1,118.91	1,662.51	10,110.96	<b>£29,759</b>	<b>£3,884</b>
35066	Grappenhall Heys	5,110.83	3,077.35	1,453.60	453.33	72.45	511.29	759.69	4,620.24	<b>£16,059</b>	<b>£706</b>
35067	Latchford St James'	4,641.72	3,077.35	1,453.60	411.72	65.80	464.36	689.96	4,196.16	<b>£15,001</b>	<b>£9,887</b>
35068	Alderman Bolton	6,542.85	3,077.35	1,453.60	580.35	92.75	654.55	972.55	5,914.80	<b>£19,289</b>	<b>£26,836</b>
35069	Bruche	4,765.17	3,077.35	1,453.60	422.67	67.55	476.71	708.31	4,307.76	<b>£15,279</b>	<b>£2,119</b>
35070	Beamont	9,727.86	3,077.35	1,453.60	862.86	137.90	973.18	1,445.98	8,794.08	<b>£26,473</b>	<b>£31,073</b>
		<b>£431,532</b>	<b>£212,337</b>	<b>£100,298</b>	<b>£38,277</b>	<b>£6,117</b>	<b>£43,171</b>	<b>£64,144</b>	<b>£390,109</b>	<b>£1,285,985</b>	<b>£653,509</b>

CC	Name		1,453.60	2.19	0.35	2.47	3.67	22.32		
35103	Culcheth		1,453.60	2,426.52	387.80	2,736.76	4,066.36	24,730.56	<b>£35,802</b>	
35107	St Gregory's		1,453.60	1,966.62	314.30	2,218.06	3,295.66	20,043.36	<b>£29,292</b>	
35115	Sir Thomas Boteler		1,453.60	1,349.04	215.60	1,521.52	2,260.72	13,749.12	<b>£20,550</b>	
35121	Cardinal Newman		1,453.60	1,708.20	273.00	1,926.60	2,862.60	17,409.60	<b>£25,634</b>	
		<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£5,814</b>	<b>£7,450</b>	<b>£1,191</b>	<b>£8,403</b>	<b>£12,485</b>	<b>£75,933</b>	<b>£111,276</b>
		<b>£431,532</b>	<b>£212,337</b>	<b>£106,113</b>	<b>£45,727</b>	<b>£7,308</b>	<b>£51,574</b>	<b>£76,630</b>	<b>£466,042</b>	<b>£1,397,262</b>

**Appendix 1: Draft Individual School Budgets 2016/17 - Primary Schools**

CC	Name	Basic Per Pupil <b>£2,788.03</b>	Deprivation <b>£3,210.60</b>	EAL <b>£370.45</b>	SEN Contingency <b>-</b>	High Cost, Low Incidence SEN <b>-</b>	Lump Sum <b>£156,677</b>	Designated Provision <b>-</b>	Rates <b>-</b>	Early Years <b>-</b>	TOTAL	Minimum Funding Guarantee	Revised TOTAL
35001	Bewsey Lodge	663,551	229,833	12,062	8,303	11,521	156,677	271,698	33,264	101,898	1,488,808	89,196	<b>1,578,004</b>
35002	Dallam	524,150	242,007	10,117	0	9,397	156,677	408,824	9,954	96,146	1,457,272	22,076	<b>1,479,348</b>
35003	Evelyn Street	593,851	163,740	8,454	0	8,420	156,677	0	9,923	67,718	1,008,782	110,313	<b>1,119,095</b>
35004	Meadowside	574,334	218,492	4,820	21,301	20,115	156,677	271,698	10,080	75,884	1,353,402	120,450	<b>1,473,852</b>
35005	Oakwood Avenue	1,449,776	386,461	7,261	27,352	39,033	156,677	301,170	24,192	153,541	2,545,463	44,039	<b>2,589,502</b>
35006	St Elphin's	1,048,300	157,320	17,959	33,098	24,537	156,677	0	8,618	101,479	1,547,987	0	<b>1,547,987</b>
35007	St Andrew's	543,666	234,374	3,501	2,990	5,348	156,677	0	1,814	0	948,370	0	<b>948,370</b>
35008	St Ann's	526,938	102,739	8,365	0	5,458	156,677	0	1,991	83,653	885,820	105,433	<b>991,253</b>
