

AGENDA

Meeting: Schools Forum
Place: Council Chamber - Council Offices, Browfort, Devizes
Date: Thursday 13 October 2011
Time: 1.30 pm

Briefing Arrangements:

Briefing will be held at 11.00am in the Council Chamber, Browfort and will focus on YPSS and associated funding models.

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:

Mr N Baker
Mrs Julia Bird
Mr David Cowley
Mr C Dark
Mrs A Ferries
Mrs J Finney
Mr J Foster
Mrs C Grant
Mr J Hawkins
Mr M Keeling

Ms I Lancaster-Gaye
Miss S Lund
Dr Tina Pagett
Mr J Proctor
Mrs Joy Tubbs
Vacancy
Vacancy
Mr M Watson
Mrs C Williamson

AGENDA

PART I

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

1. **Election of Chairman**

To elect a Chairman for the 2011/12 year.

2. **Election of Vice-Chairman**

To elect a Vice-Chairman for the 2011/12 year.

3. **Apologies**

4. **Minutes of the previous Meeting** (*Pages 1 - 10*)

To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2011 (copy attached)

7. **Declaration of Interests**

To receive any declarations of personal or prejudicial interests.

6. **Chairman's Announcements**

7. **Schools Forum Constitution, Memberships and Arrangements** (*To Follow*)

To clarify the current constitution and membership of Schools Forum.

To review the operation and make-up of Schools Forum in the light of the development of Wiltshire Governor Groups and changes to academy status by a proportion of Wiltshire Schools

8. **Reports from Working Groups** (*Pages 11 - 16*)

To receive updates from the following working groups:

- School Funding Working Group (*documents attached*)
- Early Years Reference Groups (*report to follow*)
- Schools Services Group (*verbal update*)

9. **DSG Update paper** (*Pages 17 - 24*)

To receive an update paper, which will confirm the final DSG settlement for 2011/12, consider the Final Pupil Premium allocation for 2011/12 and proposed actions and also consider– initial formula issues and proposals for Savings in the 2012/13 DSG.

The budget monitoring report is also included.

10. **Schools Funding Consultations** *(To Follow)*

To summarise the response to the consultations following the seminar on 4th October.

11. **Schools Revenue Balances 2010/11** *(Pages 25 - 32)*

To analyse the revenue balances at the end of the financial year 2010/11 and the implications for the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme.

12. **Schools Financial Value Statement** *(Pages 33 - 36)*

To consider a report from Phil Cooch that will introduce the new statement and outline the implications for schools.

13. **Schools PFI Affordability Gap** *(Pages 37 - 42)*

14. **SEN Services - Activity Analysis** *(To Follow)*

To receive a presentation from Karina Kulawik, this will include a breakdown of activities undertaken by the Inclusion Service across core, statutory and discretionary services. Schools Forum to consider which elements of the service should be funded.

15. **Carbon Reduction Commitment - Impact on Schools** *(Pages 43 - 56)*

To identify the impact on the schools budget and consider proposals for charging DSG or individual schools.

16. **Young People's Support Service** *(Pages 57 - 84)*

To receive an update on proposals for the service and to consider proposed models for devolving funds.

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

To confirm the dates of future meetings, as follows:

01 December 2011 – location to be confirmed

19 January 2011 – location to be confirmed

18. **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 23 JUNE 2011 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, BROWFORT, DEVIZES.

Present:

Mr N Baker, Mrs Julia Bird, Mr C Dark, Mrs A Davey, Mrs A Ferries, Mrs J Finney, Mrs C Grant, Mr T Hatala (Substitute), Mr J Hawkins, Mr M Keeling, Ms I Lancaster-Gaye, Mr M Watson and Mrs C Williamson

Also Present:

Mr Andy Bridewell and Cllr Bill Moss

142. **Public Participation and Questions**

The Chairman welcomed those present to the June meeting of the Schools Forum. There was no public participation.

143. **Apologies**

Alice Kemp
Tina Pagett
Carol Grant
Sarah Lund
Ann Ferries
Tim Gilson

Cllr Lionel Grundy

Phil Cooch

144. **Minutes of the previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held 03 March were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record, and sign the minutes of the Schools Forum meeting held 03 March 2011.

145. **Declaration of Interests**

None

146. **Chairman's Announcements**

At the request of the Chairman, it was agreed that a report into the constitution and future set-up of the Schools Forum be brought back to the next meeting to clarify and determine the groups approach to vacancies and sub-committees.

147. **Update from Children's Trust Board**

Julia Cramp, Service Director Commissioning and Performance, DCE gave a verbal update on the work of the Children's Trust Board since the last meeting of the Schools Forum.

It was explained that there were two key components to the Children's Trust board from an organisational point of view – the Commissioning Executive, and the Stakeholder partnership. Both of these bodies had representation from primary and secondary schools and governors, in addition to officers of Wiltshire Council and partner organisations.

Two strategies had been developed by the Trust in recent months namely:

- 13 to 19 Commissioning Strategy (draft). Consultation ends 5th August 2011
- Emotional Wellbeing & Mental Health Strategy (draft) – consultation on this strategy open to mid-July.

It was explained that the Trust was also working on a new set of multi-agency threshold documents for school-age children, which would give clear and authoritative guidance on when and how to intervene.

These documents would be available for comment within the next two weeks.

Additionally the Trust was revising the Children's Plan, which now had three central aims:

- ✓ Early Intervention
- ✓ Raising Aspirations
- ✓ Living Healthily

A separate strategy and plans were in development for Children in Care.

Further information can be found at the partnership's website: www.wiltshirepathways.org

148. **Young People's Support Service (YPSS) Update**

The Committee received a verbal update from Martin Cooper, Manager for Behaviour & Attendance, DCE.

Martin explained that he had assumed his role in April, and his priority was to revisit the YPSS Review undertaken by Colin Smith last year. The report included 30 recommendations, some which had already been adopted as part of the restructure of DCE earlier in the year.

A retiring Headteacher from Clarendon had been seconded to produce an implementation plan and agree which recommendations should be pursued.

Since the report was issued the YPSS team have undertaken some internal evaluations and also have received an OFSTED inspection, results of which are currently awaiting publication.

These actions have established the fact that structural changes will be necessary to achieve the goals that Wiltshire Council has in mind for the YPSS. There will need to be a new way of managing the Virtual School / Pupil Referral Units.

Four options have been investigated with a view to implementing any chosen plan from September. The options are as follows:

- 1) To enter into an agreement with an existing (already identified) special school to provide the services
- 2) To enter into an agreement with an outside provider.
- 3) To separate the function along geographical lines and enter into an agreement with the local school federations in the regions of Wiltshire to provide YPSS services in each area.
- 4) A mixed-economy of the options above.

At the current point in time only the West Wiltshire federation is in a position to offer services immediately. YPSS staff were currently being consulted on these options and an entrustment document was being prepared by legal services.

149. **SEN Forward Plan**

The Schools Forum noted the SEN Forward Plan

150. **SEN Equipment Budget**

Karina Kulawik, Team Manager (Central SEN Services), summarised her report for the committee. It was explained that following the transition to unitary status, the arrangements for funding for equipment were extremely fragmented and inconsistent.

The new approach aimed to provide a common understanding of when a school should purchase an item from its delegated budget, and when it should expect the Council to provide certain items. Feedback from the PHF and SEN working group gave an initial indication that a list format would be preferred by schools, with examples of how certain common high and lower value items should be purchased. It should also help staff to work more efficiently.

The central funding for SEN equipment had now been collected into a single source which amounted to around £108,000

Contributions from Schools Forum Members were focused on the following issues:

- The growing complexity of needs and demand for SEN services
- Contributions from the Health Authorities in Wiltshire – Officers promised to investigate and clarify the obligations of partner organisations in this area.
- The arrangements for provision of equipment for those Wiltshire Students placed out-of-county and for those placed in Wiltshire by other authorities – for which the recoupment arrangements would be very complex.

Resolved:

- 1) To return an update paper to the October meeting**
- 2) School Forum confirm the process for the provision of specialist equipment to support children & young people with access needs in Wiltshire setting, as follows:**
 - **Schools will be required to pay for auxiliary aids to support inclusion as per attached list.**
 - **high value items will be provided by the LA. This option will require continuation of a centrally retained equipment budget.**
- 3) The letter to be sent to Schools confirming and explaining the new arrangements is to make clear that individual cases will always be looked at by Central SEN Services.**

151. Dedicated Schools Budget Final Outturn 2010/11

Liz Williams updated the Forum on the Final Outturn of the dedicated schools Budget 2010/11. The figures show an underspend against DSG of £2.899 million. This was a favourable movement of £0.400 million compared with the previous report to Schools Forum.

The key contributory factors for the underspend were explained to be the following:

- The Independent Special Schools budget underspent by £0.343 million.
- The recoupment budget (for placements in other local authority special schools and non-school placements) was also underspent by £0.723 million.
- Early Years budgets underspent by £1.603 million, as a result of lower than expected take up for the extension of the free entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds from 10 to 15 hours.

Standards Funds – It was explained to the Schools Forum that the DfE wrote to Local Authorities in March stating that the final payment of 2010/11 standards funds would not be made to LAs as the funding was now included in the DSG for 2011/12. Local Authorities disagreed with this approach and the non

payment does in fact represent a reduction in grant in 2010/11. For Wiltshire the reduction is £1.088 million.

Wiltshire had complied with the DfE guidance and set up a debtor for £1.088 million in the 2010/11 accounts, noting that the risk of this approach is that the money will not be forthcoming in 2012/13 and therefore the Council will face a reduction in schools funding in that year.

A short discussion ensued wherein Stephanie Denovan highlighted the Council's attempts to reform and continue the Every Child a Reader style programmes, in a manner adapted to Wiltshire's needs.

Resolved:

- 1) To note the outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Budget in 2010/11**
- 2) To note the issues relating to the 2010/11 standards funds and to consider this further once the final DSG settlement for 2011/12 is confirmed.**
- 3) Not to commit the identified underspend at this juncture in the meeting.**

152. **Maternity Costs - Keeping in Touch (KIT) Days**

It was explained that the purpose of this item was to formalise the Council's policy regarding Keeping in Touch days, in order for guidance to be sent to Schools to clarify the matter. The current legislation permits managers to decide upon the granting of KIT days to individuals. Members were asked to consider whether individual schools or the central schools budget should fund these.

Resolved:

- 1) That KIT days be charged to individual schools.**
- 2) That this change be effective from 1 September 2011.**
- 3) That a letter of clarification be sent out to all Schools as a joint statement from the Human Resources department and the Schools Forum.**

153. **Early Years Reference Group - Membership**

Simon Burke spoke to his report on the membership of the Early Years Reference Group and invited the committee to review its membership. He also confirmed that validation of the headcount figures was undertaken, and that calculations took place once a year to identify and note the impact of children from neighbouring counties who attended an Early Years provider in Wiltshire.

Resolved:

- 1)
 - i. **To appoint Alan Butler, Fiona Webb, Lucy Waterman and Andrea Gray as members of the EYRG;**
 - ii. **To re-appoint Rosemary Collard, Mark Cawley, Mike Fairbeard and John Proctor for a further term of office;**
 - iii. **To continue to seek a representative from children's centres;**
 - iv. **Not to seek to replace Janet Stanford when her term of office expires in November.**
- 2)
 - i. **To meet the requirements of the Code of Practice, and the wishes of providers, it is proposed to introduce a system to enable providers to claim funding (and to refund any over-payment) with effect from September 2011.**
 - ii. **Providers will be required to submit details of children not declared in the headcount for the funding period in the following circumstances:**
 - **children who started to access free entitlement with the provider after the headcount date;**
 - **children who ceased to access free entitlement with the provider after the headcount date;**
 - **children who were inadvertently not included on the headcount form;**
 - **children who were included on the headcount form but for whom inquiries were outstanding**

154. **Final DSG Settlement / DSG Update**

Liz Williams updated Schools Forum on the projected level of DSG and the implications for the schools budget in the absence of the final Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for 2011/12

The so-far unvalidated January count of pupils, including academies, is expected to be 63,845 or 35 pupils lower than the initial estimate which was based on October pupil data it was explained. Within this, numbers of pupils in schools are 69 higher the initial estimate and the numbers of 3 and 4 year olds in the Early Years Census are 104 lower than estimated. The implications of the expected reduction in pupil numbers will result in a shortfall in DSG, compared with the original estimate of £0.165 million.

The updated calculation for the number of schools which had converted to academies on 1st April 2011 indicates a LACSEG deduction of £0.312 million.

This represents a further shortfall in DSG compared with the original estimate of £0.074 million. However this estimate does not include any funds returning to the budget as income from traded services.

The total shortfall in DSG compared with the agreed schools budget is estimated at £0.239 million.

Members of the Schools Forum were asked to consider whether or not to fund the expected shortfall in the current financial year from the underspend rolled forward from 2010/11.

It was confirmed by officers that the Music Education Grant Allocation 2011/12 will continue to be allocated to primary schools in Wiltshire to support music tuition at Key Stage 2 on the same basis as in previous years.

More information had also been forthcoming on the arrangements for administering the Looked After Children (LAC) pupil premium, and it was confirmed that the funding follows the child not the school and will track in-year changes in the statement status of a child.

Officers were asked to investigate the precise definition of an 'Armed Forces Family' used for the pupil premium for children from military families: in particular whether those eligible must have parents / guardians in the military or whether having other close relatives in the military would constitute eligibility for the measure.

John Hawkins and the rest of the Forum thanked officers for their work in producing these figures.

Resolved:

- a. That the projected shortfall in DSG for 2011/12 should be offset from the 2010/11 DSG underspend.
- b. That if the final DSG settlement is significantly different from this estimate, the Schools Funding Working Group should meet as a matter of urgency in July to consider any further implications on the schools budget.
- c. That Music Education Grant for 2011/12 be allocated to schools on the same allocation basis as the Music Standards Funds grant in 2010/11.
- d. That the payment of the Pupil Premium for Looked After Children be linked to the payments for the Personal Education Plan for each child meeting the criteria of "looked after continuously for at least 6 months".

155. **Schools Funding Consultation Response**

The Schools Forum noted the draft consultation response, in particular the inclusion of the below table which made clear the discrepancy in the Guaranteed Unit of Fund measure (GUF) received by Wiltshire Council, compared to other local authorities.

