

AGENDA

Meeting: Schools Forum
Place: Committee Room III - County Hall, Trowbridge
Date: Thursday 3 March 2011
Time: 1.30 pm

Briefing Arrangements:

At present there is no plan for a briefing to precede this meeting. If a briefing becomes necessary due to a late item, this will be communicated to members of the Schools Forum by email.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Liam Paul, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718376 or email liam.paul@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Membership:

Secondary School Headteachers

Mrs C Grant
Mr M Watson
Mr C Dark

Mr J Foster
Vacancy
Vacancy

Primary School Headteachers

Mr N Baker
Mrs Julia Bird
Mrs J Finney
Mrs C Williamson

Diocesan Representative
Mrs A Davey

Teacher's Representative
Mr J Hawkins

SEN School Headteacher

Ms I Lancaster-Gaye

Maintained School w/Nurseries Rep.
Mr M Keeling

Academy Representative

Mr David Cowley

14-19 Group Representative
Dr Tina Pagett

School Governor Representatives

Mrs A Ferries

Early Years Representative
Mr J Proctor

AGENDA

PART I

Items to be considered whilst the meeting is open to the public

1. **Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The Council welcomes contributions from members of the public.

Statements

If you would like to make a statement at this meeting on any item on this agenda, please register to do so at least 10 minutes prior to the meeting. Up to 3 speakers are permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes each on any agenda item. Please contact the officer named above for any further clarification.

Questions

To receive any questions from members of the public or members of the Council received in accordance with the constitution. Those wishing to ask questions are required to give notice of any such questions in writing to the officer named above (acting on behalf of the Director of Resources) no later than 5pm on (4 clear working days, e.g. Wednesday of week before for a Wednesday meeting). Please contact the officer named on the first page of this agenda for further advice. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.

Details of any questions received will be circulated to Committee members prior to the meeting and made available at the meeting and on the Council's website.

2. **Apologies**

3. **Minutes of the previous Meeting** (*Pages 1 - 12*)

To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 02.02.2011 (copy attached)

4. **Declaration of Interests**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests.

5. **Chairman's Announcements**

6. **Budget Monitoring** (*Pages 13 - 18*)

To report on the projected budget monitoring position for 2010/11 and update on the position for the forthcoming 2011/12 financial year.

7. **Council Business Plan (including Early Intervention Grant)** (*To Follow*)

8. **Devolved Formula Capital** (*Pages 19 - 22*)
9. **Minimum Funding Guarantee Variations** (*To Follow*)
10. **Controls on Surplus Balances Schemes - Options for 2011/12 onwards**
(*Pages 23 - 26*)
11. **Results of the Consultation on a change to the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme** (*Pages 27 - 37*)
12. **Confirmation of dates for future meetings**

To confirm the dates of future meetings, as follows:

23 June 2011

13 October 2011

01 November 2011

13. **Urgent Items**

Any other items of business, which the Chairman agrees to consider as a matter of urgency.

PART II

Items during whose consideration it is recommended that the public should be excluded because of the likelihood that exempt information would be disclosed

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING HELD ON 2 FEBRUARY 2011 AT COMMITTEE ROOM III - COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE.

Present:

Mr N Baker, Mrs Julia Bird, Mrs J Finney, Mr J Foster, Mrs C Grant, Mr J Hawkins, Mr M Keeling, Ms I Lancaster-Gaye, Mr J Proctor and Mr M Watson

Also Present:

Mr P. Beaumont

113. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

Mrs Ann Ferries
Mr Chris Dark
Mr Catriona Williamson
Mr David Cowley
Dr Tina Pagett

Also from observers

Mrs Rosheen Ryan
Rev. Alice Kemp
Mr Ted Hatala

114. **Minutes of the previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2010 were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.

115. **Declaration of Interests**

None

116. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman announced two changes to the order of items listed in the Agenda:

- Item no. 16 – Review of Transitional protection would be considered first, as the proposal chosen had possible impacts on subsequent decisions.
- Item no.13 – Minimum Funding Guarantee would be moved up the Agenda, to be discussed prior to the Budget Proposals 2011/12 [Agenda Item no.12].

117. **Review of Transitional Protection**

Phil Cooch outlined the confidential report.

Resolved:

- i) That the following level of transitional protection be applied to Downlands School:

Protection reduced by £160k per year from 11-12 and to £0 in 13-14						
	<i>Year 1</i>	<i>Year 2</i>	<i>Year 3</i>	<i>Year 4</i>	<i>Year 5</i>	Cost of Protection
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	
Transitional Protection (TP)	£406,419	£132,615	£35,077	£0	£0	£574,111

- ii) The Controls on Surplus Balances scheme should be applied to Downlands on any surplus above and beyond the figures agreed under the scheme of transitional protection, outlined above.
- iii) The 2009-10 revenue balance of £151,994 should not be removed from the scheme.
- iv) There should be no further formal reviews of Downlands' transitional protection, as it is noted that figures will appear on the annual reporting of rollovers year-to-year, that come to the Schools Forum.
- v) Any savings from the adjusted scheme of transitional protection that is to be adopted will be re-invested in the Central SEN budget to allow for fuller funding of the SEN banding formula.

118. **Budget Monitoring**

Liz Williams summarised the current in-year budgetary position. As at 31 December 2010, the figures show projected underspend against DSG of £2.369 million. Any variance against the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be carried

forward into the next financial year. Key pressures and potential underspends were identified:

- **Premature Retirement Costs**

This service is predicted to overspend by £7,877 after adjustment for the severance policy for local government reorganisation in place for non-teaching staff. This has now been replaced by a new severance policy by the Council.

- **Maternity Costs**

Technical issues relating to SAP have now been resolved. Payroll data suggests an overspend of £114,000

- **Special Educational Needs Services**

Underspends are predicted against the Independent Special Schools (ISS) budget and the Special Recoupment budget. As previously agreed these would be included in the delegation of funds to mainstream primary schools for SEN. The Named Pupil Allowance (NPA) is projected to be on target at this stage.

- **Early Years Budgets**

Early Years budgets are due to underspend by £1.6 million. Of this £1.3 million is against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. The remainder is accounted for by vacancies in teams. The projected spend on 3 and 4 year olds is based only on one term's worth of data and is liable to revision.

- **Young Person's Support Services (YPSS)**

At the December Schools' Forum meeting it was agreed that £91,000 should be allocated from the projected underspend to fund cost pressures within the YPSS.

Resolved:

To note the revenue budget monitoring position for 2010/11 and that further work is required to ensure accurate projections on the maternity budget.

119. **3-year budgets for Schools**

The Forum received a verbal update from Phil Cooch, C & E Finance team on the statutory requirements surrounding the submission by schools of three-year budgets, and his thoughts on the continuation of the process. Concerns had been raised at the previous Schools forum meeting about the viability of submitted budget for three years in advance, when the current DSG estimates cover only one school year.

Key points were as follows:

- To vary the application of the Minimum Funding Guarantee would require approval from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on a case by case basis.