35009	St Barnabas'	529,726	128,424	8,850	0	4,446	156,677	0	2,016	80,404	910,543	17,559	<b>928,102</b>
35010	St Margaret's	1,187,701	250,427	2,578	5,891	16,200	156,677	0	9,677	137,174	1,766,325	0	<b>1,766,325</b>
35011	Our Lady's	515,786	93,107	7,120	10,358	14,855	156,677	0	2,142	83,100	883,145	7,467	<b>890,612</b>
35012	Sacred Heart	543,666	86,686	17,304	0	235	156,677	0	1,966	0	806,534	0	<b>806,534</b>
35013	St Alban's	549,242	48,159	23,046	0	7,928	156,677	0	2,268	71,301	858,620	0	<b>858,620</b>
35014	St Augustine's	381,960	134,845	10,558	0	235	156,677	0	1,663	42,064	728,002	17,390	<b>745,392</b>
35015	St Benedict's	582,698	54,580	8,217	0	840	156,677	0	4,259	104,197	911,467	0	<b>911,467</b>
35016	St Stephen's	582,698	118,792	10,006	0	1,482	156,677	0	2,016	0	871,671	27,507	<b>899,178</b>
35017	Appleton Thorn	579,910	9,631	430	0	12,049	156,677	0	15,624	0	774,321	1,588	<b>775,909</b>
35018	The Cobbs Infants	722,100	54,580	1,626	0	20,121	156,677	0	22,680	206,300	1,184,084	6,538	<b>1,190,622</b>
35019	Broomfields Junior	1,039,936	80,266	1,852	0	2,948	156,677	0	24,394	0	1,306,072	0	<b>1,306,072</b>
35020	St Monica's	532,514	28,895	859	22,581	42,934	156,677	0	1,814	0	786,275	0	<b>786,275</b>
35021	St Wilfrid's	1,157,032	6,421	3,056	10,891	13,378	156,677	0	5,947	0	1,353,403	0	<b>1,353,403</b>
35022	Bradshaw	521,361	32,106	441	0	6,178	156,677	0	9,450	0	726,213	5,774	<b>731,987</b>
35023	St Thomas'	585,487	32,106	1,297	3,823	22,832	156,677	0	2,999	46,275	851,495	0	<b>851,495</b>
35024	Stockton Heath	992,539	61,002	3,942	7,284	27,022	156,677	0	52,416	0	1,300,881	0	<b>1,300,881</b>
35025	Stretton St Matthew's	565,970	16,053	0	0	2,216	156,677	0	3,100	0	744,016	0	<b>744,016</b>
35026	Thelwall Juniors	451,661	19,264	0	0	618	156,677	0	7,686	0	635,905	0	<b>635,905</b>
35027	Thelwall Infants	328,987	25,685	0	1,342	12,533	156,677	0	5,796	0	531,020	5,882	<b>536,902</b>
35028	Statham	543,666	35,317	2,519	0	11,051	156,677	0	8,568	0	757,798	0	<b>757,798</b>
35029	Cherry Tree	596,639	25,685	2,156	7,030	23,598	156,677	0	11,088	0	822,873	0	<b>822,873</b>
35030	Ravenbank	1,104,060	57,791	2,137	0	20,620	156,677	0	23,184	0	1,364,469	0	<b>1,364,469</b>
35031	Oughtrington	1,154,245	22,474	430	24,203	44,439	156,677	0	26,964	0	1,429,432	0	<b>1,429,432</b>
35032	Glazebury	273,227	38,528	404	0	0	156,677	0	1,890	0	470,726	0	<b>470,726</b>

35033	Culcheth	593,851	57,791	0	3,378	5,646	156,677	0	9,072	0	826,415	2,827	<b>829,242</b>
35034	Newchurch	593,851	19,264	2,167	0	0	156,677	0	10,584	0	782,542	3,641	<b>786,183</b>
35035	Twiss Green	593,851	35,317	430	0	0	156,677	0	12,978	0	799,252	0	<b>799,252</b>
35036	St Paul of the Cross	512,997	54,580	2,200	0	1,909	156,677	0	2,848	0	731,211	0	<b>731,211</b>