Pupils per DSG Calculator		63895			
Local Authority	GUF 2011-12	Difference	Total increased GUF if Wiltshire funded at the same level	Potential extra funding that a 200 pupil primary school would receive	Potential extra funding that a 1000 pupil secondary school would receive
Wiltshire	4593	0	£0		
Hampshire	4648	55	£3,514,225	£11,000	£55,000
BANES	4788	195	£12,459,525	£39,000	£195,000
Glos	4661	68	£4,344,860	£13,600	£68,000
Swindon	4696	103	£6,581,185	£20,600	£103,000
Dorset	4683	90	£5,750,550	£18,000	£90,000
North Somerset	4677	84	£5,367,180	£16,800	£84,000
Somerset	4668	75	£4,792,125	£15,000	£75,000

Liz Williams, Head of Finance made the forum aware that the second phase of consultation was due to take place soon – any contributions from Forum members and other interested parties were welcome.

156. **Intended Use of Revenue Balances (IURB) Monitoring 2009/10**

The Schools Forum noted the report, commending the fact that there were no failures to complete the Intended Use of Revenue Balances Monitoring Return or the respond to the request for information.

157. **Report of the School Funding Working Group**

The Forum noted the report of the Schools Funding working group.

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

The dates and location of future meetings were noted.

159. **Urgent Items**

None

(Duration of meeting: 1.40 - 3.35 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

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

13 October 2011

Report from the Schools Forum School Funding Working Group

Purpose of report

1. To report on the meeting of the School Funding Working Group held on 30th September 2011

Main considerations for School Forum

2. The draft minutes of the meeting are attached at Appendix 1.
3. The School Funding Working Group made the following recommendations:

4. **SEN Support Service Activity Analysis**

It was recommended that cluster groups should consider, in particular, the services that are funded by DSG and that are in scope for LACSEG to review what services should be centrally funded and what might be traded.

It was agreed that the paper be amended to identify the costs of the statutory elements of each service

5. **Carbon Reduction Commitment for Schools**

The group considered a paper outlining options for the charging of the schools share of Wiltshire's carbon emissions to the schools budget.

It was recommended that Option 2, charging individual schools, be implemented.

6. **Pupil Premium Grant 2011/12**

The group considered the final allocation of pupil premium grant for 2011/12 and recommended that allocations to individual schools be amended in line with the final data on free schools meals and service pupils in order not to overspend against the grant allocation.

7. **Schools Revenue Balances 2010/11**

It was agreed that the 3 schools who appeared to have exceeded the permissible thresholds be subject to clawback and invited to appeal.

Proposals

8. That Schools Forum note the recommendations made by the Schools Funding Working Group.

**Name of Director Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education**

Report author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)

01225 713675

Elizabeth.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

**Schools Forum Schools Funding Working Group and SEN Working Group
Joint Meeting**

Minutes – 30th September 2011

Present: Liz Williams, Martin Watson, Phil Cooch, John Hawkins, Neil Baker, Julia Cramp, John Kimberley, Judith Finney, Jane Nicholls, Sarah O'Donnell, Karina Kulawik, Arianne Crampton (for the item on the Carbon Reduction Commitment)

Apologies: Carol Grant, Tim Gilson (J Nicholls substituting), Tristan Williams, Phil Beaumont, Bruce Douglas

		Action
1	<p>Minutes from Previous Meeting The note of the meeting of 24th January had been discussed at Schools Forum</p> <p>The letter to schools regarding the funding of KIT days had not yet been sent to schools as EW still needed to check the information given in the letter against the guidance on HR Direct.</p>	EW
2	<p>SEN Support Services Activity Analysis KK outlined the work that had been done to analyse the activity of SEN Support Services across the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statutory 2. Critical 3. Essential/Capacity Building 4. Traded activity <p>Explaining that the analysis had been carried out by individual teams but then moderated across the service to ensure consistency of approach. The analysis had been discussed with PHF but had not yet been considered by WASSH.</p> <p>The purpose of the paper was to get a steer from Schools Forum on those services that should be delivered and funded centrally and which services, if any, could be delegated and traded.</p> <p>NB fed back that the paper had been well received at PHF but that it was difficult to get all schools to agree on approach as views would depend on how much use they currently made of services and what their experience had been.</p> <p>There was some discussion on the DSG funded services in particular and whether funding could be delegated or should be held centrally.</p> <p>The group agreed that cluster groups should be asked to consider the DSG funded services plus those that are in scope for the LACSEG adjustment and look at what should be provided centrally and what could be traded.</p> <p>The group requested that the statutory elements of each service be costed and these figures included in the paper.</p>	EW

3	<p>Carbon Reduction Commitment for Schools</p> <p>Ariane Crampton introduced the Carbon Reduction Scheme and updated the group on the current position. The report highlighted that the schools' share of emissions in Wiltshire (including academies) was around 60% of the total for the Council. Guidance from the government now indicates that the schools share of a Local Authorities CRC emissions should be charged to the schools budget. based on an estimated charge of £16 per tonne CO₂ this would represent an overall cost of £371,258</p> <p>Within the paper 3 options were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Top slice to the overall schools budget 2. Charge to individual schools based on emissions 3. Combination of options 1 and 2 <p>AC noted that the favoured option of the Cabinet Members responsible for the environment and for schools was to charge individual schools in order to incentivise schools to reduce consumption.</p> <p>The group recommended that Option 2 in the report, charging individual schools, be agreed by Schools Forum.</p> <p>It was agreed that the LA will provide data to schools on expected carbon usage.</p>	
3	<p>DSG Update</p> <p>EW circulated a summary of the final DSG settlement for 2011/12. The final DSG allocation was £140,000 lower than the initial estimate and it was agreed that this would be funded from the underspend carried forward from 2010/11, as proposed to Schools Forum at the June meeting.</p> <p>EW also updated the group on initial proposals for savings to be achieved from the 2012/13 budget. £1.9 million savings need to be identified in order to adjust for the one off funding in the 2011/12 budget. Initial proposals included a proposal to apply negative inflation to the overall delegated budget in the expectation of a -1.5% MFG for schools next year.</p>	
4	<p>Pupil Premium 2011/12</p> <p>PC updated the group on the final allocation of Pupil Premium Grant for 2011/12. The final allocation is £2,818,559 compared with a provisional estimate of £2,881,990. PC explained that the DfE had not provided a school by school breakdown of the final allocation but that if the finalised data on FSM and service pupils was applied then the final allocations total £2,810,640.</p> <p>The final LA data gives a total PPG allocation that is £71,350 less than the provisional allocation notified to schools in March 2011 with their budgets. The group agreed it is necessary to adjust the allocation to avoid a shortfall against the grant and noted that if this caused budget issues for any individual school then the</p>	PC

	Accounting & Budget Support Team would work with that school to look at recovery actions.	
5	<p>Schools Revenue Balances 2010/11</p> <p>PC circulated a paper outlining the position in relation to schools revenue balances for 2010/11. 41 schools had exceeded the permissible threshold, 38 of which were considered to have properly assigned balances in accordance with the scheme. It was agreed that the 3 remaining schools appear to have balances not correctly assigned and therefore should be subject to clawback. It was agreed that these schools be notified and invited to appeal.</p>	PC
6	<p>Any other Business</p> <p>It was agreed that the papers on the Schools Value Statement and the PFI Affordability Gap would go straight to Schools Forum</p>	
5	<p>Date & Time of Next Meeting</p> <p>Date of Next Meeting to be confirmed</p>	

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

13 October 2011

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) UPDATE PAPER

Purpose of the Report

1. To inform Schools Forum of the final Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for 2011/12.
2. To present budget monitoring information against the DSG for the financial year 2011/12 as at 31st August 2011.
3. To update Schools Forum on the final allocation of Pupil Premium Grant for 2011/12
4. To give initial consideration to proposals for achieving the required savings against DSG in 2012/13.

Background

DSG Settlement 2011/12

5. In January 2011 Schools Forum set a schools budget for 2011/12 of £274.653 million based on estimated DSG income of £273.117 million (after Academy recoupment) and utilisation of 2010/11 underspend of £1.536 million. It was agreed that savings would need to be identified in 2012/13 to recover this one off funding.
6. In June 2011 a report was considered by Schools Forum giving an estimate of the final DSG for 2011/12. This report suggested there would be a shortfall in the overall DSG allocation (including Academies) of £0.165 million compared with the initial estimate on which the budget was based. Net of Academy recoupment that shortfall increased to £0.239 million. Schools Forum agreed in June that this shortfall should be met from the underspend rolled forward from 2010/11.

Pupil Premium Grant 2011/12

7. Following the announcement by the Government of the new Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) from April 2011, provisional allocations were notified in with school Funding Certificates. The notes sent to schools with their budgets stated that these allocations were provisional, pending confirmation of the final PPG figures from the DfE and the funding values from 2012-13 onwards. This paper deals with the 2011-12 position only. It also does not deal with the grant received for Looked After Children (LAC), as those pupils were excluded from the provisional allocations and are subject to different payment arrangements.
8. The PPG Free School Meals element is allocated on the basis of £430 per pupil for each full time equivalent pupil recorded on the January 2011 school census as eligible for FSM in Year groups R to 11 in mainstream schools; and £200 per pupil for each full time equivalent pupil recorded on the January 2011 census, as a Service child in Year R to 11 in mainstream schools.

Main Considerations

Final DSG Settlement 2011/12

9. The final DSG settlement was received in July 2011 giving a total DSG (including Academies) of £293.255 million, a shortfall of £0.140 million (30.5 pupils) compared with the initial estimate. The final impact of academy recoupment is still to be bottomed out but it is recommended that the final DSG settlement can be managed as agreed by Schools Forum in June.

Budget Monitoring 2011/12

10. Appendix 1 to this report outlines the budget monitoring summary as at 31st August 2011. At this point in the year an underspend of £0.903 million is projected against the overall schools budget. Key variances are as follows:
 - a. *Independent Special School Placements* – this budget is currently projected to underspend by £0.821 million. The forecast is based on all current placements and includes young people for whom a placement has been agreed by the Joint Complex Needs Panel but which may not yet be in place. The underspend arises from reduced numbers of placements and reflects the increased number of pupils who can be provided for within Wiltshire schools. It is expected that further placements will be made during the remainder of the year and that as a result the projected underspend will reduce.
 - b. *Other Targeted Services* – underspends within the EMAS and Traveller Education Service have arisen due to vacancies and due to the maximisation of the standards funds within the EMAS Team.
 - c. *Early Years Free Entitlement for 3 & 4 year olds* – an underspend of £0.108 million is projected against the Early Years Single Funding Formula. This projection is updated termly based on the uptake of the free entitlement across settings.
 - d. *Premature Retirement Costs* – the PRC budget is expected to overspend by £0.122 million based on redundancy cases up to 31st August. Costs up to the end of August would normally represent the bulk of the spend against this budget however indications from HR are that there will be further costs incurred through the year and thus this overspend is expected to increase.

Pupil Premium Grant 2011/12

11. In July 2011 the DfE wrote to all LAs to confirm the grant allocations for 2011-12. This included adjustments for schools that became academies between January 2011 and April 2011. The total PPG grant income for Wiltshire is £2,818,559 (excluding the LAC element and allocations in respect of schools that converted to academy status between January and April.). The provisional PPG allocations totalled £2,881,990(excluding LAC and adjusting for those schools that converted to academy status between January and April) and using finalised FSM and Service data the final allocations total £2,810,640.
12. The DfE grant exceeds the total grant requirement derived from the LAs latest data by £7,919 but the DfE will not supply the LA with a school by school breakdown of their total PPG allocation, so it is not possible to identify the individual school funding differences.
13. The final LA data gives a total PPG requirement which is £71,350 less than the provisional allocations. There are differences in both the FSM and service pupil counts when compared to the provisional allocations. These differences are mainly due to the inclusion of pupils in the provisional allocations that should not have been counted as they do not attract the grant e.g. pupils under four years old and pupils above 15 years old as at 31/8/10.
14. Appendix 2 lists those schools (and some schools that have become academies since April 2011) where there is a difference between the provisional and final allocations.
15. If the provisional allocations are not adjusted there will be a shortfall against the grant received of £71,350.
16. The following options are therefore to be considered by Schools Forum:
 - a. Revise the provisional PPG allocations to reflect the latest entitlement.
 - b. Overspend the grant allocation against DSG.

17. As there is no DSG available in 2011-12 to offset the overspend it is recommended that the individual school allocations are adjusted. This will leave a surplus of £7,919 which will have to be repaid to the DfE.

Proposals for DSG Savings 2012/13

18. In setting the budget for 2011/12 Schools Forum recognised that savings would need to be achieved in 2012/13 to balance the use of one off funding in 2011/12. In total £1.930 million one off funding was utilised in balancing the 2011/12 budget.
19. The DfE has notified local authorities that the school funding system is to remain unchanged for 2012/13 and it is therefore possible to assume that, as in 2011/12, there will be no inflationary increase applied to the schools budget and that there will be a minimum funding guarantee in schools of -1.5%. In setting the budget for schools in Wiltshire for 2011/12 zero inflation was applied however in other neighbouring authorities negative inflation, in line with the MFG, was applied across the delegated budget. This is something that Schools Forum will need to consider for 2012/13 in order to achieve the necessary savings.
20. Initial proposals for savings across DSG budgets can be summarised as follows:

Option	Potential Saving £m
Procurement Opportunity Assessment to review potential for savings in ISS budget. Opportunity Assessments have been targeting 10% savings from procurement budgets	0.440
Review of likely uptake of free entitlement against Early Years Single Funding Formula – current projection is budget will underspend by £0.108m but only based on 1 st term's numbers	0.200
EOTAS Recoupment – new CAMHS contract should reduce need for expensive placements, for example, Marlborough House. Also Service Director for C&P looking at appropriate split between Health and DCE contribution to placements	0.050
Budget Centralisation – take saving in advance of centralising any DSG budgets eg., Comms, Legal, etc	??
Delete Assisted Places Budget – budget to fund places at outdoor education centres etc for families on limited incomes. Other neighbouring authorities are looking at this option	0.048
Income generation – outcome of review of core and discretionary services in the Inclusion Service	??
Apply negative MFG to schools delegated budget in 2012/13. Estimate saving achieved from -0.5% MFG	1.094
Uncommitted underspend 2010/11	0.700

21. These proposals need further work to develop the detail but give an indication of the service areas that could be considered whilst minimising the impact on front line service delivery across support services for the more vulnerable young people. Schools Forum are invited at this stage to give a steer on the savings identified above and to identify if there are other areas that should be considered.
22. The estimated DSG will be brought to Schools Forum at the December meeting and this will enable more detailed consideration of the savings required.

Proposals

23. Schools Forum are asked to consider the following proposals:
- That the shortfall arising from the final DSG settlement should be funded from the DSG underspend rolled forward from 2010/11 as agreed at the June meeting.
 - Schools Forum should note the budget monitoring position at the end of August 2011.