- The process would require a full consultation to be concluded by the end of April
- The method of budgeting, and the prudent, forward-looking approach to financial planning that it implied was already embedded in the working practises of the Local Authority and the area's schools.
- The modelling software used by the council and schools – HSS, relies on inflation assumptions dictated by the local authority.
- The second- and third-year budgets are indicative: they can be, and frequently are revised, due to pupil numbers other than initially expected.

It was explained that the Chief Finance Officer's view was that requiring three-year budgets was in keeping with the local authority's emphasis on medium-term financial planning.

A brief discussion emerged, and the key unknowns for the second and third years were identified as the number of pupils; the value of the pupil premium and variability of the DSG. It was expected pupil premium funding would rise as a result of wider measures of eligibility (Free School Meals ever).

Members of the forum were asked to approve the forthcoming year's inflation assumptions.

Resolved:

- i) **That schools forum recommends not to go to consultation in order to vary the application of the Minimum Funding guarantee (MFG)**
- ii) **To approve the inflation assumptions of:**

Staffing	0%
Non-staffing costs	3.5%
Income	0%
Funding Guarantee	-1.5%
Pupil Premium	x1.25 each year

120. **Report of the Schools Funding Working Group (SFWG)**

The report was taken as read, and summarised by Liz Williams, who explained that the recommendations from the working group were present to inform the Forum's response to items no.9 and 10 on the agenda [minute no 122 and 123 respectively].

Resolved

To note the report and minutes and the recommendations of the SFWG.

121. Report of the SEN Working Group

Liz Williams updated the Forum regarding the discussions of the SEN Working group, and drew members' attention to the recommendation that the (notional) amount within AWPU that was SEN funding be included on the Funding Certificate for each school.

Trevor Daniels, Head of SEN provision explained that he had investigated this, and these costs equate to approximately 2.4% of the AWPU. Schools could then be advised of the totality of the funding that they receive for SEN, respond to requests for information, and budget accordingly.

It was explained that this notional element of the AWPU represented fixed funding for SEN provision, regardless of the school and number of SEN-statemented children attending. It was a reflection of the estimated costs every school must incur to have a basic structure/capability to handle special educational needs. For example in a low-needs school this would include a proportion of teacher, Education Support Assistant and admin time.

Resolved:

That the notional SEN element of the AWPU will be identified on the funding certificates as part of the notional SEN funding in the school's budget.

122. Supply Pool Insurance Scheme

Phil Cooch introduced the item and outlined the general aims of the proposals contained therein.

Schools Forum was informed that the Supply Pool Insurance scheme had been running for a number of years to provide insurance cover for staff sickness absence.

Forum members were asked to consider the desired price of 2011/12 premiums, whether or not they wished academies to be allowed to join the scheme, and the percentage amount of cashback to pay back to schools under the Cashback element of the scheme.

Resolved

Schools Forum agree that:

- i) Previously developed enhancements to the scheme should continue**
- ii) 2011/12 premiums will be offered at a 0% increase on 2010/11 prices.**
- iii) Cashback arrangements should continue**
- iv) The cashback calculation should increase from 50% level to 100% level, as set out in the report.**

And further that

- v) Academies may join the scheme and be encouraged to do so.**

123. Free School Meals Pooling Scheme

Phil Cooch introduced the item and outlined the scope of the Free School Meals Pooling Scheme (FSM). He explained it was set up in 2001 with the aim of offering schools some financial stability and protection against to the cost of unexpected changes in the number of free school meals they have to provide to their pupils.

Schools Forum's agreement was sought to distribute all, or some, or none of the £132,965 surplus balance on the Free School Meals pool at the end of 2010-11 and to agree the distribution method.

Resolved

Schools Forum agree that

- i) That 70% (£83,285) of the surplus balance be distributed as cashback, in accordance with the recommendation of the SFWG, thus leaving £49,679 as a reserve.**
- ii) That officers use the same distribution method as applied in 2009/10**

124. Delegation of Special Educational Needs Funding to Primary Schools - Update

Liz Williams introduced the item and summarised the report and general aims of the proposals contained therein.

A discussion ensued and the following key points were made:

- The funds generated by the recoupment of cost from bringing children back 'in-county' did not always return, in their entirety to schools, as these external placements were often co-funded by partners such as social care or the NHS.
- Mrs Finney re-iterated that the underlying rationale was to build a robust system which can aid early intervention in SEN cases. The NPA was reflective of needs.
- Trevor Daniels also expressed the benefits of delegation – prevention and early intervention, and also the reduced bureaucratic burden that comes with a system which identifies need properly and at an early stage.

Forum members discussed how best to allocate the funds released from the earlier considered review of transitional protection [Agenda Item no.16 / Minute

no .117, and were strongly in favour of keeping any savings made in SEN provision within the SEN budget, and redistributing accordingly.

Resolved

- i) Savings from the review of Transition Protection at Downlands School would be added to the total funds outlined for delegation and/or band funding**
- ii) The first call on the funds be to fully fund (100%) the special school bands 1+ - 5.**
- iii) The remainder of funds to be used to increase the amount of SEN funds delegated to primary schools as**
- iv) That savings in the second year from the review of Transition protection also stay with the central SEN budget, to help achieve fully funded band values 1+ - 5 for special schools, or fund other pressures on the SEN budget as necessary**

Stephanie Denovan, Service Director Schools & Learning, thanked the Schools Forum and officers for their work in the area of delegation, which had produced a system much improved on that which was previously in place. She also thanked the Special schools themselves for their help in this project.

125. Minimum Funding Guarantee

Phil Cooch spoke to his report and explained the limited powers Schools Forum would have in future, regarding the application of the Minimum funding guarantee.

The purpose of the guarantee is to provide stability and predictability in school funding. The starting point for the MFG calculation is the per pupil amount that an individual school received in the previous financial year, known as the baseline budget share per pupil.

It was explained that following new regulations Schools Forum no longer has the general power to approve variations to the MFG affecting schools covering no more than 50% of pupils in the authority. Exceptions were noted, but for all other variations School Forum's agreement must be sought to vary the normal operation of the MFG and then to seek the Secretary of States approval for proposed changes.

Resolved:

i) The following baseline adjustments should be applied to avoid inappropriate minimum funding guarantees:

- To remove new school and new year group allowances from the MFG Baseline**
- To remove small schools curriculum protection from the MFG Baseline**

- To remove service school safety net from the MFG Baseline
- To remove SLC funding from the MFG Baseline from schools experiencing significant pupil growth
- To remove the 6th form non AWPU adjustment from the MFG Baseline
- To remove the basic flat rate from the MFG Baseline for schools experiencing significant pupil growth
- Where a Specialist Learning Centre is to close, to remove the associated funding from the Baseline
- 1-2-1 allocations of grant paid in 2010-11 as these are deemed to be one-off allocations

ii) That the above adjustments are applied where necessary for the 2011-12 financial year and that the Secretary of State's approval is sought for these adjustments.