35037	Burtonwood	571,546	77,054	0	0	3,987	156,677	0	10,584	0	819,848	0	<b>819,848</b>
35038	Christ Church	853,137	134,845	433	0	6,300	156,677	0	3,074	95,414	1,249,882	0	<b>1,249,882</b>
35039	St Oswald's	582,698	32,106	2,163	0	9,199	156,677	0	2,570	0	785,414	0	<b>785,414</b>
35040	Brook Acre	605,003	301,796	4,297	0	2,729	156,677	0	10,710	95,221	1,176,434	31,493	<b>1,207,927</b>
35042	St Bridget's	591,062	144,477	8,198	0	1,458	156,677	0	3,049	0	904,921	27,967	<b>932,888</b>
35043	St Lewis'	518,573	48,159	852	9,340	3,456	156,677	0	1,789	0	738,845	0	<b>738,845</b>
35044	Croft	579,910	44,948	0	0	0	156,677	0	12,600	0	794,135	0	<b>794,135</b>
35045	Locking Stumps	953,507	144,477	3,593	0	9,669	156,677	0	26,303	0	1,294,225	0	<b>1,294,225</b>
35046	Penketh	579,910	19,264	1,300	0	1,482	156,677	0	11,970	0	770,603	0	<b>770,603</b>
35047	St Joseph's	853,137	6,421	0	0	1,717	156,677	0	2,797	0	1,020,749	0	<b>1,020,749</b>
35048	St Vincent's	749,980	48,159	1,682	0	2,964	156,677	0	3,377	0	962,839	0	<b>962,839</b>
35049	Penketh South	507,422	19,264	437	22,135	26,894	156,677	0	10,584	67,436	810,848	29,927	<b>840,775</b>
35050	St Peter's	607,790	25,685	0	0	2,100	156,677	0	2,545	0	794,797	0	<b>794,797</b>
35051	Woolston CP	635,671	55,832	2,871	2,131	13,978	156,677	139,368	35,784	0	1,042,311	0	<b>1,042,311</b>
35052	Woolston CE	596,639	0	863	21,333	18,584	156,677	0	2,696	0	796,793	278	<b>797,071</b>
35053	Great Sankey	875,442	51,369	863	17,013	13,711	156,677	0	44,100	111,400	1,270,575	0	<b>1,270,575</b>
35054	Chapelford Village	1,341,042	41,738	6,835	0	10,759	156,677	0	66,150	0	1,623,201	2,467	<b>1,625,668</b>
35055	Park Road	560,394	25,685	852	3,556	15,904	156,677	0	9,828	0	772,896	0	<b>772,896</b>
35056	Barrow Hall	1,516,688	48,159	3,453	18,947	21,542	156,677	0	21,420	0	1,786,886	0	<b>1,786,886</b>
35057	Sankey Valley St James'	554,818	125,213	6,109	0	5,051	156,677	0	2,797	84,179	934,844	83,171	<b>1,018,015</b>
35058	Hollinfare St Helen's	368,020	25,685	882	1,253	1,815	156,677	0	2,092	0	556,423	3,242	<b>559,665</b>
35059	Winwick	538,090	32,106	0	0	7,310	156,677	0	3,604	0	737,786	0	<b>737,786</b>
35060	Birchwood	496,269	205,478	5,831	16,459	13,003	156,677	0	3,203	75,807	972,728	0	<b>972,728</b>
35061	Gorse Covert	850,349	25,685	6,542	0	4,332	156,677	0	25,956	0	1,069,540	0	<b>1,069,540</b>
35062	Cinnamon Brow	847,561	122,002	3,838	5,102	4,274	156,677	130,088	4,662	111,404	1,385,609	17,514	<b>1,403,123</b>
35063	Old Hall	1,157,032	54,580	15,374	4,891	5,446	156,677	0	29,484	0	1,423,484	0	<b>1,423,484</b>
35064	Callands	855,925	41,738	8,154	22,122	14,692	156,677	0	26,964	0	1,126,272	9,586	<b>1,135,858</b>
35065	St Philip's	1,262,978	35,317	11,399	0	13,247	156,677	0	8,757	0	1,488,374	0	<b>1,488,374</b>