- c. That individual schools allocations for the Pupil Premium are adjusted in line with the final data
- d. That Schools Forum considers the initial savings proposals for DSG in 2012/13.

CAROLYN GODFREY
DIRECTOR, CHILDREN & EDUCATION

Report Author: Liz Williams, Head of Finance (DCE)

Tel: 01225 713675 e-mail: elizabetha.williams@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - budget monitoring summary as at 31st August 2011

Appendix 2 – schools where there is a difference between the provisional and final allocations.

Financial Monitoring

Service Areas	Approved Budget £m	Projected Outturn for £m	Variation for Year £m
1 Funding Schools			
DSG Funded Expenditure	218.834	218.834	0.000
Total	218.834	218.834	-
2 Schools & Learning Branch			
Independent Special Schools	4.507	3.685	-0.821
Named Pupil Allowances	2.135	2.135	0.000
Special Recoupment	1.577	1.577	0.000
Specialist SEN Service	0.852	0.852	0.000
Sensory Service	0.550	0.558	0.008
Ethnic Minority Achievement Service	0.492	0.365	-0.127
Travellers Education Service	0.238	0.191	-0.046
Local Collaborative Partnerships	0.124	0.124	0.000
Young People's Support Services	2.619	2.619	0.000
Behaviour Support	0.925	0.925	0.000
Other Targeted Services	0.486	0.486	0.000
Total Targeted Schools & Learner Support	14.504	13.518	-0.986
School Buildings & Places	0.037	0.037	0.000
Admissions Service	0.261	0.261	0.000
Other School Improvement Services	0.025	0.025	0.000
Total School Improvement	0.323	0.323	0.000
Early Years Single Funding Formula	14.626	14.518	-0.108
Other Early Years Services	0.718	0.760	0.042
Total Early Years & Childcare	15.344	15.278	-0.066
Business & Commercial Services	0.573	0.573	0.000
Total Schools & Learning	30.745	29.693	- 1.052
3 Commissioning & Performance			
Schools Maternity Costs	0.838	0.863	0.026
Schools PRC - New Cases	0.496	0.618	0.122
SIMS Licence	0.199	0.201	0.002
Other services	0.281	0.281	0.000
Total	1.814	1.963	0.149
4 Safeguarding			
Child Protection in Schools	0.040	0.040	0.000
Total	0.040	0.040	-
5 Social Care & Integrated Youth			
QES	0.042	0.042	0.000
Assisted Places Scheme	0.048	0.048	0.000
Looked After Children Education Service	0.150	0.150	0.000
Total	0.240	0.240	-
6 DSG Within Corporate Services			
Gross Expenditure	3.398	3.398	0.000
Total	3.398	3.398	-
	255.072	254.169	- 0.903

Note POSITIVE variances = OVERSPEND

Notes

- 1 Independent Special Schools based on placements to dates and soft projections for expected placements.
- 2 No variance included for Recoupment - work on going to review all projections
- 3 Ethnic Minority Achievement Service and Travellers Service projected to underspend due to vacant posts. Maximisation of Standards Funds also contributing to EMAS position.
- 4 Projected overspend on Schools PRC cases based on cases to 31st August 2011. HR indicated that further estimates have been given and therefore further costs expected.

This page is intentionally left blank

Ex academies as at April 11

DfE No	School	Difference Free Meals Pupils	Difference Service Pupils	Total Difference
4067	Wootton Bassett	-£1,720	-£6,600	-£8,320
5219	Clarendon Infants, Tidworth	£0	-£7,800	-£7,800
4072	Warminster Kingdown	£0	-£6,400	-£6,400
2159	Kiwi	£0	-£5,800	-£5,800
4071	Avon Valley	£0	-£4,600	-£4,600
4075	John of Gaunt School	-£4,300	-£200	-£4,500
5217	Zouch	£0	-£4,200	-£4,200
4064	Malmesbury	-£3,010	-£800	-£3,810
4013	Melksham Oak	-£2,580	-£600	-£3,180
5406	John Bentley	-£2,150	-£800	-£2,950
5415	Matravers	-£2,580	-£200	-£2,780
3022	Bulford St Leonard's	£0	-£2,400	-£2,400
5225	The Avenue	£0	-£2,400	-£2,400
4069	Clarendon	-£2,150	-£200	-£2,350
5400	St Augustine's	-£860	-£1,400	-£2,260
7010	Larkrise	-£1,720	£0	-£1,720
5411	Devizes	-£1,290	-£200	-£1,490
4537	St Laurence	-£1,290	£0	-£1,290
7008	Exeter House	-£1,290	£0	-£1,290
7009	St Nicholas	-£1,290	£0	-£1,290
4070	Stonehenge School	-£430	£0	-£430
4610	St Joseph's	-£430	£0	-£430
5405	St John's, Marlborough	-£430	£0	-£430
7002	Rowdeford	-£430	£0	-£430
3030	St Dunstan	£0	-£400	-£400
4000	Abbeyfield	£0	-£400	-£400
3300	St Michael's, Aldbourne	£0	£600	£600
2029	Lypiatt	£0	£1,400	£1,400
		-£27,950	-£43,400	-£71,350

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

13 October 2011

SCHOOLS REVENUE SURPLUS AND DEFICIT BALANCES 2010-11

Introduction

1. This report presents the position of balances of Wiltshire schools as at 31st March 2011 and identifies those that are in deficit.
2. Members last considered a report on Schools' balances and deficits in October 2010. In that report, 21 schools were in deficit with a total value of £0.725 million and the value of surpluses was £11.639 million.
3. A Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme is in place which applies limits to school rollovers as follows:
 - Secondary schools up to 5% of school budget share
 - Primary and special schools, 8% of school budget share or £10,000 whichever is the higher.Any surplus balances in excess of the above thresholds may be clawed back and redistributed to the sector from which they arose.
4. A performance target has been set by the Chief Financial Officer that limits deficits to 10% of total positive balances.

Summary of Main Considerations

Current situation and trends

5. Appendices 1 and 2 to this report summarise the overall position on schools' revenue balances, by phase of school, and details the position on deficits as at 31st March 2011.
6. The main points are:
 - The net revenue balances now stand at £11.084 million and represents 4.54% of budget shares for 2010-2011
 - This reflects an increase of 1.56%, £0.171 million, when compared with 2009-2010 net revenue balances of £10.914 million.
 - The number of schools in deficit is 23 with a total value of £1.267 million. This reflects an increase in numbers and value of 2 and £0.542 million respectively when compared to the previous year-end, as detailed in paragraph 2 above.
 - The number of schools with balances above the permissible threshold (see Para. 3 above) is 41 with a total value of £5.385 million. This indicates that 17.6% of schools appear to be holding 44% of all revenue balances. The Intended Use of Revenue Balances returns, required by the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme, have been scrutinised by officers to ensure that funds have been

properly assigned and will be monitored to check these funds have been spent accordingly. Appendix 3 lists these schools and shows:-

The total revenue balances of the 41 schools	£5.385m	(a)
Balances held for specific purposes as detailed in the Controls on Surplus Balances Scheme e.g. planned projects	- £2.196m	(b)
Leaving a general balance of	£3.189m	(c)

- Where an individual school shows an excess balance above the permissible threshold (Appendix 3 Column d) the LA may claw back these funds. The School Funding Working Group has considered a detailed report which indicates that £0.006 million excess balances (column e) of three schools should be subject to the claw back mechanism. These schools should now be sent letters advising them of the position and giving them the opportunity to appeal.
- The process for the claw back of funds has highlighted the practicalities of redistributing what could be small sums of money within the financial year in which they are clawed back. Schools Forum, on 2nd October 2007, agreed :-
 - a. the principle of redistribution of funds within the sector from which they originated
 - b. any clawed back funds below a threshold of £100K within any sector be used towards the write off of closed schools deficit budgets. Any surplus to be used to off-set costs of premature retirement (if allowed)
 - c. the methodology to be used in the event that sums are redistributed to be based on the AWPU rate.
- Deficits are slightly above the Chief Financial Officers' target of 10% of positive rollovers. The actual is 10.26%.

7. The movement in net revenue balances over the past 3 financial years is shown in the following table:

	2008 – 09	2009 – 10	2010 – 11	2010-11 Balances as % of 2010-11 Budget Share	Increase/ Decrease from 2009-10	Increase / Decrease
	£	£	£	%	£	%
Primary	8,036,294	6,171,009	6,393,619	2.62%	+222,610	+3.61%
Secondary	5,250,613	4,003,849	3,638,915	1.49%	-364,934	-9.11%
Special	673,835	738,699	1,051,587	0.43%	+312,888	+42.36%
	<u>13,960,741</u>	<u>10,913,553</u>	<u>11,084,122</u>	<u>4.54%</u>	<u>170,564</u>	<u>1.56%*</u>

*NB this represents the total percentage decrease in all schools balances between 2009-10 and 2010-11

8. Detailed below is an analysis of the Intended Use of revenue Balances returns received from 41 schools which were over their permissible threshold:

Intended use of revenue balances of the 41 schools:	£	%
Specific Reserves:		
Planned investments of capital nature to be met from revenue	1,088,037	20
Ring fenced grants	996,590	19
Pupil 'trigger' funding notified late in the year	111,601	2
General Balance	3,188,803	59
Total Revenue Rollover	5,385,031	

9. At it's meeting on 2 February 2011, Schools Forum agreed that the thresholds for clawback of excess reserves for Downland School would be:

- 26.5% for 2011/12
- 26.8% for 2012/13
- 18.8% for 2013/14
- 8% from 2014/15 onwards

This decision followed a review of the school's Transitional Protection funding. Downland School had a revenue rollover of £530,452 for 2011/12 which was below the revised permissible threshold of £542,192.

10. Five schools converted to academy status during the financial year 2011/12 and their net revenue balance of £260,147, as at the point of conversion, is included in the analysis at paragraph 7.

Recommendations

15. Schools Forum members are invited:-

- i) to comment as appropriate on this report

CAROLYN GODFREY
Director, Department for Children & Education

Report Author: Phil Cooch, Schools Accounting and Budget Support Manager
Tel: 01225 713814
e-mail phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendices 1 and 2 - overall position on schools' revenue balances
Appendix 3 - schools with balances above the permissible threshold

This page is intentionally left blank

ANALYSIS OF REVENUE ROLLOVERS 2010/11

Appendix 1

Type of School	Number	Rollovers Above Limit			Reasonable Rollovers				Deficit Rollovers			
		Rollover Value	2010-11 Budget Share	Rollover as % of Budget	Number	Rollover Value	2010-11 Budget Share	Rollover as % of Budget	Number	Rollover Value	2010-11 Budget Share	Rollover as % of Budget
Primary	31	2,075,597	18,981,679	10.9%	150	4,434,237	83,873,477	5.3%	18	-376,359	10,949,692	-3.4%
Secondary	9 *	3,140,543	47,253,833	6.6%	14	1,649,308	55,383,341	3.0%	5 **	-890,786	16,371,522	-5.4%
Special	1	168,896	1,788,621	9.4%	5 ***	882,691	9,408,177	9.4%	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	41	5,385,036	68,024,133	7.9%	169	6,966,236	148,664,994	4.7%	23	-1,267,145	27,321,214	-4.6%

Page 29

Deficits as a percentage of positive Rollovers (local Target 10%)

	Deficits	Positive Rollovers	Deficit as a % of Rollover
Primary	-376,359	6,509,834	5.8%
Secondary	-890,786	4,789,850	18.6%
Special	0	1,051,587	0.0%
Total	-1,267,145	12,351,272	10.3%

Note: Classification of Rollovers

Above Permissible Limit: Secondary's greater than 5%
Primary's & Specials greater than £10k or 8% of Budget Share (whichever is higher)

Reasonable: Positive, but below above limit

Deficits: Negative

* Includes 1 now academy status

** Includes 2 now academy status

*** Includes Downlands

Analysis of Planned Revenue Deficits & Final Outturn

Appendix 2

DfE No.	School Name	Budget Template 10/11		School's Income & Expenditure Forecast @ Dec 10		Revenue Actual 10/11		Predicted & ended in deficit	Predicted a surplus/balanced budget & ended in deficit
2009	Bratton		-£14,974		-£14,492		-£11,075	*	
2037	Devizes Southbroom Infant		-£23,667		-£20,757		-£1,105	*	
2159	Bulford Kiwi		-£44,811		-£16,000		-£4,803	*	
2170	Grove Primary	£11,069		£7,106			-£5,592		*
2191	Manor Fields		-£31,776		-£31,776		-£589	*	
3022	Bulford C.E.		-£29,610		-£13,780		-£42,671	*	
3030	Calne St Dunstan Primary		-£22,075		-£21,987		-£19,779	*	
3071	Figheidean St Michael's C.E.		-£753	£2,824		£13,801			*
3134	Newton Tony C.E.	£3,959			-£8,182		-£7,648		*
3159	Seagry C.E.		-£6,710		-£1,354	£2,048			
3160	Semington St George's C.E.		-£7,859		-£18,569	£5,984			
3122	Market Lavington St. Barnabas' C.E.		-£17,546		-£12,444		-£10,644	*	
3139	Tisbury St John's C.E.		-£10,075		-£15,066		-£12,443	*	
3231	Devizes St Peter's		-£41,916		-£8,355	£5,440			
3352	Heytesbury C.E.		-£22,908		-£28,165		-£29,827	*	
3355	St Nicholas, Porton		-£35,265		-£35,266		-£28,404	*	
3396	Tilshhead St Thomas A'Beckett C.E.		-£1,308	£3,600		£3,879			
3435	Wardour R.C.		-£31,935		-£30,098		-£17,538	*	
3448	Bemerton St John CE		-£6,889		-£8,795	£1,565			
3450	Great Wishford C.E.		-£16,855		-£16,855		-£25,885	*	
3459	Hindon St Mary's & St.John's		-£4,141	£6,125		£1,641			
3466	The Manor	£2,489			-£33,796		-£40,194		*
3468	Amesbury Primary	£4,058			-£631		-£44,665		*
3471	Lyneham Primary		-£70,213		-£54,112		-£64,372	*	
4001	Wyvern College		-£299,054		-£305,659		-£308,436	*	
4070	Amesbury The Stonehenge		-£27,113		-£22,112	£22,602			
4071	Avon Valley		-£17,495	£32,272			-£43,031	*	
4075	Trowbridge The John of Gaunt		-£104,929	£323,154		£129,961			
5218	Clarendon Junior	£5,406			-£17,397		-£9,126		*
5405	Marlborough St Johns		not rec'd		-£938,636		-£366,809		*
5411	Devizes	£2,968			-£131,805	£322,867			
5412	South Wilts	£13,279					-£74,145		*
5418	Salisbury High		not rec'd		not rec'd		-£98,365		*
	Total Deficits		-£889,877		-£1,806,089		-£1,267,146		
	No of Deficits		24		25		23	15	9