126. Budget Proposals 2011/12

Liz Williams outlined her report which concerned several elements which needed to be considered before officers can finalise the schools revenue budget, in readiness for approval at Cabinet and Full Council.

Background & Risks

Schools Funding Settlement – The Department for Education (DfE) financial settlement is for one year only. No details have been provided for 2012/13 financial year. This settlement contains significant changes from previous years, including the mainstreaming of a number of former standards funds in to the Dedicated Schools Grant, and the addition of a Pupil premium.

Estimate of Dedicated Schools Grant – A confirmation of the final level of grant will not be received until June 2011 and the final level of grant could be higher or lower than the estimate.

Use of one-off funding in 2011/12 – Currently it is estimated that there will be an underspend of £2.369 million in 2010/11 and this can be utilised against priorities, however there is some risk in this projection because of uncertainty around take up of the extended free entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds.

Academies – The estimate of DSG includes those academies known in January to be converting to academy status by April 2011.

Dedicated Schools Grant – Estimate for 2011-12

Officers recapped the elements of the estimated grant, which was based on a 0% inflationary rise. A minimum funding guarantee of -1.5% will be applied to individual school's budgets. Numbers of pupils used in the estimate have been based on the October pupil count and adjusted for trends and other known changes.

The budget requirement [see Appendix 1 to the Agenda] was considered by the forum along with the potential cost pressures so far identified [Appendix 2 to the agenda]. A shortfall was identified of £1.246 million against the estimated level of DSG, if the identified cost pressures are to be funded. This shortfall would increase to £1.536 million if Schools Forum were also to invest in the Young Persons Support Service following the review of the service.

This shortfall can be met from taking part of the 2010/11 rollover however this would mean investing up to £1.536 million of one-off funding in to the 2011/12 budget.

Officers and members of Schools Forum agreed that the risk associated with investing one off funding in 2011/12 must be mitigated by the development of savings across central DSG funded services of at least £1.6 million, or 5%, in time for 2012/13. The Chairman explained that work had already begun in this respect, and papers with proposals/updates would likely return to the Forum in the Autumn.

Trevor Daniels explained a secondary issue was dealing with changes to, and the budget definition of, services which are not provided directly through schools – an example raised by forum members was Broadband contracts and provision, where the leeway for action by individual schools and the regulations would need assessing.

Following discussion on the merits of providing the identified funding for the YPSS, Liz Williams reminded the forum that a new funding model was under development, and this would include changes to AWPU and the education of children & young people with severe medical needs.

Allocation of Former Standards Funds

The proposals here reflected the sequence of discussions at previous School Forum meetings and at the meetings of the School Funding Working Group. Figures were shown [Appendix 3 to the Agenda] which show the impact on each school, and in total, of different methods of allocation, on an adjusted budget baseline. This took out the distortion caused by the withdrawal of one-off grants and other exceptions.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that re-allocation of grants had kept funds key-stage and phase specific, in keeping with the wishes of the Forum.

Resolved:

Budget Setting

- i) The Young Person's Support Service (YPSS) receives funds of £290,000, indicated as necessary in the recent review of the service.**
- ii) A new funding model for the YPSS is to be developed and presented to the Forum when ready.**
- iii) The final budget requirement is thus £274.653 million**

- iv) That one-off funding from the 2010/11 rollover be used as necessary to address the identified cost pressures
- v) That the risk associated with rolling over fund be mitigated through the development of savings proposals within central DSG budgets of at least £1.6 million for 2012/13. Use of one off funding in this way will allow time for central services to be restructured in line with the Departmental restructure, and for the continuation of the work started with schools to transform and develop traded services.

Allocation of Former Standards Funds

- vi) Investment priorities were confirmed as those identified by previous Schools Forum meetings – see report and appendix 2 to the agenda.
- vii) A statement of principles agreed by the Schools Forum for the allocation of former Standards funds be finalised and circulated to schools [see Attachment 2 to the Minutes].
- viii) The allocation of the Former Standards Funds through the funding formula to be set out as follows [Appendix 1 to the minutes], with inclusion of a Flat Rate of £20,000 per primary school, £50,000 per secondary school and £20,000 per special school.

127. **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

128. **Confirmation of dates for future meetings**

The dates of future meetings were noted and confirmed.

(Duration of meeting: 1.30 - 4.35 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Liam Paul, of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718376, e-mail liam.paul@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

**Standards Funds 2010/11 rolled in to DSG 2011/12
Summary of Allocation Methodology for 2011/12**

Grant	Year 1 2011/12	Any changes for Year 2/3
School Standards Grant	Current formula to be replicated	
School Standards Grant (Personalisation)	Distribute via AWP within phase	
School Development Grant	Flat Rate: Primary £20,000 Secondary £50,000 Special £20,000 Funding for Advanced Skills Teachers replicated for 2011/12	AS 2011/12 but AST funding to be added to AWP allocation.
School Lunch Grant	Remainder allocated by AWP within phase	
Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant	Allocated via AWP – not phase specific	
Specialist School funding and High Performing Specialist School funding	Retained Centrally Secondary Schools: 1 st Specialism to be allocated via KS3 and KS4 AWPUs 50% of 2 nd and 3 rd specialisms to be allocated via AWP (KS3 and 4) and 50% to be replicated as per 2010/11 allocations Special Schools – replicate 2010/11 allocation	Secondary Move to full allocation via AWP
1-2-1 Tuition	Allocated via KS2 and KS3 AWPUs	
Extended Schools Sustainability grant	Funding for Parent Support Advisors (PSA) to be replicated (as per summary from M O'Malley) Remaining amount to be allocated via AWP	Full allocation via AWP

Grant	Year 1 2011/12	Any changes for Year 2/3
Extended Schools Subsidy Grant	Allocate via AWPU	
Targeted Support for the Secondary National Strategy allocated to schools	Allocate via KS3 and KS4 AWPU	
Targeted Support for the Primary National Strategy allocated to schools	Every Child Programme funding to be allocated via KS1 AWPU Remainder to be allocated via KS1 and KS2 AWPU	
Diploma Formula Grant	YPLA allocation for cohort to be replicated	

Changes have been made to the Minimum Funding Guarantee to remove Extended Schools grants, which are allocated to clusters in 2010/11, and for National Strategies and 1-2-1 funding which contained significant one off allocations of funding, from the baseline. Permission will need to be sought from the Secretary of State for the proposed adjustment for 1-2-1 funding however the other two adjustments are prescribed in the new regulations.

**WILTSHIRE COUNCIL
SCHOOLS FORUM
3rd March 2011**

SCHOOLS BUDGET UPDATE

Purpose of the Paper

1. To report on the projected budget monitoring position for 2010/11.
2. To update Schools Forum on progress with budget setting for 2011/12.