35066	Grappenhall Heys	577,122	6,421	863	0	1,137	156,677	0	26,460	54,172	822,853	0	<b>822,853</b>
35067	Latchford St James'	524,150	89,897	6,172	0	1,482	156,677	0	2,495	73,111	853,983	26,048	<b>880,031</b>
35068	Alderman Bolton	738,828	244,006	9,728	24,495	10,634	156,677	0	10,781	110,668	1,305,817	23,295	<b>1,329,112</b>
35069	Bruche	538,090	19,264	3,764	0	11,071	156,677	0	19,168	49,293	797,326	44,012	<b>841,338</b>
35070	Beamont	1,098,484	282,532	18,352	22,592	24,202	156,677	0	24,884	127,142	1,754,865	0	<b>1,754,865</b>
		<b>48,729,191</b>	<b>5,942,101</b>	<b>321,862</b>	<b>381,196</b>	<b>724,266</b>	<b>10,810,713</b>	<b>1,522,846</b>	<b>858,161</b>	<b>2,506,381</b>	<b>71,796,717</b>	<b>886,680</b>	<b>72,683,397</b>

**Appendix 1: Draft Individual School Budgets 2016/17 - Secondary Schools**

CC	Name	Per Pupil £4,139.98	Deprivation £3,023.58	EAL £992.75	LCHI SEN £704.45	SEN			Des Prov	Rates	Split Site	TOTAL	Min Fund Guarantee	Revised TOTAL
						Contingency	HCLI SEN	Lump Sum £136,762						
35103	Culcheth	4,542,839	202,580	993	101,124	0	15,927	136,762	0	299,880	0	5,300,105	0	<b>5,300,105</b>
	Penketh	3,899,221	435,942	4,904	140,700	0	25,293	136,762	182,076	22,075	0	4,846,973	14,008	<b>4,860,981</b>
	King's Academy	1,881,933	89,166	2,343	35,166	0	1,482	136,762	0	2,621	0	2,149,472	0	<b>2,149,472</b>
	Great Sankey	6,139,429	190,486	4,974	165,799	0	42,324	136,762	0	50,904	0	6,730,677	0	<b>6,730,677</b>
35107	St Gregory's	3,682,409	196,063	21,483	111,846	21,187	38,313	136,762	304,528	21,874	0	4,534,464	0	<b>4,534,464</b>
	University Academy Warrington	1,907,349	359,597	6,771	101,927	31,326	37,286	136,762	182,076	18,749	0	2,781,842	0	<b>2,781,842</b>
	Birchwood	3,726,925	332,594	7,942	132,239	39,780	41,470	136,762	0	37,044	0	4,454,756	0	<b>4,454,756</b>
	Bridgewater	6,123,187	200,432	4,914	129,245	2,791	45,224	136,762	304,528	26,964	297,000	7,271,047	0	<b>7,271,047</b>
35115	Sir Thomas Boteler	2,528,480	323,273	8,766	113,078	37,775	52,704	136,762	182,076	8,669	0	3,391,582	0	<b>3,391,582</b>
	Beamont Collegiate Academy	3,161,274	550,291	29,783	181,776	0	7,314	136,762	0	15,019	0	4,082,219	3,616	<b>4,085,835</b>
35121	Cardinal Newman	3,199,107	296,310	14,891	111,634	0	43,710	136,762	0	14,213	0	3,816,627	0	<b>3,816,627</b>
	Future Tech Studio	850,766	95,355	1,010	43,137	0	0	136,762	0	0	0	1,127,029	52,388	<b>1,179,417</b>
	Lymm	6,026,244	175,368	4,964	111,838	26,167	28,166	136,762	0	45,612	0	6,555,121	0	<b>6,555,121</b>
		<b>47,669,164</b>	<b>3,447,457</b>	<b>113,737</b>	<b>1,479,510</b>	<b>159,026</b>	<b>379,213</b>	<b>1,777,900</b>	<b>1,155,284</b>	<b>563,623</b>	<b>297,000</b>	<b>57,041,913</b>	<b>70,012</b>	<b>57,111,925</b>