		a	b	c	d	e	f	
DfE No	School Name	Revenue Balance	Amount Earmarked for specific purpose	General Balance	Permissible Threshold	Excess Balance Subject to clawback	Excess Balance Not Subject to Clawback	Sch Type
2008	Fitzmaurice	£66,618	£13,682	£52,936	£54,245			Primary
2022	Ivy Lane	£148,421	£123,736	£24,685	£71,001			Primary
2029	Lypiatt	£17,717	£0	£17,717	£17,021	£696		Primary
2065	Larkhill	£88,299	£22,000	£66,299	£68,528			Primary
2137	Westwood with Iford	£31,831	£0	£31,831	£23,611		£8,220	Primary
2140	Wootton Bassett Inf	£28,847	£980	£27,867	£27,955			Primary
2198	Ludwell	£31,198	£16,000	£15,198	£20,536			Primary
2218	Kings Lodge	£141,717	£105,093	£36,624	£91,229			Primary
2222	Walwayne Court	£74,384	£14,266	£60,118	£68,074			Primary
2226	Charter	£80,652	£400	£80,252	£78,570	£1,682		Primary
3013	Box CE	£65,647	£47,000	£18,647	£43,575			Primary
3018	Broad Hinton	£60,492	£30,282	£30,210	£30,211			Primary
3035	Cherhill	£46,832	£33,120	£13,712	£45,801			Primary
3047	Crockerton	£38,823	£18,210	£20,613	£29,146			Primary
3090	Holt	£41,978	£18,210	£23,768	£31,880			Primary
3110	Lydiard Millicent	£142,869	£124,165	£18,704	£47,710			Primary
3216	St Peter's, Marlborough	£61,827	£13,200	£48,627	£49,099			Primary
3220	Minety	£31,058	£0	£31,058	£31,036		£22	Primary
3243	Great Bedwyn	£90,438	£50,295	£40,143	£51,621			Primary
3344	Forest & Sandridge	£55,833	£55,833	£0	£45,402			Primary
3400	West Ashton	£27,730	£18,210	£9,520	£25,656			Primary
3418	St Joseph's	£50,723	£28,210	£22,513	£31,250			Primary
3437	St Patrick's	£55,425	£15,640	£39,785	£47,700			Primary
3461	Kennet Valley	£27,664	£4,114	£23,550	£26,360			Primary
3465	Wylve Valley	£34,689	£600	£34,089	£34,099			Primary
4064	Malmesbury School	£331,084	£120,403	£210,681	£274,561			Secondary
4069	Clarendon College	£278,692	£26,644	£252,048	£276,966			Secondary
4072	Kingdown	£380,163	£63,537	£316,626	£317,530			Secondary
4537	St Laurence	£410,599	£207,657	£202,942	£264,415			Secondary
5201	Downton	£50,937	£5,846	£45,091	£47,702			Primary
5205	Frogwell	£103,475	£3,981	£99,494	£95,834	£3,660		Primary
5206	Studley Green	£105,533	£32,000	£73,533	£82,657			Primary
5215	Ludgershall Castle	£86,801	£40,718	£46,083	£58,957			Primary
5219	Clarendon Infants	£76,745	£25,000	£51,745	£65,412			Primary
5225	The Avenue	£110,391	£55,000	£55,391	£76,654			Primary
5400	St Augustine's	£240,610	£60,000	£180,610	£208,795			Secondary
5402	Lavington	£186,084	£0	£186,084	£108,388		£77,696	Secondary
5404	Sheldon	£612,729	£355,433	£257,296	£377,262			Secondary
5406	John Bentley	£377,713	£127,434	£250,279	£268,266			Secondary
5411	Devizes School	£322,867	£272,779	£50,088	£266,509			Secondary
7008	Exeter House	£168,896	£46,550	£122,346	£143,090			Special
0	Total for listed schools							
41		£5,385,031	£2,196,228	£3,188,803	£4,024,314	£6,038	£85,938	

%

Primary	2,075,594	38.54%
Secondary	3,140,541	58.32%
Special	168,896	3.14%
	5,385,031	100.00%

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

13 October 2011

School Financial Value Standard (SFVS)

Purpose of the Paper

1. To raise School Forums awareness of the DfE's replacement for the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS).

Background

2. The Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) is available to schools to use from September 2011. The SFVS replaces the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS), which was withdrawn by the Secretary of State with effect from 15 November 2010. It has been designed in conjunction with schools to assist them in managing their finances and to give assurance that they have secure financial management in place. Governing bodies have formal responsibility for the financial management of their schools and so the standard is primarily aimed at governors.
3. All local authority maintained schools are required to complete the standard once a year. The SFVS will not be externally assessed and there is no prescription to the level of evidence that the governing body should require. However, the DfE expect the completed returns to feed into the regular internal audit processes of local authorities.
4. Those schools which had not attained the FMSiS by the end of March 2010 must complete and submit the SFVS to the local authority by 31st March 2012 and conduct an annual review thereafter. For all other maintained schools the first return should be submitted by 31st March 2013 with an annual review thereafter.
5. CFOs will be expected to say each year how many SFVS reports they have received from schools before 31 March. Local authorities (LAs) will also be expected to give a general assurance that they have a system of audit in place which gives them adequate assurance over their schools' standards of financial management and the regularity and propriety of their spending.
6. The current Education Bill contains a clause restoring the Secretary of State's power to make directed revisions to local authority schemes for financing schools. The DfE expect to consult as soon as practicable on a directed revision which will add SFVS as a requirement into LA schemes.
7. What do schools need to do?
 - i. The standard consists of 23 questions which governing bodies should formally discuss annually with the head teacher and senior staff.
 - ii. The questions which form the standard are in 4 sections (The Governing Body and School Staff, Setting the Budget, Value for Money and Protecting Public Money) and each question requires an answer of Yes, In Part, or No.

If the answer is “Yes”, the comments column can be used to indicate the main evidence on which the governing body based its answer. If the answer is “No”, or “In Part”, the column should contain a very brief summary of the position and proposed remedial action.

- iii. In the 5th section, governors should summarise remedial actions and the timetable for reporting back. Governors should ensure that each action has a specified deadline and an agreed owner.
 - iv. The governing body may delegate the consideration of the questions to a finance or other relevant committee, but a detailed report should be provided to the full governing body and the chair of governors must sign the completed form.
 - v. The school must send a copy of the signed standard to: **Schools Accounting & Budget Support Team, East Wing, County Hall, Trowbridge.**
8. What are Local Authorities expected to do with the SFVS returns?
- i. Unlike FMSiS, the SFVS will not be externally assessed. LAs should use schools’ SFVS returns to inform their programme of financial assessment and audit.
 - ii. LA and other auditors will have access to the standard, and when they conduct an audit can check whether the self-assessment is in line with their own judgement.
 - iii. Auditors should make the governing body and the LA aware of any major discrepancies in judgements.
9. Since SFVS will be brought within the scope of schemes for financing schools, it will be in scope of local authorities’ powers to issue a notice of concern or in extremis to withdraw financial delegation. Local authorities could issue a notice of concern where schools fail to complete SFVS as required. They could also consider publishing a list of schools that have not completed SFVS on time.
10. The Department have indicated that they will take a particular interest in those schools that had failed to attain FMSiS by the due date of 31 March 2010 and will therefore be required to complete SFVS by 31 March 2012. They have also stated that they expect to follow up with local authorities any cases where the CFO statement shows that such schools have not completed SFVS.

Main considerations

11. It is clear however, with the introduction of SFVS, that there is a DfE expectation that maintained schools will receive regular probity audits and, as a consequence, the Internal Audit Team have programmed in thirty school audits this financial year, commencing in September 2011. These schools have already been contacted. A return to a cycle of school audits will contribute to the CFO providing the assurance required as mentioned in paragraph five above. It should be noted that the internal audit will also focus upon reviewing and testing those areas of financial management/administration and governance which are considered to be of highest risk for schools, many of which are not included in the SFVS.
12. Processes will need to be put in place that monitors compliance with this initiative and which also objectively assesses the comments contained in individual returns, so that they can usefully inform internal audit programmes and the LAs intervention and support activities.

13. To raises awareness of the SFVS a letter has been sent to all maintained schools including links to the guidance, materials and the self assessment return.

Proposals

14. That the SFVS self assessment return is included in the financial returns compliance statement which is sent to head teachers and governors routinely during the year.

15. That a system of “scoring” the returns on an objective basis is put in place to inform the LAs programme of financial assessment and audit.

16. That consideration is given to the LA publishing a list of those schools that do not complete the SFVS on time in an annual report to Schools Forum.

Recommendations

17. That SFVS returns are included in the financial returns compliance statement.

18. That a further report is presented to the School Funding Working Group on the proposal contained in paragraph fifteen above.

19. That a list of those schools that do not complete the SFVS on time is published in an annual report to Schools Forum.

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, Principal Accountant (Schools)
Children & Education Finance Team, Resources Department
Tel: 01225 713814 e-mail: phil.cooch@wiltshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools Forum

13th October 2011

Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Schools Affordability Gap 2012-13 Onwards

Purpose of report

1. To update members of the Schools Forum on the current position regarding the Schools PFI Sinking Fund and the affordability gap relating to the Fund and to recommend an increase in contributions from 2012-13 onwards.

Background

2. A Private Finance Initiative (PFI) agreement was signed to build three new secondary schools in North Wiltshire in 2000. The new schools were built at Abbeyfields, Chippenham, Wootton Bassett & Malmesbury and the PFI agreement covered both the initial building costs and the running costs (Facilities Management and Lifecycle costs). In two of these schools, sixth form units have been built more recently and added to the PFI contract, though this factor does not impact specifically upon the affordability gap.
3. At the outset of the agreement a detailed model was constructed to analyse the costs over the contract period including appropriate assumptions. All of the costs were modelled over the full contract period of 32 years. The detailed model was then agreed by the parties as part of the sign off of the contract documentation. From these calculations a figure is produced, generally known as the Unitary Charge, which is the annual amount payable by Wiltshire Council to the contractor, which is adjusted annually by the Retail Price Index (RPI). In this contract the Unitary Charge is described as the Basic Access Payment (BAP).

Main Considerations for Schools Forum

4. The Unitary Charge or BAP is funded as follows:
 - PFI Credit, Government Grant: this was agreed at the outset of the contract: it is paid in equal fixed instalments throughout the contract period (£3.251 million per annum). Unlike the BAP, it is not inflated through the contract period, which means that in relative terms the Grant is worth significantly more at the start of the contract than at the end of it. Therefore, looking annually at the Council's expenditure and income, the contract will generate a surplus in its earlier stages which will be offset by a deficit later on. This means that an Equalisation Fund (a type of Sinking Fund) has to be built up in the early years to cover the anticipated deficits that are inevitable in the later years of the contract.

- Local Management of Schools (LMS) & Equivalent contributions from Academies: the PFI contractor is providing a facilities management (FM) service and the BAP includes the lifecycle costs of keeping the building in a serviceable condition, for example electrical and boiler updates for the duration of the contract. In a non-PFI situation the school would be using a proportion of its formula allocation under LMS or the new academy arrangements, to cover such costs and therefore an estimate was made at the outset of the contract of an appropriate percentage of LMS budgets to put into the contract. The agreed percentage contribution was 10% and this has been maintained.
 - Affordability Gap or PFI Supplement: it was apparent at the outset that there was an “affordability gap” in the project. This gap is covered by the PFI Supplement, which is an amount provided from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget, in order to balance the overall position over the full contract period of 32 years. This funding is top-sliced from the overall schools budget and therefore any change will impact marginally on each school in Wiltshire. Under the current funding mechanism for maintained schools and academies each PFI school receives an amount through the Local Authority School funding formula that is equal to its contribution to the fund. That amount is then recharged from the school and the contribution paid in to the fund. As stated above, this is a cost to the overall schools budget for Wiltshire. From 2012-13 this mechanism will be controlled by the DFE for the two academy schools (Wootton Bassett & Malmesbury), though the Council is waiting for clarification of how this will work in practice from April 2012 onwards, depending on the funding mechanism for academies that is put in place from April 2012.
5. The contract has now been operational for approximately 10 years and the equalisation fund has been reviewed a number of times. In the early years of the contract, the figures were generally in line with expectations, though in recent years the position has deteriorated somewhat. The main reasons for this are as follows:-
- Benchmarking: utility costs were reviewed under the terms of the contract in both April 2006 and April 2008 and the impact was an increase in the costs. This increase was not recoverable from the schools under the contract terms and therefore this has resulted in a shortfall on the Sinking Fund. More recent utilities & soft service benchmarking exercises have also had an impact, albeit a less significant one.
 - Interest Rates – as referred to above, the contract in its earlier years creates a surplus which is transferred to the Sinking Fund. Interest is added to the cumulative balance and the expectation in the original contract model is that 6% would be added to the cumulative balance. However, the economic environment has changed markedly with the credit crunch and subsequent recession, leading to a position where, at present, Wiltshire Council is only receiving an average of approximately 0.5% on its investments.
 - Pupil Numbers – this had varied over the 10 year period since the inception of the contract though the overall impact of these changes is roughly neutral.

The Affordability Gap

6. The factors outlined above have clearly put pressure on the Sinking Fund and the overall annual contribution from 2012-13 onwards needs to be reviewed.
7. There is some uncertainty over the amount of increase required; in particular, there is a strip of land near to Abbeyfields School which the Council may be able to sell for primarily housing development over the next few years. Any Capital receipt from this land is currently ringfenced to the PFI Sinking Fund. However, in the current economic environment, it is difficult to give an accurate indication of land values and clearly Wiltshire Council will want to maximise the value of such a Capital receipt by timing the sale appropriately. Taking all of the factors into account, a reasonable approach is that the overall contribution from the three schools to the affordability gap be increased from £600,000 per annum to £700,000 per annum. This represents a total cost pressure of £100,000 against the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2012/13.
8. The actual cost pressure to be funded from the Wiltshire DSG, however, will be determined by how academies are funded from 2012/13. If the current recoupment methodology is retained then academies will be included in the overall DSG settlement and their budgets recouped from Wiltshire. In that instance the impact will be the full £100,000. Should recoupment cease, as has been indicated by recent consultations, then the affordability gap for the two academy PFI schools will be paid to Wiltshire by the DfE and the cost pressure on the Wiltshire schools budget will be the increased cost to Abbeyfield of £11,800.