Main Considerations

Budget Monitoring 2010/11

3. Appendix 1 shows expenditure as at 31st January 2011, the figures show a projected **underspend against DSG of £2.499 million**. Any variance against the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) will be carried forward in to the next financial year. Schools Forum have previously agreed that £1.536 million should be utilised to fund priorities in 2011/12.
4. Key pressures and potential underspends are detailed below.

Maternity Costs

5. Based on payroll data this budget is projected to overspend by £114,000.

Special Educational Needs Services

6. Underspends are projected against the Independent Special Schools (ISS) budget and the Special Recoupment budget which funds placements in other local authority maintained special schools. From 2011/12 it has been agreed that the ongoing effect of the underspend against these budgets will be released in to the delegated budget to increase the amount delegated to mainstream primary schools for SEN. This is a key component of the SEN review and has been agreed by Cabinet. Further detail is provided in the SEN Delegation update report to this meeting.
7. The Named Pupil Allowance (NPA) budget is not yet fully committed however it is expected that there will be further NPA allocations through the remainder of the year and it is therefore projected to be on target at this stage.

Early Years Budgets

8. Early Years budgets are projected to underspend by £1.8 million. Of this £1.5 million is against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. The projected spend on the free entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds is based on actual take up of session to date and the projected profile of placements for the remainder of the year. This

projection is only based on one term's data for the extension of the free entitlement from 12.5 to 15 hours and is therefore an estimate at this stage and will be updated for the January pupil count when available.

Young Person's Support Service

9. At the December meeting of Schools Forum it was agreed that £91,000 should be allocated from the projected underspend to fund cost pressures within the YPSS.

Budget Update 2011/12

10. Following the recommendation of the Schools Forum meeting on 2nd February the proposed schools budget has been considered by Cabinet and recommended to Council for consideration on 22nd February.
11. Roadshows have been held for Head Teachers, Governors and schools finance staff to outline the main issues within the budget. These have been well attended.
12. Proposals for the variation of the minimum funding guarantee have been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration. A separate report on the outcome of these submissions will be tabled at the Schools Forum meeting.
13. Data from the pupil census has now been collated and checked by the Research and Stats team and work has commenced on detailed budget calculations at school level.
14. The financial planning software has been updated for the provisional AWPU and other values and is now being tested by the Accounting & Budget Support Team prior to issuing to schools in early March.

Proposal

15. School Forum is asked to note the revenue budget monitoring position for 2010/11 and the progress on finalising individual schools budgets for 2011/12.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report Author
Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)
(01225) 713675, elizabetha.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

22nd February 2011

Background papers

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report:
None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Budget Monitoring Summary

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial Monitoring

Service Areas	Approved Budget 2010/11 £m	Projected Outturn for Year £m	Variation for Year £m
1 Funding Schools			
DSG Funded Expenditure	210.990	210.990	0.000
Total	210.990	210.990	-
2 Schools & Learning Branch			
Independent Special Schools	5.426	5.215	-0.210
Named Pupil Allowances	3.625	3.625	0.000
Special Recoupment	1.727	1.119	-0.608
Learning Support Team	0.534	0.534	0.000
Other SEN	0.411	0.247	-0.164
Total SEN	11.723	10.741	-0.982
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service	0.430	0.403	-0.027
Travellers Education Service	0.283	0.283	0.000
Local Collaborative Partnerships	0.153	0.153	0.000
Other School Improvement Services	0.019	0.019	0.000
Total School Improvement	0.885	0.858	-0.027
Early Years Single Funding Formula	11.442	9.942	-1.500
Other Early Years Services	1.372	1.026	-0.346
Total Early Years	12.814	10.968	-1.846
School Buildings & Places	0.341	0.313	-0.028
Total Schools & Learning	25.763	22.881	- 2.883
3 Targeted Services			
YPSS	2.312	2.407	0.095
Behaviour Support	0.991	0.991	0.000
EOTAS Recoupment	0.123	0.203	0.080
PASISS Teams	0.923	0.923	0.000
Other Targeted Services	0.113	0.113	0.000
Total Targeted Services	4.463	4.638	0.175
4 Commissioning & Performance			
Schools Maternity Costs	0.911	1.025	0.114
Schools PRC - New Cases	0.507	0.515	0.008
SIMS Licence	0.199	0.201	0.002
Other services	0.275	0.275	0.000
Total	1.891	2.015	0.124
5 Safeguarding			
Child Protection in Schools	0.040	0.040	0.000
Total	0.040	0.040	-
6 Children's Social Care			
Looked After Children Education Service	0.150	0.235	0.085
Total	0.150	0.235	0.085
9 DSG Within Corporate Services			
Gross Expenditure	3.535	3.535	0.000
Total	3.535	3.535	-
	246.832	244.333	- 2.499

Note POSITIVE variances = OVERSPEND

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVOLVED FORMULA CAPITAL: NON-VA SCHOOLS

Background

1. At its meeting held on 19 March 2009 the Schools Forum agreed that the allocation of grants to federated, amalgamated and split-site schools should be considered ahead of the 2011-2014 funding settlement.
2. Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) grant has been allocated to schools for several years. Initially the grant was part of The Standards Fund Programme but more recently was funded from the Capital Pot. Schools can use DFC for any capital purpose.
3. The grant has been allocated to Wiltshire according to a school-level national formula. The allocations to individual schools have been calculated by applying some local variations to the national formula.
4. DFC for VA schools is allocated by the Department for Education direct to individual schools who may nominate their diocese to manage the grant.
5. Schools Forum is invited to consider future arrangements for the distribution of DFC to non-VA schools in Wiltshire.

Current Arrangements

6. DFC is provided by the Department for Education by formula which is based upon the numbers of schools and pupils reported in the school census of the January of the preceding calendar year. Grant to schools has, correspondingly, been calculated on the same basis. This has presented some confusion and distortion of sums allocated.
7. The formula allocation for 2008-2011 was:

<i>Figures in £</i>	Per School	Per Primary Pupil	Per Secondary Pupil	Per boarding pupil, PRU pupil or special school pupil
Higher rate 2008-11	18,500	63.00	94.50	189.00
Lower rate 2008-11	9,250	31.50	47.25	94.50

8. All unmodernised schools were entitled to the higher rate of DFC. Modernised schools were entitled to the standard rate of DFC, which was 50% of the total higher rate DFC figure. Modernised schools were new schools or those which, in the previous ten years, had 80% or more of their floor area modernised.

9. The national formula for DSG provides only a single flat rate to each school irrespective of whether schools have split sites through reorganisation or amalgamation. Schools Forum agreed that a flat rate should be allocated to each site, thereby upholding the principle that amalgamated schools should not be worse off by amalgamating. These additional flat rate payments have been funded from the DfE allocations made for schools which have closed or by reducing the formula allocation to all schools. This principle has not been applied to amalgamated VA schools which receive their DFC allocation direct from DCSF.