Proposal

9. It is proposed that
 - a. Schools Forum agrees to an additional amount of £100,000 be allocated to increase the contribution to the PFI Affordability Gap for the 3 PFI schools. this total will be amended if the recoupment methodology for funding academies is ceased by the DfE.

Carolyn Godfrey
Director, Children & Education

Report Author

Adam Stirling, Business Analyst
(01225) 718663, adam.stirling@wiltshire.gov.uk

Background papers

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

Appendices

Appendix 1: Revised Apportionment of Affordability Gap from 2012-13 onwards.

APPENDIX 1

REVISED APPORTIONMENT OF AFFORDABILITY GAP FROM 2012-13 ONWARDS

	Abbeyfield	Malmesbury	Wootton Bassett	TOTAL
Current breakdown of 2011-12 "Affordability Gap"	£71,000	£229,000	£300,000	£600,000
Increase "Affordability Gap" for 2012-13 to £700,000				£700,000
Use current proportionate breakdown for revised total of £700,000	£82,833	£267,167	£350,000	£700,000
Rounded Figures - Suggested 2012-13 Contributions	£82,800	£267,200	£350,000	£700,000

Page 41

Then there are two Scenarios as follows:-

a) Recoupment Continues in 2012-13

Change in Wiltshire Council Contribution	£100,000
------------------------------------------	----------

b) Recoupment Ends from April 2012 onwards

Change in Wiltshire Council Contribution	£11,800
------------------------------------------	---------

Change in DFE Contribution (Academies)	£88,200
----------------------------------------	---------

Total Change in overall contribution	£100,000
---------------------------------------------	-----------------

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools' Forum

13 October 2011

The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) and Schools

1. Purpose

- a) To outline the situation of Wiltshire Council and schools with regard to financial and legal liabilities arising from the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC);
- b) To identify a preferred way forward for discussion at the October 2011 Schools Forum on how schools will take on their financial liability for the CRC from 2012/13 (the council is bearing the costs corporately for 2011/12).

2. Wiltshire Council and the CRC

The CRC Scheme

The CRC is a mandatory scheme to improve energy efficiency and thereby cut CO₂ emissions in large public and private sector organisations. The scheme is described in detail at Appendix 1. A glossary is included at the back of this paper.

The scheme applies a number of drivers to encourage participating organisations to better understand and reduce their energy usage:

- Financial:
 - purchasing allowances for every tonne of CO₂ emitted
 - 10% uplift in costs for estimated data¹
 - fines for non-compliance
- Behavioural:
 - collation of better, more accurate energy data and a requirement to keep records
 - increasing energy efficiency / reducing emissions to cut costs
- Reputational:
 - through the publication of an annual performance league table

Changes to the CRC

In the Autumn/Winter 2011, Government will draft a package of legislative measures which aim to simplify the CRC from April 2014 onwards (Phase 2). See Appendix 1 and point 3d) below.

Wiltshire Council's emissions

Wiltshire Council's CRC carbon emissions come from an estate counting over 800 properties, including over 230 schools. Transport emissions are not included in the CRC.

Wiltshire Council's total footprint for 2010/11, the first reporting year of the first phase of the CRC, was approximately 47,600 tCO₂ and its annual report covered around 43,000 tCO₂. Schools represented 51% of our annual report emissions. Street lighting represented 18%. In 2011/12 the council will switch street lighting from dynamic to passive energy supply which removes it from CRC eligibility, thereby reducing overall emissions and saving the council around £95k per annum in CRC costs. As a result, schools' share of emissions is predicted to increase to around 60% of the council's CRC emissions.

¹**Non-estimated (actual) data** requires two meter readings to be taken at least six months apart for gas and electricity, or supplier statements to be provided for fuels such as oil and LPG.

The first year that the council will pay for its CRC emissions will be in July 2012 retrospectively for 2011/12, at £12 per tCO₂. The council is accruing for these costs in 2011/12. If the rate of £12 per tonne had been applied to emissions for 2010/11, the council would have had to purchase allowances for a **total of £525,624**. The **CRC liability relating to schools (including academies) would have been £261,972**. In the following two years of Phase 1, the price of carbon is expected to rise to £14, then £16 per tCO₂. Assuming no changes in emissions, liability for schools' emissions at £16 per tCO₂ would rise to £349,296. Beyond Phase 1, costs are likely to continue to rise on an annual basis by £2 per year. At the same level of emissions future costs for schools' emissions would be £392,958 at £18 per tCO₂, and £436,620 at £20 per tCO₂.

Reducing our liability

There are three ways to reduce the financial liability from the CRC: 1) reduce emissions; 2) increase the amount of actual data to avoid the 10% uplift; 3) ensure the council does not incur fines for non compliance.

In order to reduce our CRC liability, the council is:

- Installing automatic meter reading equipment (AMR) across the estate, including schools, in order to accurately measure consumption and to target where consumption is unexpectedly high. For 2010/11, we have avoided the 10% uplift on 89% of our annual report emissions through recording actual consumption data.
- Implementing a Carbon Management Plan with a target to reduce emissions
- Implementing an invest-to-save programme of work, whereby investment in energy efficiency measures in the short term will lead to long term savings (from both avoided energy spend and avoided CRC costs)
- Working with schools through a dedicated Projects Officer to help reduce emissions (see below).

The costs of the CRC are currently built into the council's corporate medium term financial strategy and identified on the risk register.

Support for Schools

In the school year of 2011/12, the dedicated Climate Change Projects Officer-Schools will pilot two new engagement programmes to help schools reduce their emissions - the Carbon Trust's Collaborative Low Carbon Schools Service and the Ashden Environmental Award-winning Severn Wye Energy Agency project called YEP! (Young Energy People).

Both of these projects are expected to generate at least 10% energy savings in participating schools, primarily through behaviour change, which will lead to both CRC savings and energy cost savings. The intention is to roll out these projects with a greater reach and impact in following years.

In addition to these projects, an Energy Surveyor is being funded within the Energy Services Team to identify energy efficiency opportunities both in the schools and non-schools estate, targeting high energy consumers to start with. The Energy Surveyor will visit all the schools on the Low Carbon pilot programme and will offer to conduct surveys in other high consuming schools and academies once it has been established that the school has a willingness to act on the findings.

A proportion of Wiltshire Council's invest-to-save fund will be available to schools as 0% financing for energy efficiency measures with a good payback (generally 4-years or less).

Web pages and resources are being produced for all Wiltshire schools to enable them to effectively monitor and reduce their energy consumption within their schools, including advice on 'green' ICT equipment and solar panel schemes.

The Cost of Energy

The council's procurement team have reviewed the corporate contracts for gas and electricity. The vast majority of schools have opted into these contracts and the Procurement team will be writing to all schools updating them on the following information:

At present, the council has yearly procurement rounds starting on 1st April for gas and 1st October for electricity. The council has taken the decision to align the procurement rounds so from 1st April 2012 all rounds will start on 1st April.

Electricity prices starting on 1st October 2011 will only cover six months to 1st April 12 and are likely to be higher than they would have been if a complete year round had started on that date. The price of electricity is likely to be in the region of 30% more than prices paid in October 2010. The gas price will be unaffected as this is already priced for April 1st start.

From April 2012 the rolling annual electricity contract will be re-established (aligned with the gas contract). This may be increased or reduced by market price changes during the winter.

3. Current CRC Issues

a) Schools' Emissions Performance and Performance League Table

As it is estimated that during 2011/12 schools will account for 61% of the council's CRC footprint, the council's position in the national CRC league table will be heavily influenced by school performance in carbon management. It is therefore essential that schools continually strive to improve their performance by reducing energy consumption both for reputational reasons and because the future cost of energy and the CRC are likely to increase significantly. It is therefore recommended that after each annual submission, in the autumn of each year, a survey benchmarking Wiltshire schools' CRC emissions performance is compiled by the council.

In order to enable schools to determine their relative performance against others, each school will be provided with two performance league tables with the names of all other schools apart from their own deleted. These tables will outline the CRC cost per school building size and CRC cost per pupil numbers. (The age of schools buildings is not a useful comparison factor: one would expect modern buildings to be more energy efficient than older buildings, but in fact although they may be thermally more efficient, they often incorporate higher use of ICT equipment making them high energy consumers.) Further supporting information will then be provided alongside this to inform the data. A survey will be prepared for 2010/11 based on the CRC charges relating to each school if the council had to purchase allowances.

b) Costs and Schools

To date, correspondence from the council to schools has stated that the cost of the CRC will initially be borne corporately, although it has been signalled that costs may eventually be passed on to schools. It should be noted that the CIPFA CRC Guide for Schools states that CRC costs can be top-sliced from the DSG budget. Alternatively, it may be apportioned to Individual School Budgets, provided there is agreement from the School Forum. Penalties incurred as a result of non-compliance may be passed on directly to individual schools.

In order to avoid the 10% uplift for estimated data, the council will require actual (non-estimated) consumption data from schools. Where the 10% uplift is incurred by the council as a result of schools failing to provide actual (non-estimated) data, the council will consider passing on this cost to schools.

Options for passing costs to schools are discussed in point 4 below.

c) Compliance reporting issues

The council faces penalties in the event of non- or inaccurate reporting.

Schools have a statutory requirement to provide the data that the LA requires with regard to the CRC. It is proposed to include the provision of energy data alongside the routine financial compliance statements already provided to head teachers and governing bodies with the intention of achieving full compliance. The process to pass on the cost to a school where it fails to comply would be subject to consultation with all schools and agreement of Schools Forum.

A list of the information required from schools is attached at Appendix 2.

d) Academies and the CRC

With academies (and PFI Schools) being funded separately from the Wiltshire Council budget, the council is in a situation of having no direct control over the energy consumption / emissions from these buildings or the resulting CRC costs.

The Department for Education standard academy transfer documents do not include any reference to the CRC. From mid August 2011, the legal documents prepared by Wiltshire Council for transferring schools to academy status will include clauses requiring the academies to report CRC data to the council and to refund the council for the purchases of allowances made on their behalf.

Local government has lobbied government on this issue. In the current consultation on simplifying the CRC which closes on 2 September, Wiltshire Council will recommend that from Phase 2 (2013/14 – 2018/19) onwards:

- Our preferred option is for the responsibility for CRC for academies to be removed from the council and handed over to the Department for Education or the Young People's Learning Agency. Academies will already have staff in place who would be in a position to take on the responsibility of administering the CRC – bursars, facilities managers, business managers, etc. In this way, energy can be considered to be a resource to be managed in the similar way that finances are already.
- Alternatively, if responsibility stays with local government, we would want provision to be made in the CRC regulations placing a legal requirement on academies to:
 - Provide energy consumption data and evidence as reasonably requested by the Local Authority.
 - Pay the LA for allowances to cover their emissions
 - To reimburse the LA for the administrative burden
 - To put in place and deliver against a 'carbon management plan' with a target to deliver a reduction in the academy / school's emissions. The target must have the LA's approval that and be challenging but deliverable.

e) Academies and Solar panels

The academy transfer leases allow for academies to sub-let their roofs for solar photovoltaic schemes under their own authority. However, they must seek consent from Wiltshire Council for any alterations that need to be made to any roof.

4. Options

Wiltshire Council is aware from national networks such as the Local Government Information Unit that local authorities are considering how to pass on CRC costs to schools. Informal officer networking shows that most authorities in our region are keen to charge individual schools, or failing that will top slice the DSG budget.

In the meantime, the council has considered three options for ensuring the costs relating to schools are passed on appropriately to the schools budget. **In all three options, the costs of the CRC for the first year (ie payment in July 2012 for 2011/12) will be borne by the council corporately:**

Option 1, Top-slicing Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) budget:

Regulations allow LAs to “top slice” the schools proportion of the CRC from the Dedicated Schools Grant, with the agreement of Schools Forum. This would leave less funding to be spent on all schools but would mean individual schools are not faced with an additional cost pressure. This option would not provide transparency in schools as it would effectively remain a hidden cost. Schools Forum agreement is required.

Assuming CO₂ emissions across the schools estate stay at the current levels (ie 22,053 tCO₂) and that the cost of carbon is as previously indicated by Government, projections for the total liability from schools are:

2011/12 @ £12 per tCO ₂ To be paid from corporate budget	2012/13 @ £14 per tCO ₂	2013/14 @ £16 per tCO ₂
£261,972	£305,634	£349,296

Risks to centralising the CRC costs to the DSG:

- Failure of schools to take ownership of their CRC emissions and to engage with energy efficiency.
- For schools that do engage and reduce their emissions, they receive no direct financial benefit in the form of reduced CRC costs (beyond the direct energy cost savings they are able to make)
- If some schools fail to engage at all (eg fail to provide energy consumption data) the council will bear corporately either the cost of fines or the 10% uplift for estimated data

Benefits of centralising the CRC costs to the DSG:

- DCE is in a stronger position to coordinate and drive forward energy efficiency work programmes.

Option 2, Charging individual schools – Cabinet Members’ Preferred Option:

Regulations permit LAs to pass the costs on to individual schools. To achieve this, the LA must formally consult all head teachers and governing bodies and seek the agreement of Schools Forum, to amend the LA’s Scheme for Funding Schools. Schools would also need to be notified of the likely charges in advance of the financial year so that they can include the cost in their three year budget plans. Schools will need to accrue for the charge at the end of 2011-12. Agreement would also need to be reached regarding how the monies would be recovered from schools i.e by invoice or deduction from budget share payments. As the LAs Scheme for Funding Schools does not apply to academies, an alternative arrangement would need to be put in place. Consideration could be given to amending the Scheme to allow the LA to deduct any unpaid charge from the following year’s budget share. Schools Forum agreement would be required and a consultation with all schools.

Table 1 below illustrates the level of CRC liability to individual schools with a range of costs of carbon (£12 to £20 per tonne). A range of typical schools was selected on the basis of their current overall budget (ie large, medium and small).

The greatest CRC liability currently (ie current emissions at £12 per tCO₂) would lie with Marlborough St Johns School & Community College at £11,715, the second greatest would lie with Chippenham Sheldon School at £8,079. The lowest CRC liability currently would lie with Chirton CE VC Primary School at £164.

The vast majority of schools (74%) would have a CRC liability of less than £1,000. A further 14% would have a liability of £1,000 - £4,000. 27 schools would have a liability of between approximately £4k and £12k, these schools being secondaries, those that are already academies and special schools.

Risks of charging individual schools:

- The CRC liability for the vast majority of schools is currently relatively small (£200 - £1,000) which may not be enough to encourage schools to take ownership of the issue. Charges will increase over time, but for many schools may remain relatively low.
- The burden of administering the charges may be relatively high.

Benefits of charging individual schools:

- Greater awareness of and ownership of the issue.
- The costs of CRC can be built into the business cases for energy efficiency measures.
- Schools that successfully reduce their emissions will see a direct impact on their CRC financial liability

Table 1: Illustration of typical CRC costs at the individual school level based on 2010/11 emissions

Type of School	School name	DfE Number	2011/12 School Budget	TOTAL tCO ₂ 2010/11	CRC Cost at £12 / t	CRC Cost at £14 / t	CRC Cost at £16 / t	CRC Cost at £18 / t	CRC Cost at £20 / t
Secondary – large	Warminster Kingdown School	4072	£6,982,070	514.75	£6,177	£7,207	£8,236	£9,266	£10,295
Secondary - large	Trowbridge The John Of Gaunt School	4075	£5,951,372	580.84	£6,970	£8,132	£9,293	£10,455	£11,617
Secondary – small	Amesbury The Stonehenge School	4070	£3,612,772	385.01	£4,620	£5,390	£6,160	£6,930	£7,700
Secondary – small	Durrington Avon Valley College	4071	£3,485,630	373.52	£4,482	£5,229	£5,976	£6,723	£7,470
Special	Rowdeford School	7002	£2,354,340	274.95	£3,299	£3,849	£4,399	£4,949	£5,499
Primary - Large	Chippenham Charter Primary School	2226	£1,009,603	84.31	£1,012	£1,180	£1,349	£1,518	£1,686
Primary - Large	Bradford on Avon Christ Church CE Contr'd Primary	3015	£1,322,102	75.46	£906	£1,056	£1,207	£1,358	£1,509
Primary - Medium	Christian Malford CE Primary School	3038	£354,055	28.46	£342	£398	£455	£512	£569
Primary - Medium	Chilton Foliat CE Primary School	3318	£390,202	24.11	£289	£338	£386	£434	£482
Primary - Small	Figheledean St Michael's CE Primary School	3071	£346,527	24.58	£295	£344	£393	£442	£492
Primary - Small	Savernake St Katharine's CE Primary School	3023	£318,067	17.11	£205	£240	£274	£308	£342

Option 3, Combination of Passing on / Top-slicing a Proportion of the Costs:

This is a combination of options 1 and 2. For example, at 50% DSG budget charge and 50% charged to individual schools, the total deducted from the DSG would be £131k at £12 per tCO₂, and £175k at £16 per tCO₂. With schools being charged for 50% of their CRC liability, around 200 schools would be responsible for under £1,000 of CRC liability.

Risks and benefits for a combination of passing on and top-slicing a proportion of costs:

- Although it would provide some protection for schools with higher costs, it would arguably be more bureaucratic and not provide transparency of the real costs. This option could, however, be used as a transition to individual charging.

5. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- 5.1 A survey benchmarking Wiltshire schools' CRC emissions performance be compiled by the council and shared with Wiltshire Schools after each annual submission.
- 5.2 Compliance be monitored and reported through the routine financial compliance statements already provided to head teachers and governing bodies and that the process of passing on the cost to a school that fails to comply be consulted with all schools through the Schools Forum.
- 5.3 Option 2 be agreed by Schools Forum as the preferred way forward for passing CRC costs on to schools.

Stephanie Denovan
Service Director Schools & Learning

Alistair Cunningham
Service Director Economy & Enterprise

Appendix 1: Summary of the CRC

The CRC Scheme

The CRC is a mandatory scheme to improve energy efficiency and thereby cut CO₂ emissions in large public and private sector organisations. These large organisations are responsible for around 10% of the UK's CO₂ emissions. The scheme features a range of reputational, behavioural and financial drivers to encourage participating organisations to develop energy management strategies that promote a better understanding of and reduce energy usage.

The CRC is designed to run in three phases, with payments being made as follows:

Phase 1: 2011/12 – 2013/14 **Phase 2:** 2014/15 – 2018/19 **Phase 3:** 2019/20 – 2023/24

Organisations became eligible for Phase 1 of the scheme if in 2008 they consumed around 6,000 MWh (6,000,000KWh) of electricity (around £500k worth) and had at least one half-hourly electricity meter (HHM) settled on the half-hourly market. Participants include supermarkets, restaurant chains, water companies, banks, local government and all central government departments.

From 2010/11, data on energy consumption (gas, electricity, heating oil, LPG, kerosene, biomass, etc) must be gathered by participating organisations and reported to the Environment Agency (the CRC scheme administrator) by the end of July following the end of each financial year for the duration of the scheme. Evidence for energy consumption (meter readings and supplier invoices) must be kept for the duration of the scheme. The EA will audit participating organisations following a risk based approach, and all organisations can expect to be audited once every five years.

The EA apply conversion factors to each of the reported energy fuel types to determine the amount of carbon emissions of each participating organisation. Emissions from electricity generated onsite from renewable energy sources (eg solar pv) may be off-set against the overall footprint where ROCs or FITs are not claimed.

Organisations must report on their emissions footprint (Footprint Report) in the first year of Phase 1. Alongside this, organisations must submit an Annual Report for each year of the phase which must include at least 90% of these emissions, on the basis that the final 10% of emissions are likely to be too onerous to gather information on due to the small level of consumption.

CRC Costs

In the first year of Phase 1 (2010/11), there is no financial charge for emissions. For 2011/12, organisations must purchase allowances to cover their annual report emissions at a charge of £12 per tonne of CO₂. This payment will be due in July 2012. The price of allowances for future years is not yet confirmed and will be set annually in Government's April Budgets. Current indications suggest the charge for allowances will rise to £14 per tCO₂ for 2012/13 and will rise to £16 per tCO₂ in 2013/14, bringing it in line with the Carbon Floor Price². Thereafter, Government has signalled that the cost of CRC allowances will rise to £30 by 2020, and the price is therefore likely to rise by around £2 per year.

A second financial driver is applied in order to improve energy data management, in the form of a 10% uplift on emissions for which the organisation has only estimated data rather than actual data. (Data is considered to be actual where there are two meter readings at least six months apart.)

² From April 1st 2013, firms generating [electricity](#) will be required to pay at least £16 per tonne of CO₂ they produce. This is known as the Carbon Floor Price.

CRC Fines

Fines will be applied to an organisation where it fails to report or reports inaccurately.

Performance League Table

In October of each year the EA will publish a performance league table. In the first year, an organisation's position in the league table will depend on: a) the amount of emissions covered under the Carbon Trust Scheme (a performance improvement accreditation scheme to reduce emissions) over the last three years; and b) the percentage of emissions covered by voluntary automatic meter reading (AMR) (ie a way of collecting accurate, actual data).

In subsequent years, the position in the league table will be determined by the relative improvement of performance. A growth metric will be applied to ascertain whether emissions have increased or reduced relative to the size of the organisation. For private sector organisations this is calculated relative to turnover. For the public sector, relative to revenue spend.

Changes to the CRC

It should be noted that the CRC is under review and is likely to be changed in autumn 2011 for Phase 2 as it has been criticised for being over-complicated. In particular, local government discussion forums have picked up the following issues:

- The CRC is a carbon trading scheme, although currently it is more like a tax as a fixed price payment is made retrospectively on the basis of actual emissions. This is likely to be changed by the review into two sales of allowances in a year: the first made at the beginning of the financial year at the fixed price rate on the basis of projections of likely energy consumption/emissions, and the second taking place at the end of the year on a market price basis to ensure enough allowances have been purchased to cover actual emissions.
- Government recognises that the changing of schools' status to academies creates an anomalous situation whereby councils are responsible for the emissions of entirely independent organisations. This is likely to be addressed in the CRC review. However, nationally the schools estate represents a significant amount of emissions and it is unlikely that Government will remove these emissions from the CRC. The issue to be resolved is who will take on the responsibility of reporting them and paying for the resulting allowances.
- It is probable that to simplify the scheme, fewer fuel types will have to be reported with LPG and kerosene no longer included.
- It is also possible that the distinction between the annual report (100% of emissions) and the footprint report (90% of emissions) may be removed.

Appendix 2: Information required by Wiltshire Council from Schools for CRC reporting purposes

All Energy consumption data for the year 01/04 – 31/03

Every school is obliged under the CRC regulations to provide such information as is reasonably requested from the Local Authority for the purposes of complying with the CRC. This will include total energy used per utility and per supply for the whole site, including other buildings on the site such as caretakers bungalows, nurseries etc, and details of how those other buildings on the site are supplied and paid for.

Wiltshire Council will require the following information to be supplied by schools each year:

For each electricity and gas supply:

- The Meter Serial Number (found on the meter)
- The Meter Point Administration Number (electricity) and the Meter Point Reference (gas) – found on the bills
- The name of the supplier
- The amount of energy used through that meter between 01/04 and 31/03
- Details of any sub meters fed through that meter and the amount of energy recorded by the sub meter
- Details of any change of meter during the specified period
- Details of any change of supplier during the specified period

For each oil or LPG supply:

- Details of all deliveries of fuel during the specified period, with copies of delivery invoices
- Details of any changes to fuel supplies during the specified period

For any renewable energy generated on the site:

- Details of how much electricity or heat has been generated during the period 01/04 to 31/03
- Details of any ROCs (Renewable Energy Certificates) or FITs (Feed in Tariff) or RHI (Renewable Heat Incentive) that have been claimed for generating energy on site
- Details of how generation amounts have been recorded (egg. measured through a meter or calculated by estimation)

NB: On site renewable energy generation sources may include solar panels, wind turbines, heat pumps, CHP units, biomass boilers and anaerobic digesters.

Notification of changes to buildings:

- Details of any significant changes to buildings that may have an impact on energy consumption, such as an extension; refurbishment; new heating system; electrical rewire etc.

This information will be collected every year using a survey form to be completed and returned by each school.

Appendix 3: Schools converting to Academy Status

1. The following academies have already converted:

- Hardenhuish (1/09/2010)
- Lavington Secondary (16/12/2010)
- South Wilts Grammar (1/01/2011)
- Bishops Wordsworth's Grammar (1/02/2011)
- Sheldon (1/04/2011)
- The Corsham School (Secondary) (1/04/2011)
- Corsham (Primary) (1/04/2011)
- Wootton Bassett Secondary (1/07/2011)
- Pewsey Vale Secondary (1/07/2011)
- Kingdown Community (1/08/2011)
- St Laurence (1/08/2011)
- Malmesbury Secondary (17/08/2011)
- St Augustine's Catholic (1/09/2011)
- Calne St Edmund's RC Primary (1/09/2011)
- Devizes St Joseph's RC Primary (1/09/2011)
- Great Cheverell Holy Trinity Primary (1/09/2011)
- Springfields Special School (1/09/2011)

2. The following are due to convert imminently:

- St Edmund's Girls School Salisbury (1/10/2011)
- John Bentley (originally 1/09/2011 but now date TBC, expected relatively soon)

Glossary / Acronyms

- AMR Automatic meter reading equipment (AMR or smart meters) which enable the accurate collection of data. A meter will be defined as an AMR meter under CRC if it meets the following four criteria:
- The meter together with an ancillary device is capable of capturing consumption data on at least an hourly basis;
 - The meter is the main fiscal meter and not a sub-metering device;
 - The meter has been read remotely;
 - The consumption data is made available to the customer.
- CIPFA Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy
- CO₂ Carbon dioxide is by far the most significant of the greenhouse gases contributing to global warming. Once CO₂ is released from the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, etc) it stays in the atmosphere for around 100 years, thus creating a cumulative build up and intensifying the greenhouse effect.
- CRC The Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme is a mandatory scheme to improve energy efficiency and thereby cut CO₂ emissions in large public and private sector organisations. These organisations are responsible for around 10% of the UK's CO₂ emissions. The scheme features a range of reputational, behavioural and financial drivers which aim to encourage organisations to develop energy management strategies that promote a better understanding of energy usage. Details are in Appendix 1.
- DSG The Dedicated Schools Grant is a ring-fenced specific grant from central government which must be used in support of the authority's Schools Budget and for no other purpose.
- FITs Feed in Tariff - Feed-in Tariffs (FITs) became available in Great Britain on 1st April 2010. Under this scheme energy suppliers make regular payments to householders, communities and organisations who generate their own electricity from renewable or low carbon sources such as solar electricity or wind turbines. Investors in renewable electricity generation receive a generation tariff for every kWh of energy generated. They will receive the benefit of reduced energy costs by using the energy they generate and any electricity exported to the national grid will also garner a tariff (the feed-in part of the tariff).
- LPG Liquefied petroleum gas (also called LPG, GPL, LP Gas, autogas, or liquid propane gas) is a flammable mixture of hydrocarbon gases used as a fuel in heating appliances and vehicles.
- PFI Private Finance Initiatives
- RHI Renewable Heat Incentive – Like the Feed-in Tariff, the RHI incentivises property owners to invest in renewable heat (eg solar thermal panels, biomass boilers, etc) by receiving a guaranteed payment for paid for 20 years from the registration date and index-linked for inflation generating heat. The RHI is administered by the official regulator Ofgem who pay the tariffs with money from the Treasury. Investors will save money by eliminating or reducing the need for gas or oil, both of which are becoming increasingly expensive year-on-year. In addition, they will be paid up to 8.5p/kWhr for the hot water and heat generated and used. The exact tariff depends on exactly what systems you use and how large they are.
- ROCs The Renewables Obligation (the RO) is the main support scheme for renewable electricity projects in the UK. It places an obligation on UK suppliers of electricity to source an increasing proportion of their electricity from renewable sources.
- A Renewables Obligation Certificate (ROC) is a green certificate issued to an accredited generator for eligible renewable electricity generated within the United Kingdom and supplied to customers within the United Kingdom by a licensed electricity supplier. One ROC is issued for each megawatt hour (MWh) of eligible renewable output generated.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Schools' Forum

Date 13/10/11

The Future Development of the Young People's Support Service

Purpose of Report

1. The report outlines the current position of the Young People's Support Service (YPSS) and Wiltshire's involvement in a pathfinder pilot Trial of Alternative Provision being run by the Department for Education (DfE). Later this month Cabinet will be asked to approve a request to the Secretary of State to close YPSS from 31 August 2012 and to delegate the responsibility for permanently excluded students to schools. Schools' Forum are asked to consider the devolution of the current funding of YPSS to schools using a formula based on aspects of deprivation set out in Appendices 1 to 3. This will give individual schools the funds to enable them to fulfil this responsibility either themselves or by commissioning others to do so.
2. The objective of this strategic approach is to create an effective provision and better outcomes for permanent excluded pupils and those at risk of permanent exclusion. The expected outcomes are
 - a. To effect immediate improvements to the existing service (whilst work to develop the new service is underway)
 - Produce an improvement Action Plan
 - Ofsted to approve plan
 - Implement actions from September 2011
 - b. To acquire the Power to Innovate from the Secretary of State for Education
 - Submission to Secretary of State for approval
 - Power granted and some statutory functions suspended
 - c. To develop an innovative and effective service specification
 - Research best practice and explore creative methods
 - Develop and agree new curriculum and critical service requirements
 - Produce new service specification
 - d. To develop with secondary schools an innovative and effective delivery mechanism
 - Work with individual secondary schools or groups of secondary schools to develop appropriate models for delivery against the specification
 - Audit existing and research potential new providers of the service
 - e. To close the existing YPSS and launch the new provision