Arrangements for 2011-12

10. The national formula allocation for 2011-12 is:

Per School	Per Primary Pupil	Per Secondary Pupil	Per boarding pupil, PRU pupil or special school pupil
£4,000	£11.25	£16.88	£33.75

11. The distinction between modernised and unmodernised schools has been removed.
12. The DfE has been asked to clarify the arrangements for the allocation of DFC, especially in light of advice that the school financial regulations will require federations to retain any formula saving arising from the potential loss of individual lump sum payments.
13. The guidance from the DfE states that DFC allocations at local authority level are indicative and will be adjusted in line with end-of-year pupil figures in maintained schools. This could imply that the DfE will be basing the funding on current years pupil numbers not the preceding January as in the past.
14. To maintain the second lump sum to split site schools would cost £32,000 which, if met from the overall DFC allocation, would reduce the lump sum to all schools by approximately £190. Alternatively, it may be possible to meet this cost from DSG either by increasing the basic flat rate in the schools formula or through a separate flat rate factor effectively funding it from the Individual Schools Budget (ISB) quantum.
15. In 2011-12, the following eight schools would be eligible to receive a second flat rate payment:
 Brinkworth - federated in 1993
 Five Lanes - was Potterne and Worton
 The Manor - was Lowbourn Junior and St Michaels Infants
 The Village - was Monkton Farley and Atworth
 Corsham Primary - incorporated Box Highlands
 Lyneham Primary - was Junior and Infants
 The Mead - incorporated Wingfield
 Longford - was Odstock and Britford

Recommendations

16. Schools Forum is invited to consider whether:
- i. DFC should be allocated according to the current or preceding year's pupil numbers;
 - ii. Schools maintaining two sites should receive two lump sum payments and if so how it should be funded.

CAROLYN GODFREY
Director, Department for Children and Education

Report Author: Simon Burke
Head of Business and Commercial Services
Schools and Learning

Contact: Tel.: 01225 713840
simon.burke@wiltshire.gov.uk

Unpublished documents relied upon in the production of this report: None

This page is intentionally left blank

**Wiltshire County Council
SCHOOLS FORUM
3 March 2011**

Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme

Purpose of the paper

1. To seek a decision on whether the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme should continue in 2011-12.

Background

2. With effect from April 2011 the DfE have removed the requirement for Local Authorities to have a Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme in place. However, Regulations will allow a Local Authority to have a Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme if it wishes.
3. The proposed revised wording in the Regulations is as follows: "Local Authority Funding Schemes may contain a mechanism to claw back excess surplus balances. Any mechanism should have regard to the principle that schools should be moving towards greater autonomy, should not be constrained from making early efficiencies to support their medium-term budgeting in a tighter financial climate, and should not be burdened by bureaucracy. The mechanism should, therefore, be focused on only those schools which have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances and/or where some level of redistribution would support improved provision across a local area."
4. As this change is effective from April 2011, the Local Authority's current Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme will apply to excess balances carried forward at the end of 2010-11.
5. At its meeting in January, Schools Forum deferred a decision on whether to continue with the Scheme, pending identification of the national picture.
6. With the relaxation of the Regulations in this respect and the revised wording in paragraph three above, it could be interpreted that the Government would not seek to apply a national "top-slice" to school revenue balances, as was suggested by the previous administration.
7. The revised wording in paragraph three above indicates that, where a Scheme is in place, it should only focus on those schools that have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances. It should be noted that this is the focus of Wiltshire's current Scheme. Only those schools that have balances that exceed the permitted thresholds of 5% or 8% in secondary and primary / special schools respectively are required to justify their excessive balances.

Main Considerations

8. A decision on whether to continue with the current Scheme is required before 1 April 2011 as it will enable schools to be informed before they

finalise their budgets for 2011-12 onwards and also for any associated LA financial reporting and budget documents to be amended accordingly.

9. Whilst the intention of the Scheme is not to claw-back excessive balances from schools, its operation has enabled the LA to monitor and challenge schools that have built up excessive reserves. This would be difficult if the Scheme was not in place.
10. Wiltshire schools balances have reduced between 2008-09 and 2010-11 and this could be a consequence of the Scheme being in place. It should also be noted that the number of schools with excessive balances has reduced significantly over the past two years.
11. The DfE published a national comparison of school revenue balances recently which showed that the balances held by schools in Wiltshire are below the national average. It also showed that 14% of schools in Wiltshire held balances above the permitted threshold in 2009-10 compared to the England average of 27.7%.
12. As one of the lowest funded LAs in the country making a case to the Government for increased funding may be difficult if schools are holding significant or increasing balances.
13. The Audit Commission's Valuable Lessons report on improving economy and efficiency in schools (2009) commented that excessive revenue balances represent an inefficient use of public money as retained funding is not being used to improve outcomes for children.
14. The application of the Scheme has been refined recently with the aim of reducing the administration involved. If it is decided that the Scheme should continue it could be further refined as follows:
 - a. Requiring only those schools that exceed the permitted thresholds to submit a Controls on Surplus Balances monitoring statement. Currently all schools are encouraged to complete this return irrespective of the level of their reserves.
 - b. By deferring a decision on the recent consultation to change the Scheme as set out in the next Agenda item.

Proposal

15. That Schools Forum considers the merits of continuing the Scheme or removing it. Given that the DfE have not published any further guidance on this issue and it is difficult to gauge the national picture, consideration could be given to operating the Scheme in 2011-12 with a further review in the autumn.

Recommendation

16. That Schools Forum decides whether to continue with the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme in 2011-12.

CAROLYN GODFREY
Director, Department for Children & Education

Unpublished documents relied upon in the production of this Report: NONE

Environmental impact of the recommendations contained in this Report: NONE
KNOWN

Report author: Phil Cooch., Schools Accounting & Budget Support Manager,
Children & Education Finance Team, Resources Department
Tel: 01225 713814
e-mail: philcooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Results of the consultation on a change to the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme.

Purpose of the Paper

1. To report the results of the consultation on a proposal to change the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme.

Background

2. A Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme is in place which applies limits to school balances as follows:
 - Secondary schools up to 5% of current year school budget share
 - Primary and special schools, up to 8% of current year school budget share or £10,000 whichever is the higherAny surplus balances in excess of the above thresholds may be clawed back and redistributed to the sector from which they arose.
3. In 2009 the DCSF and Local Government Association conducted a joint survey of local authorities on the subject of school balances using the results to develop a best practice guide. An evaluation of Wiltshire Council practice against the key factors demonstrated that sound procedures were in place to successfully manage down school balances.
4. It is proposed to further support the management of excess surplus balances by adopting a key factor from the best practice guide that schools with balances over the thresholds are challenged on their whole balance and not just surpluses over the threshold. The 5% and 8% thresholds should not be viewed as targets but as the maximum percentage which might be retained in exceptional circumstances.

Results of the Consultation

5. A summary of the responses received is given below:-

Phase	Agree	Disagree	Total
Primary	38	25	63
Secondary	6	4	10
Special	0	1	1
Total	44	30	74

6. Several schools made comments and these are included in Appendix 1 attached to this report.

Main Considerations

7. The Secretary of State for Education published the schools White Paper, The Importance of Teaching, in November 2010. This advised that the requirement for local authorities to have a clawback mechanism would be removed from 2011/12 and that there would be a consultation on making changes to the current arrangements from 2012/13.