- Application to Sec of State for formal closure of the existing YPSS
 - Transfer of agreed responsibility to secondary schools on 1 September 2012
 - Invite the existing YPSS centres to make proposals to continue to operate providing a traded service
 - Council adopts regulatory and monitoring role
- f. The expected outputs from the new provision will be:
- To increase the number of young people with identified behavioural issues achieving either 5 grades A*-C (including English and Mathematics) at GCSE or achieving positive value added
 - To reduce the number of students permanently excluded
 - To improve the attainment at KS2 of children eligible for free school meals and with special education needs
 - To reduce the number of young people who become NEETS (Not in Education, Employment, or Training)
 - To remove the YPSS from special measures

Background

3. The council has currently a statutory requirement to provide all children who have been permanently excluded from school with full-time education. Local Authorities must provide facilities dedicated to this provision which have the generic title of Pupil Referral Units (PRU). In Wiltshire the facilities and service are referred to as the Young People's Support Service (YPSS). The overall aim of the service is to provide the young people referred to YPSS with as good a standard of education and appropriate opportunities in life as if they were in the regular school system.
4. The YPSS consists of four centres: Bridge Centre in Chippenham, Trinity Centre in Trowbridge, Kennet Centres in Devizes, and Jon Ivie Centre in Salisbury. The centres cater for students who have been permanently excluded or are at risk of being excluded from their mainstream schools.
5. The council has recognised that for some time the service required attention and improvement in some areas. In autumn 2010 the council carried out a full review of the whole service. The conclusions contained some far-reaching and long-term options for the service.
6. In May 2011, the YPSS was inspected by OfSTED. This is the second time in six years that YPSS has been placed in an OfSTED category. The report from the inspectors identified failings in the service in the following key areas:
 - Inadequate attendance by students
 - Limited curriculum – not enough variety to suit all needs of the students
 - Several of the centres have inadequate accommodation with limited space and poor resources, particularly ICT.
 - Too many permanently excluded students – not enough examples of students returning to mainstream education

Generally, OfSTED considered that the leadership and management of the YPSS had been ineffective at making the necessary improvements quickly enough. The service has been placed under 'Special Measures'.

7. From a national perspective, PRU's struggle to provide similar performance standards to the mainstream education system and very few achieve good or satisfactory Ofsted assessments. As these services are measured against the mainstream school system and are centred on those young people who for a variety of reasons, often behavioural, are unable to remain in that system, achieving comparable standards is inherently challenging.
8. The Department for Education is keen to promote creative and progressive thinking in the provision of education services. It has launched a trial in order to develop improved alternative provision. The trial involves the participating Local Authorities delegating the responsibility for educating permanently excluded students to their secondary schools. This will be done by using the Power to Innovate to enable Local Authorities to work outside existing regulations. Funds to support the provision will be devolved to secondary schools. The purpose of the trial is to engage secondary schools in taking greater responsibility for the education of permanently excluded students. This is in line with the proposals in the education bill that is currently before parliament. Local Authorities will, however, retain responsibility for the "wellbeing".
9. Wiltshire's Department for Children and Education (DCE) considers that the current position with the YPSS and the change-potential offered by the DfE initiative represents a clear opportunity to radically improve the service and the outcomes for the young people it serves. There is an acceptance that the historic and current difficulties with the YPSS cannot be resolved through the existing delivery mechanism and that being granted the Power to Innovate will enable the council and its partners to design and implement a new and more effective service.
10. In line with the DfE's preferred direction for this type of service, the trial will deliver a fundamental shift of responsibility by delegating this from the council to schools. Either singularly or collectively, working to an agreed framework with specified outcomes, schools will receive the funding currently used by the council and provide for the permanently excluded young people.
11. The strategic approach to YPSS will cover all aspects of the work required to close the existing and launch the new provision, with a target completion of 31st August 2012. Monitoring and certain governance arrangements will continue beyond that date to oversee the delivery and initial performance of the new provision.

Main Considerations for Schools' Forum

12. The purpose of this strategic approach is to increase the attainment of the most vulnerable young people within our communities by producing provision that is more effective at secondary level. It will make a significant contribution to the Council's corporate goals of "Providing high quality low cost customer focused services," and "Working together to support our communities." It relates particularly to the priorities of "working in partnership to support vulnerable individuals and families" and to "increase opportunities to help young people achieve their potential.

The Schools ' Forum will need to consider

- Whether the total funds it is proposed to allocate are sufficient to achieve the desired objectives? The proposed figure is based upon the historical budget allocated to YPSS without the one off addition provided by School's forum in 2011-2012.
- Whether the level of funding is affordable?
- Whether the formula proposed is the most equitable way of distributing the funds?

13. In particular Schools Forum is asked to consider the proposed models for the devolution of funding for the provision of services to students who have been permanently excluded or are at risk of permanent exclusion. Funding models have been developed using the current budget for the YPSS service, the final budget for 2012/13 will need to be approved by Schools Forum as part of the budget setting process but the models give a steer for the relative impact of each formula.

14. In developing a formula driver for the allocation of funding varying combinations of the use of a Flat rate, Pupil Numbers and Deprivation Scores have been used. In its current consultation on schools funding, "Proposals for a Fairer System", the DfE identifies that the incidence of pupils in Pupil Referral Units, or alternative provision, is best predicted by the youth population size and deprivation. These models reflect those principles.

15. Following a meeting with Secondary Head Teachers represented on Schools Forum and the 3 Federations, further models have been added to incorporate a service pupil element for those models which are based on Free School Meal (FSM) data. This is to reflect the concern that the use of FSM data would disadvantage schools with a significant service population as they are not eligible for FSM.

16. A summary of the 6 funding models is shown in Appendix 1, with the consolidated total at Federation level shown at Appendix 2. Appendix 3 gives the detail for each model.

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

17. There is no specific environmental impact within this report. However any future strategy developments in relation to small schools would need to be considered carefully assessing and then managing the environmental impact.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

12. This strategic approach is likely to have a positive impact on equality by
- a) Improving the provision for those young people permanently excluded or at risk of permanent exclusion. These young people tend to come from the most disadvantaged socio-economic groups with the lowest attainment and the poorest academic progress. Enhanced provision will improve the attainment and progress of these young people.
 - b) Although provision will be developed by individual secondary schools or groups of schools this will be done against a service specification to ensure that there are not significant differences across the county that could lead to inequalities. The service specification will be supported by a rigorous monitoring process to ensure that quality is maintained.
 - c) For the first time alternative providers from the private and voluntary sector will be invited to be put on a register to improve the regulation and quality of their provision.

Risk Assessment

13. The main risks are set out below. A risk register is attached as Appendix 4.

- The Secretary of State does not approve the closure of the existing YPSS
- The Secretary of state imposes conditions for the closure
- The Secretary of State does not award the Power to Innovate
- YPSS fails its monitoring visits by HMI and the DfE decide that it should be taken over by another provider
- Some schools refuse to accept the responsibility for permanently excluded students and continue to exclude
- All schools refuse to take part in the trial because they feel the funds available are inadequate
- All schools refuse to take part in the trial because they feel there is a need for capital investment in accommodation

- Staff leave YPSS because it is going to close and the Service becomes unsustainable.
- Some schools fail to deliver provision of sufficient quality
- An alternative provider has major safeguarding issues

Financial Implications

14. There are the following financial considerations

- a. Funding for the delivery of provision will be devolved to secondary schools but will be based on the existing budget
- b. Funding will need to be found to meet the cost of any redundancies as a result of the closure of the existing YPSS and work is ongoing to confirm whether this would need to be met from the overall schools budget (DSG) or whether central support will be available.
- c. Funds will need to be set aside to provide the capital investment required to develop suitable offsite accommodation to support the provision

Legal Implications

16. The transfer of the responsibility for permanently excluded students from the Local Authority will be a change to the current legal position. This will be done through an application for the power to innovate which will be submitted in November 2011.

17. The closure of YPSS is likely to lead to all or some of its current staff being made redundant. The HR and Legal departments are engaged with the project group to manage this situation.

Options considered

18. The placing of YPSS in special measures by the OfSTED inspection of May 2011 provides clear evidence that maintaining the status quo is not a viable option. This view is supported by a commissioned report from Colin Smith in October 2010 which produced a clear set of recommendations for change. Four different models of operating YPSS are set out in Appendix 5 "YPSS and discussion of options." The inspection judgement requires prompt and effective action within a timescale that is externally determined and an action plan remains the focus for the work of YPSS. Monitoring visits by HMI will be conducted every four to six months until HMI deem that YPSS has made sufficient progress to have a full inspection that would bring it out of special measures. The report was published in July 2011 and an appropriate Action Plan has been submitted and accepted. It is

anticipated that the first monitoring visit will be at the end of October or the beginning of November. 2011.

19. Consideration has been given to the idea of putting in an internal manager to address the issues. The complex nature of the service operating over four geographical dispersed centres means that any intervention of this kind would require a team rather than a single individual. In the current situation the Council does not have the capacity to do this over the protracted period of time required. It seems more sensible to lay the foundations for a long term and more sustainable solution. For that reason this option is not one considered in Appendix 1.
20. The OfSTED judgement raises the question as to whether the service should continue in its current form albeit with a different mode of operation or whether it should be closed and reconstituted. Given the inability of the service to operate effectively over a number of years it is clear that radical change is needed. To close the current service, reorganise it and completely rebrand it would signal the kind of clear break with the past that is needed. Whilst acknowledging, as the OfSTED report does, that improvements in teaching and learning have been made it is clear that to secure the further progress that is now needed there has to be a complete transformation of the service. Closing it in its current form would enable that to happen. It would seem, therefore, that this should be the first logical step that should take place whichever of the proposed options of operation are chosen.
21. The education of young people in hospital or unable to attend school for other medical reasons is a different matter. A key recommendation of Colin Smith's report is that this element should be separate. As the issues surrounding these young people are quite different from those who have been permanently excluded it makes perfect sense to educate them separately and this is also in line with best practice in other authorities. The education of these young people is, therefore, not included in this proposal and will be addressed separately.
22. Option 1 for a single special school to take over running the service for an initial two year period appeared to have a number of advantages. Springfields is in OfSTED terms an outstanding school. It has particular strengths in the areas of curriculum and leadership which are key areas deemed inadequate in the OfSTED report on YPSS. It also has a proven track record of working with secondary schools in the North and the West through its vocational centre. It already has, therefore, good relations with many secondary headteachers and would not need to spend time establishing these as would an external provider. Further discussion with school made it clear, however, that its current focus is on gaining academy status. For this reason it does not feel that it

has the capacity to take over the whole of YPSS. It is, therefore, not possible to pursue option 1.

23. Option 2 putting the service out to tender is an attractive proposition. There are clearly a number of organisations who have developed expertise in this area and with a total of around £3 million this could be a highly desirable contract to bid for. However the time involved in going out to tender which would take at least twelve months would cause a significant delay at a time when quick action is essential. The time taken to tender would be time wasted in terms of any impact upon young people. It would create a prolonged period of uncertainty that is likely demoralise the staff employed by both services. This delay is hard to justify as there is an alternative effective option that could make an immediate difference. In addition there is a real danger that going to a single external provider would actually be an obstacle in the long term aim of increased delegation to the partnerships. Some headteachers have already expressed the view that going to a single external provider would simply perpetuate their frustrations with the current system giving them less control and with less accountability towards them. There is also the fact that only one out of the four buildings is actually fit for purpose. A strategy needs to be developed to address this in line with the recommendation made in OfSTED's 2007 document "Establishing successful practice in pupil referral units and local authorities" that LAs should "ensure that PRU accommodation is suitable and that improvements are made urgently where necessary." It is also one of the issues raised in the May 2011 inspection of YPSS. Embarking on this at the same time as going out to tender for an external provider would further complicate the situation and seem to be extremely unwise.

24. The preferred direction of development for both the Council and the current government is for the delegation of this service to schools or groups of schools as set out in options 3 and 4. The Department for Education has invited Wiltshire to take part in a national trial on the development of alternative provision. This trial would last for three years and would involve the delegation of the responsibility for permanently excluded students to schools supported by devolved funding. Exemption from existing regulations would be provided through the Power to Innovate which would be given to those Local Authorities that are part of the Trial. Local Authorities would retain ultimate responsibility for the "wellbeing" of young people. Under option 3 the responsibility would be delegated and the funding devolved to the existing Federations. There are, however, a number of reasons why this is not an effective option at this point in time. Firstly, the partnerships of secondary schools do not all have the same capacity to take responsibility for a delegated service. Second and most important the three existing Federations were developed largely to implement the 14-19 strategy especially the introduction of diplomas. They

are not necessarily the right configurations to take responsibility for making provision for permanently excluded students. Option 4 provides much more flexibility. By delegating the responsibility and devolving the funding to individual secondary schools it enables them to decide how best to address this issue. They could decide to operate as an individual school or to work together as a partnership without having to work in the existing partnerships. It would make it possible for one school, for example Springfields, to offer to make provision on behalf of a group of schools. Equally a school or group of schools could decide to employ a private provider or, providers to deliver all or some aspects of the service. It also makes it possible for the existing YPSS centres to continue to operate by providing traded services. Clearly there is the danger in such an approach of provision being inconsistent across the county and some young people being disadvantaged. This would be addressed by secondary schools being asked to submit their proposals either individually or as groups against a clear service specification. Proposals would be scrutinised and modified if necessary to ensure both consistency and quality. Delivery would be rigorously and regularly monitored. Other providers would be invited to meet certain conditions to enable them to be placed on a register. Making individual schools directly responsible in this way gives them the greatest incentive to ensure that the provision for permanently excluded young people is of the highest possible quality.

25. This would need to be supported by the development of appropriate accommodation. There will still be a need for offsite provision and so the state of the current accommodation would need to be addressed. This accommodation might in the future be leased to partnerships of schools, the existing YPSS centres operating as private providers or other private providers.