8. In December 2010, the DfE published revisions to the Scheme for Financing Schools which local authorities are required to take into account when publishing their own schemes. Regarding clawback mechanisms, the revised Scheme reads:

“The scheme may contain a mechanism to clawback excess surplus balances. Any mechanism should have regard to the principle that schools should be moving towards greater autonomy, should not be constrained from making early efficiencies to support their medium-term budgeting in a tighter financial climate, and should not be burdened by bureaucracy. The mechanism should, therefore, be focused on only those schools which have built up significant excessive uncommitted balances and/or where some level of redistribution would support improved provision across a local area.”

Local authorities are advised that they should consider removing or relaxing their existing mechanism with effect from 1st April 2011.

9. Due consideration should be given to the practicalities of challenging schools with balances over the thresholds on their whole balance and not just surpluses over the threshold.

10. The change to the existing Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme may not be perceived as being fair and equitable.

Proposal

11. That the proposed change to the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme to challenge schools with balances over the thresholds on their whole balance be reconsidered pending the publication of the DfE’s revised guidance on clawback arrangements.

Recommendations

12. That Schools Forum decides whether it wishes to implement the proposed change to the Scheme or defer a decision pending further guidance from the DfE.

CAROLYN GODFREY
Director, Department for Children & Education

Unpublished documents relied upon in the production of this Report: NONE

Environmental impact of the recommendations contained in this Report: NONE KNOWN

*Report author: Phil Cooch, Schools Accounting & Budget Support Manager,
Children & Education Finance Team, Resources Department
Tel: 01225 713814 e-mail: phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk*

	YES	NO	Comments	
2003 Fynamore	✓			Primary
2004 Greentrees	✓			Primary
2005 Nursteed				Primary
2006 The Mead	✓			Primary
2008 Fitzmaurice	✓			Primary
2009 Bratton County				Primary
2022 Ivy Lane, Chippenham				Primary
2023 St. Pauls Primary				Primary
2028 Corsham				Primary
2029 Lypiatt		✓		Primary
2031 Neston				Primary
2032 Corsham Regis				Primary
2034 Monkton Park				Primary
2037 Southbroom Infants				Primary
2040 Easton Royal				Primary
2045 Gomeldon				Primary
2052 Hilmarton				Primary
2053 Horningsham				Primary
2060 Luckington Community				Primary
			The council should be well aware of any schools that may have financial control issued through technician visits, audit previous FMSIS, trial balances, I & E returns etc. Monitoring those with proven issued is already within the remit. Further challenges simply on balance thresholds is an inefficiency of time and money.	
2065 Larkhill		✓		Primary
2086 Stanton St Quintin	✓			Primary
2087 Ramsbury		✓		Primary
2091 Harnham Infant				Primary
2134 New Close				Primary
			If governors hold excess reserves, challenge may help them develop more effective budgeting. Also if they do not need all of their funds it could be re-directed to those who do.	
2136 Westbury Infants	✓			Primary
2137 Westwood with Iford				Primary
2140 Wootton Bassett Infants				Primary
2157 Wyndham Park Infants				Primary
2159 Kiwi	✓			Primary
2162 Noremarsh Junior				Primary
2168 Priestley				Primary
2170 Grove				Primary
2178 Princecroft		✓		Primary
2180 Redland		✓		Primary
2184 Longleaze				Primary
2185 Mere				Primary
2190 Woodlands				Primary
2191 Manor Fields	✓			Primary
2192 Pembroke Park				Primary
2193 Wansdyke Community		✓		Primary
2196 Holbrook				Primary
2198 Ludwell				Primary
2202 St Sampsons Infant	✓			Primary
2208 Pewsey	✓			Primary
2216 Burbage	✓			Primary
2218 Kings Lodge County	✓			Primary
2222 Walwayne Court				Primary
2223 Bowerhill				Primary
2225 Bitham Brook				Primary
2226 Chippenham Charter				Primary
2227 Newtown Community		✓		Primary
2228 Queens Crescent	✓			Primary
2230 Longmeadow	✓		It would be foolish not to do so!	Primary
3000 All Cannings CE	✓			Primary
3002 Ashton Keynes C of E				Primary

	YES	NO	Comments	
3013 Box C of E				Primary
3015 Christ Church				Primary
3017 Longford C of E VC		✓	This was discussed as a governors finance sub-committee on 27/1/11	Primary
3018 Broad Hinton C of E				Primary
3019 Broad Town C of E		✓	I am very concerned of the impact of this on small schools. 8% really limits my strategic plans for the future. As a small school every penny counts and to enable us to maintain our staffing structure & the future of the school this clawback decision seems very unfair when we might end up in a deficit as a result of the clawback. It does not encourage schools to plan for best value for money. I can spend money on a range of resources but not have enough to maintain my staff the following year. I would like to arrange a meeting with you to discuss my concerns further. I would also like to know what form of monitoring are in place to see the impact on small schools.	Primary
3020 St. Nicholas C of E VC , Bromham	✓			Primary
3021 St Marys Broughton Gifford				Primary
3022 Bulford St Leonards				Primary
3023 St Katherines C of E Controlled				Primary
3030 St Dunstan				Primary
3035 Cherhill C of E				Primary
3036 Chirton C of E			I am abstaining on this one as I can't honestly say I understand the implications fully enough to make a sensible judgement. My feeling is that challenge on the whole balance is asking us to be very certain in an increasingly uncertain financial climate.	Primary
3038 Christian Malford C of E				Primary
3040 Colerne C of E		✓	It's impractical, unnecessary and yet again another example of the ridiculous beurocracy heaped upon our schools.	Primary
3045 St. Sampsons C E Junior				Primary
3047 Crockerton C of E		✓		Primary
3048 Crudwell C of E				Primary
3049 Collingbourne C of E				Primary
3056 Southbroom C.E.Junior				Primary
3061 Durrington All Saints Infant				Primary
3063 Durrington C of E Controlled Junior		✓	We don't see the positive impact this would make, other than increasing workload on schools. We feel we already view the budget as a 'whole' and have justified rollover in these terms.	Primary
3071 Figheldean St Michaels C of E	✓			Primary
3078 Grafton				Primary
3086 Heddington C of E				Primary
3088 Hilperton C of E				Primary
3090 Holt V C	✓			Primary
3091 Hullavington C of E				Primary
3094 Keevil C of E Aided				Primary
3096 Kington St Michael C of E	✓			Primary
3100 Lacock CE VC Primary				Primary
3102 Langley Fitzurse C of E.				Primary

	YES	NO	Comments	
3104 Lea & Garsdon C of E		✓		Primary
3110 Lydiard Millicent C of E				Primary
3117 Malmesbury C of E				Primary
			It seems unfair to ask one school that exceeds the % by say £500 to account for ALL of the surplus and another that is £500 under not to. Either ALL schools should give plans for ANY surplus or none.	
3123 St Marys C.E. Infant , Marlborough		✓		Primary
3134 Newton Tony C of E				Primary
3135 North Bradley C of E				Primary
3140 Oaksey C of E VC				Primary
3141 Oare Cof E				Primary
3143 Ogbourne St. George				Primary
3149 Preshute				Primary
3150 St. Marys C of E, Purton	✓			Primary
			Unable to respond as I do not know what form the challenge will take.	
3158 Harnham Junior				Primary
3159 Seagry C of E				Primary
3160 St. Georges C of E				Primary
3161 Shalbourne C of E				Primary
3162 Shaw C of E				Primary
3163 Sherston C of E				Primary
3164 Shrewton C of E				Primary
3166 Southwick C of E				Primary
3170 Staverton C of E				Primary
3172 Stratford-Sub-Castle VC				Primary
3174 Sutton Veny CE				Primary
3176 St Marks C of E Junior, Salisbury				Primary
3186 Urchfont C of E				Primary
3190 St John's C E , Warminster				Primary
3191 The Minster CE				Primary
3192 Westbury C.E. Junior				Primary
3193 Westbury Leigh C.E	✓			Primary
3199 Winsley C of E	✓			Primary
3201 Winterbourne Earls C E Controlled				Primary
3203 St Bartholomews CE	✓			Primary
3205 Sambourne C E				Primary
3207 Dilton Marsh C of E				Primary
3216 St. Peters Junior , Marlborough				Primary
			Paperwork overload is huge - this is just more of the same and what does it achieve?	
3220 Minety C of E		✓		Primary
3222 St. Barnabas				Primary
3229 Coombe Bissett				Primary
3230 Dinton C of E	✓			Primary
3239 St John's C of E, Tisbury	✓			Primary
3242 Brinkworth Earl Danbys C of E				Primary
3243 Great Bedwyn C of E Controlled				Primary
3244 By Brook Valley C of E				Primary
3300 St Michaels, Aldbourne Marlborough				Primary
3306 St Nicholas C of E				Primary
3308 Bishops Cannings C. E. (Aided)	✓			Primary
3316 Chapmanslade C of E VA				Primary
3318 Chilton Foliat C of E				Primary
3319 St Peters , Chippenham		✓		Primary
3330 Derry Hill C of E (Aided)	✓			Primary
3331 St Peters C ofE Aided, Devizes				Primary

	YES	NO	Comments	
3344 Forest & Sandridge C of E	✓		I agree with the proposal as this will promote increased accountability, as it may be schools need further advice on how to make best use of their funding, rather than to have money taken away. It is fair enough to take back the % amount exceeded as per existing guidelines if this cannot be allocated to essential expenditure requirements, and I can confirm, our school for one, certainly does not use the % figure as a target.	Primary
3352 Heytesbury C.E. Aided				Primary
3355 St Nicholas, Porton	✓			Primary
3362 St. Andrews, Laverstock				Primary
3366 Morgans Vale & Woodfalls C of E VA	✓		We have clear reasons why we are operating a surplus in the short term and will happily account for this with County and it is part of our 3 year spending plan. We would expect all schools operating with a surplus to do likewise.	Primary
3372 The New Forest C of E VA		✓	In these times of budget cuts etc. schools should be encouraged to prepare for leaner times by good budget management. This 'cushion' allows them to deal with shortfalls so avoiding redundancies etc. Only the balance over the threshold should be accounted for.	Primary
3381 Rushall C of E VA		✓		Primary
3383 Sarum St. Pauls C of E VA				Primary
3387 St Martins C of E				Primary
3388 Seend C of E Aided				Primary
3396 St Thomas aBecket C.E. Aided				Primary
3400 West Ashton C.E				Primary
3401 Dauntseys Aided				Primary
3402 Whiteparish All Saints C of E VA				Primary
3405 Winterslow				Primary
3406 Woodborough C.E				Primary
3407 Woodford Valley CE		✓		Primary
3412 Christ the King RC				Primary
3418 St Josephs Catholic	✓			Primary
3425 St Osmunds Catholic				Primary
3430 St John's Catholic, Trowbridge				Primary
3435 Wardour Catholic				Primary
3437 St. Patricks R.C. Corsham		✓	Agree that schools going over the allowed % should be able to justify the over % rollover only not the whole of their balance.	Primary
3448 Bemerton St Johns CE				Primary
3449 Broad Chalke C of E Aided	✓			Primary
3450 Great Wishford				Primary
3453 Chilmark	✓			Primary

	YES	NO	Comments	
3454 Semley C of E VA		✓	In small schools the margins are very small and the sums involved are very easily significantly altered from one year to the next. For example it is quite possible to be struggling to remain below the 8% rollover one year while simultaneously knowing that there may be a deficit budget the following year. The loss of a very few children or one or two staff crossing the threshold can make a huge difference when you are operating on a small budget. Too much pressure on the 8% sum prevents good housekeeping - and encourages profligate spending just to ensure that the school remains below the rollover where a more practical action would be to carry forward the surplus to fund a lean year. Please consider that different criteria may be needed for different sizes of school.	Primary
3456 Holy Trinity C of E Aided, Great Cheverell		✓	It is already difficult to plan for unexpected expenditure - effectively this means no part of a budget can be left for emergencies - long term sickness of an uninsured HLTA, sudden increase/decrease in pupil numbers etc, because all of it must be committed to some project - likely to be of a capital nature.	Primary
3457 Walter Powell C of E VA				Primary
3459 Hindon C of E VA				Primary
3460 Alderbury & West Grimstead C of E				Primary
3461 Kennet Valley C of E				Primary
3462 Amesbury Archer				Primary
3463 Whitesheet				Primary
3465 Wylve Valley C of E VA		✓		Primary
3466 The Manor				Primary
3467 Churchfields The village School				Primary
3468 Amesbury Primary				Primary
3469 Five Lanes				Primary
3470 Wilton & Barford				Primary
3471 Lyneham Primary				Primary
3472 Bellefield C of E Primary & Nursery	✓		Schools may be less reticent to some if we were ever given a decent forward view of what to expect!	Primary
4000 Abbeyfield				Secondary
4001 Wyvern College				Secondary
4006 The Trafalgar School at Downton	✓			Secondary
4013 Melksham Oak		✓		Secondary
4064 Malmesbury	✓			Secondary
4066 The Corsham				Secondary
4067 Wootton Bassett				Secondary
4069 The Clarendon				Secondary
4070 The Stonehenge				Secondary
4071 Avon Valley College				Secondary
4072 Kingdown		✓	No, I think they should only have to explain the higher amount. We all need to keep contingencies and funds for staffing & projects through the academic year.	Secondary
4075 The John of Gaunt				Secondary

	YES	NO	Comments	
4511 St Edmunds Girls	✓			Secondary
4537 St Laurence				Secondary
4610 St Josephs Catholic	✓			Secondary
5200 Aloeric				Primary
5201 Downton C of E VA				Primary
5202 King's Park Primary	✓			Primary
5204 St. Edmunds RC				Primary
5205 Frogwell				Primary
5206 Studley Green				Primary
5207 St.Georges Catholic		✓		Primary
5208 St Mary's R.C , Chippenham				Primary
5209 Paxcroft				Primary
5210 Wingfield C of E VA				Primary
5212 Sutton Benger	✓			Primary
5213 Holy Trinity C of E				Primary
5214 St Josephs Catholic, Devizes				Primary
5215 Castle				Primary
5216 Pitton C E				Primary
5217 Zouch	✓			Primary
5218 Clarendon Junior				Primary
5219 Clarendon Infants		✓		Primary
5222 Rowde C of E				Primary
5224 All Saints VA, Netheravon	✓			Primary
5225 Avenue				Primary
5400 St. Augustines Catholic College		✓		Secondary
5402 Lavington	✓			Secondary
5403 Pewsey Vale				Secondary
			The logic for this proposal does not appear to hold water when the position of schools which have balances just under the threshold is taken into account. If the scheme is to be extended, the options seem to be either to challenge schools above the threshold, but make provision to consider challenging those schools which consistently carry forward relatively "high" revenue balances, or require all schools to submit a surplus balance return. However, extending the scheme would seem to fly in the face of government policy which is focussed o delegating responsibility to schools.	
5404 Sheldon		✓		Secondary
5405 St Johns & Community College				Secondary
5406 The John Bentley				Secondary
5408 Bradon Forest				Secondary
5411 Devizes				Secondary
5412 South Wilts Grammar				Secondary
5413 Bishop Wordsworths				Secondary
5415 Matravers	✓			Secondary
7002 Rowdeford				Special
7007 Downland				Special
7008 Exeter House		✓		Special
7009 St Nicholas				Special
7010 Larkrise				Special
7015 Springfields				Special
Primary	38	25		
Secondary	6	4		
Special	0	1		

	Yes/Agree	No/Disagree	
Primary	38	25	63
Secondary	6	4	10
Special	0	1	1
Grand Total	44	30	74
	59.5%	40.5%	30.83%

Consultation comments

		YES	NO	
				Q1 - Do you agree with the proposal to challenge schools with revenue balances over the 5% and 8% thresholds, for secondary and primary/special schools respectively, to show that they have plans for their whole balance and not just that part of the balance that takes them over the threshold?
1	Primary		✓	The council should be well aware of any schools that may have financial control issued through technician visits, audit previous FMSIS, trial balances, I & E returns etc. Monitoring those with proven issued is already within the remit. Further challenges simply on balance thresholds is an inefficiency of time and money.
2	Primary	✓		If governors hold excess reserves, challenge may help them develop more effective budgeting. Also if they do not need all of their funds it could be re-directed to those who do.
3	Primary	✓		It would be foolish not to do so!
4	Primary		✓	This was discussed as a governors finance sub-committee on 27/1/11
5	Primary		✓	I am very concerned of the impact of this on small schools. 8% really limits my strategic plans for the future. As a small school every penny counts and to enable us to maintain our staffing structure & the future of the school this clawback decision seems very unfair when we might end up in a deficit as a result of the clawback. It does not encourage schools to plan for best value for money. I can spend money on a range of resources but not have enough to maintain my staff the following year. I would like to arrange a meeting with you to discuss my concerns further. I would also like to know what form of monitoring are in place to see the impact on small schools.
6	Primary			I am abstaining on this one as I can't honestly say I understand the implications fully enough to make a sensible judgement. My feeling is that challenge on the whole balance is asking us to be very certain in an increasingly uncertain financial climate.
7	Primary		✓	It's impractical, unnecessary and yet again another example of the ridiculous beaurocracy heaped upon our schools.
8	Primary		✓	We don't see the positive impact this would make, other than increasing workload on schools. We feel we already view the budget as a 'whole' and have justified rollover in these terms.
9	Primary		✓	It seems unfair to ask one school that exceeds the % by say £500 to account for ALL of the surplus and another that is £500 under not to. Either ALL schools should give plans for ANY surplus or none.
10	Primary			Unable to respond as I do not know what form the challenge will take.
11	Primary		✓	Paperwork overload is huge - this is just more of the same and what does it achieve?
12	Primary	✓		I agree with the proposal as this will promote increased accountability, as it may be schools need further advice on how to make best use of their funding, rather than to have money taken away. It is fair enough to take back the % amount exceeded as per existing guidelines if this cannot be allocated to essential expenditure requirements, and I can confirm, our school for one, certainly does not use the % figure as a target.
13	Primary	✓		We have clear reasons why we are operating a surplus in the short term and will happily account for this with County and it is part of our 3 year spending plan. We would expect all schools operating with a surplus to do likewise.
14	Primary		✓	In these times of budget cuts etc. schools should be encouraged to prepare for leaner times by good budget management. This 'cushion' allows them to deal with shortfalls so avoiding redundancies etc. Only the balance over the threshold should be accounted for.

Consultation comments

		YES	NO	Q1 - Do you agree with the proposal to challenge schools with revenue balances over the 5% and 8% thresholds, for secondary and primary/special schools respectively, to show that they have plans for their whole balance and not just that part of the balance that takes them over the threshold?
15	Primary		✓	Agree that schools going over the allowed % should be able to justify the over % rollover only not the whole of their balance.
16	Primary		✓	In small schools the margins are very small and the sums involved are very easily significantly altered from one year to the next. For example it is quite possible to be struggling to remain below the 8% rollover one year while simultaneously knowing that there may be a deficit budget the following year. The loss of a very few children or one or two staff crossing the threshold can make a huge difference when you are operating on a small budget. Too much pressure on the 8% sum prevents good housekeeping - and encourages profligate spending just to ensure that the school remains below the rollover where a more practical action would be to carry forward the surplus to fund a lean year. Please consider that different criteria may be needed for different sizes of school.
17	Primary		✓	It is already difficult to plan for unexpected expenditure - effectively this means no part of a budget can be left for emergencies - long term sickness of an uninsured HLTA, sudden increase/decrease in pupil numbers etc, because all of it must be committed to some project - likely to be of a capital nature.
18	Primary	✓		Schools may be less reticent to some if we were ever given a decent forward view of what to expect!
19	Secondary		✓	No, I think they should only have to explain the higher amount. We all need to keep contingencies and funds for staffing & projects through the academic year.
20	Secondary		✓	The logic for this proposal does not appear to hold water when the position of schools which have balances just under the threshold is taken into account. If the scheme is to be extended, the options seem to be either to challenge schools above the threshold, but make provision to consider challenging those schools which consistently carry forward relatively "high" revenue balances, or require all schools to submit a surplus balance return. However, extending the scheme would seem to fly in the face of government policy which is focussed on delegating responsibility to schools.

This page is intentionally left blank