Conclusions

26. Overall, therefore, closing the existing YPSS, accepting the DfE's invitation to be part of its Trial and transferring responsibility for permanently excluded young people directly to individual secondary schools as in option 4 appears to offer the most effective way to improve the quality of provision. It represents a move to greater local control which is in line with the current thinking of both the Government and Wiltshire Council. It does so in a way that creates the maximum flexibility but underpinned by sufficient safeguards to protract quality and consistency. It will also enable Wiltshire Schools to begin to prepare to take on a responsibility which is likely to fall to all schools under the current Education Bill. It also, [provides an opportunity for the existing YPSS centres to continue in a different form which is likely to reduce redundancies. Secondary schools have been fully consulted on this issue. Headteachers welcome the opportunity to take responsibility for

permanently excluded students and value the choice that having funds devolved to their individual school gives them. The formula being proposed to Schools' Forum is the one that most headteachers prefer having discussed a range of different models.

Proposals

1. Schools' Forum supports the delegation of the responsibility of permanently excluded young people to secondary schools.
2. Schools' Forum agrees in principle to devolve funds to individual secondary schools to enable them to fulfil this responsibility.
3. Schools' Forum accepts the proposed formula as the most effective and equitable way to devolve the funds.
4. Schools Forum will set the quantum to be devolved in the light of the budget settlement for 2012-2013 and further work to be done to establish the real costs of provision. However in principle it accepts that at least for 2012-2013 the quantum should not be less than the current historical budget for YPSS.
5. Schools' Forum supports the general direction of development for alternative provision, Wiltshire's participation in the DfE trail and the proposed closure of YPSS.

Reason for Proposal

27. The reasons for this proposal are that it appears to be the best way to address the continued weakness of the Young People's Support Service and to improve the achievement and progression of permanently excluded students. It will also enable Wiltshire to take part in the Department of Education trial.

Carolyn Godfrey, Director Children's Services

Report Author: Mark Brotherton

Name, title and contact details

Head of Targeted Schools and Learner Support, Schools and Learning ,DCE

Mark.Brotherton@wiltshire.gov.uk

01225 713835

Date of report 3 October 2011

Background Papers

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this report:

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – summary of options for the distribution of YPSS funding to Secondary Schools

Appendix 2 – summary of allocations by Federation Area for each model

Appendix 3 – detailed funding models

Appendix 4 – Risk Register

Appendix 5 - different models of operating YPSS

This page is intentionally left blank

			1	2	3	4	5	6
Area	DfE	SCHOOL NAME	Small flat rate/20%per pupil/75% deprivation	Small Flat Rate / 95% Deprivation index	100% Deprivation index	100% distributed by Free Meals recorded on January 2011 census	48.25% Free meals/ 50% deprivation index + 1.75% Service Pupil element	98.25% distributed by Free Meals recorded on January 2011 census 1.75% Service pupil element
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	£70,462	£68,143	£66,886	£77,630	£70,900	£76,271
Wessex	4071	Avon Valley College	£70,651	£72,919	£71,914	£51,265	£81,746	£71,421
Wessex	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	£36,130	£34,957	£31,953	£39,547	£35,058	£38,855
West	4013	Melksham Oak	£110,887	£112,811	£113,905	£130,359	£119,851	£128,078
Wessex	6906	Sarum Academy	£85,007	£90,250	£90,156	£146,471	£115,750	£143,908
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	£113,138	£116,890	£118,198	£168,442	£140,372	£165,494
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarendon	£123,635	£127,463	£129,328	£143,542	£133,923	£141,030
North	5411	Devizes	£115,963	£118,466	£119,857	£139,148	£127,067	£136,713
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	£159,051	£170,242	£174,359	£87,883	£129,583	£86,345
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuish	£131,549	£130,175	£132,183	£95,206	£112,029	£93,540
North	4066	Corsham School	£118,542	£118,317	£119,700	£158,189	£136,176	£155,421
Wessex	4070	Amesbury The Stoneheng	£79,530	£80,030	£79,398	£99,600	£87,756	£97,857
North	4064	Malmesbury School	£82,692	£75,603	£74,738	£61,518	£67,052	£60,441
North	5406	Calne John Bentley	£116,826	£118,918	£120,334	£143,542	£129,426	£141,030
West	5402	Lavington	£55,085	£50,187	£47,985	£60,053	£52,968	£59,002
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Laure	£90,101	£84,266	£83,858	£68,842	£75,145	£67,637
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	£144,143	£147,436	£150,352	£125,965	£135,954	£123,761
Wessex	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	£45,325	£40,921	£38,231	£70,306	£53,038	£69,076
Wessex	6905	Wellington Academy	£86,572	£91,405	£91,372	£70,306	£105,258	£94,725
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of G	£124,189	£128,298	£130,207	£191,877	£157,684	£188,520
Wessex	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	£68,461	£64,782	£63,348	£77,630	£69,130	£76,271
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	£132,639	£129,181	£131,136	£128,895	£127,760	£126,639
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	£118,577	£118,548	£119,944	£133,289	£124,284	£130,956
Wessex	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.C	£40,917	£40,087	£37,354	£41,012	£38,465	£40,294
Wessex	5403	Pewsey Vale	£35,794	£35,066	£32,068	£46,871	£38,649	£46,051
Wessex	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordswo	£54,611	£51,962	£49,853	£2,929	£26,340	£2,878
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	£120,486	£116,936	£118,248	£80,559	£97,994	£79,149
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	£76,428	£75,061	£74,168	£14,647	£44,151	£14,391
Wessex	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	£61,318	£59,390	£57,672	£13,182	£35,197	£12,952
			£2,668,707	£2,668,707	£2,668,707	£2,668,707	£2,668,707	£2,668,707

Note: Models 5 & 6

The service pupil element targets funding to schools with greater than 20% of their pupils classified as a service pupil.

This page is intentionally left blank

YPSS Delegation models - summary of funding allocated to each federation of Wiltshire secondary schools under each model

	Model	North	% of Total	West	% of Total	Wessex	% of Total	Total
1	Small flat rate/20%per pupil/75% deprivation	£1,166,785	43.7%	£837,605	31.4%	£664,316	24.9%	£2,668,707
2	Small Flat Rate / 95% Deprivation index	£1,164,529	43.6%	£842,410	31.6%	£661,768	24.8%	£2,668,707
3	100% Deprivation index	£1,177,386	44.1%	£848,001	31.8%	£643,320	24.1%	£2,668,707
4	100% distributed by Free Meals recorded on January 2011 census	£1,105,858	41.4%	£903,728	33.9%	£659,121	24.7%	£2,668,707
5	48.25% Free meals/ 50% dep +1.75% Service Pupil element	£1,122,270	42.1%	£860,049	32.2%	£686,388	25.7%	£2,668,707
6	98.25% distributed by Free Meals + 1.75% service pupil element	£1,086,506	40.7%	£887,913	33.3%	£694,289	26.0%	£2,668,707
	Pupil numbers (excluding 6th form)	11284	44.5%	7822	30.9%	6228	24.6%	25334

This page is intentionally left blank

1. YPSS Delegation model:Small flat rate/20%per pupil/75% deprivation

Pot to delegate*		£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate		£133,435	£4,601.22	5.00%
Per pupil		£533,741	£21.07	20.00%
Free meals		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Deprivation		£2,001,530	£1.63	75.00%
		£2,668,707		100.00%

Page 73

			F	G	J	K	L	M	N								
Area	DfEE No. '865/'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(c atering)	% of service pupils	Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusion s as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	874	745	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53	2.4%	£4,601	£15,696	£0	£50,165	£70,462	89	11.9%
Wessex	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35	34.7%	£4,601	£12,114	£0	£53,935	£70,651	64	11.1%
Wessex	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	359	359	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27	1.7%	£4,601	£7,563	£0	£23,965	£36,130	36	10.0%
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89	1.7%	£4,601	£20,858	£0	£85,428	£110,887	96	9.7%
Wessex	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100	0.0%	£4,601	£12,788	£0	£67,617	£85,007	53	8.7%
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	1081	944	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115	1.0%	£4,601	£19,888	£0	£88,649	£113,138	71	7.5%
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarenc	1218	1,046	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98	0.3%	£4,601	£22,037	£0	£96,996	£123,635	76	7.3%
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95	2.3%	£4,601	£21,468	£0	£89,893	£115,963	70	6.9%
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60	0.7%	£4,601	£23,681	£0	£130,769	£159,051	60	5.3%
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuis	1645	1,320	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65	2.6%	£4,601	£27,810	£0	£99,137	£131,549	67	5.1%
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108	7.4%	£4,601	£24,165	£0	£89,775	£118,542	52	4.5%
Wessex	4070	Amesbury The Stonehen	730	730	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68	10.4%	£4,601	£15,380	£0	£59,549	£79,530	32	4.4%
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42	3.3%	£4,601	£22,037	£0	£56,054	£82,692	45	4.3%
North	5406	Caine John Bentley	1200	1,043	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98	3.2%	£4,601	£21,974	£0	£90,250	£116,826	43	4.1%
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41	2.6%	£4,601	£14,495	£0	£35,988	£55,085	27	3.9%
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Lau	1312	1,073	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47	1.4%	£4,601	£22,606	£0	£62,893	£90,101	41	3.8%
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86	11.6%	£4,601	£26,778	£0	£112,764	£144,143	48	3.8%
Wessex	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48	0.0%	£4,601	£12,051	£0	£28,673	£45,325	19	3.3%
Wessex	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48	38.1%	£4,601	£13,442	£0	£68,529	£86,572	20	3.1%
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of C	1222	1,041	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131	0.2%	£4,601	£21,932	£0	£97,655	£124,189	30	2.9%
Wessex	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53	3.9%	£4,601	£16,349	£0	£47,511	£68,461	22	2.8%
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88	4.8%	£4,601	£29,685	£0	£98,352	£132,639	39	2.8%
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	1423	1,140	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91	14.2%	£4,601	£24,018	£0	£89,958	£118,577	27	2.4%
Wessex	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.	394	394	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28	1.5%	£4,601	£8,301	£0	£28,015	£40,917	8	2.0%
Wessex	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32	6.2%	£4,601	£7,142	£0	£24,051	£35,794	5	1.5%
Wessex	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordsw	884	599	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2	6.4%	£4,601	£12,620	£0	£37,390	£54,611	7	1.2%
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55	0.0%	£4,601	£27,199	£0	£88,686	£120,486	11	0.9%
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	972	769	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10	2.8%	£4,601	£16,201	£0	£55,626	£76,428	5	0.7%
Wessex	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9	7.5%	£4,601	£13,463	£0	£43,254	£61,318	0	0.0%
		Totals	29783	25334	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822		£133,435	£533,741	£0	£2,001,530	#####	1,163	4.6%

2. YPSS Delegation model: Small Flat Rate / 95% Deprivation index

Pot to delegate*		£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate		£133,435	£4,601.22	5.00%
Per pupil		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Free meals		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Deprivation		£2,535,272	£2.06	95.00%
		£2,668,707		100.00%

Page 74

Area	DfEE No. '865/'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(ca tering)	% of service pupils	Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusio ns as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	874	745	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53	2.4%	£4,601	£0	£0	£63,542	£68,143	89	11.9%
Wesse	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35	34.7%	£4,601	£0	£0	£68,318	£72,919	64	11.1%
Wesse	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	359	359	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27	1.7%	£4,601	£0	£0	£30,356	£34,957	36	10.0%
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89	1.7%	£4,601	£0	£0	£108,209	£112,811	96	9.7%
Wesse	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100	0.0%	£4,601	£0	£0	£85,648	£90,250	53	8.7%
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	1081	944	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115	1.0%	£4,601	£0	£0	£112,288	£116,890	71	7.5%
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarendo	1218	1,046	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98	0.3%	£4,601	£0	£0	£122,862	£127,463	76	7.3%
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95	2.3%	£4,601	£0	£0	£113,864	£118,466	70	6.9%
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60	0.7%	£4,601	£0	£0	£165,641	£170,242	60	5.3%
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuish	1645	1,320	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65	2.6%	£4,601	£0	£0	£125,574	£130,175	67	5.1%
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108	7.4%	£4,601	£0	£0	£113,715	£118,317	52	4.5%
Wesse	4070	Amesbury The Stoneheng	730	730	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68	10.4%	£4,601	£0	£0	£75,428	£80,030	32	4.4%
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42	3.3%	£4,601	£0	£0	£71,001	£75,603	45	4.3%
North	5406	Calne John Bentley	1200	1,043	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98	3.2%	£4,601	£0	£0	£114,317	£118,918	43	4.1%
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41	2.6%	£4,601	£0	£0	£45,585	£50,187	27	3.9%
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Laur	1312	1,073	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47	1.4%	£4,601	£0	£0	£79,665	£84,266	41	3.8%
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86	11.6%	£4,601	£0	£0	£142,835	£147,436	48	3.8%
Wesse	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48	0.0%	£4,601	£0	£0	£36,319	£40,921	19	3.3%
Wesse	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48	38.1%	£4,601	£0	£0	£86,804	£91,405	20	3.1%
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of G	1222	1,041	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131	0.2%	£4,601	£0	£0	£123,697	£128,298	30	2.9%
Wesse	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53	3.9%	£4,601	£0	£0	£60,181	£64,782	22	2.8%
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88	4.8%	£4,601	£0	£0	£124,580	£129,181	39	2.8%
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	1423	1,140	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91	14.2%	£4,601	£0	£0	£113,947	£118,548	27	2.4%
Wesse	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.C	394	394	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28	1.5%	£4,601	£0	£0	£35,486	£40,087	8	2.0%
Wesse	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32	6.2%	£4,601	£0	£0	£30,465	£35,066	5	1.5%
Wesse	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordsw	884	599	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2	6.4%	£4,601	£0	£0	£47,361	£51,962	7	1.2%
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55	0.0%	£4,601	£0	£0	£112,335	£116,936	11	0.9%
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	972	769	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10	2.8%	£4,601	£0	£0	£70,459	£75,061	5	0.7%
Wesse	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9	7.5%	£4,601	£0	£0	£54,789	£59,390	0	0.0%
		Totals	29783	25334	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822		£133,435	£0	£0	£2,535,272	£2,668,707	1,163	4.6%

3. YPSS Delegation model:100% Deprivation index

Pot to delegate*		£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Per pupil		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Free meals		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Deprivation		£2,668,707	£2.17	100.00%
		£2,668,707		100.00%

	F	G	J	K	L	M	N												
Area	DfEE No. '865/'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(catering)	% of service pupils	Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusions as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)		
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	874	745	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53	2.4%	£0	£0	£0	£66,886	£66,886	89	11.9%		
Wesse	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35	34.7%	£0	£0	£0	£71,914	£71,914	64	11.1%		
Wesse	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	359	359	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27	1.7%	£0	£0	£0	£31,953	£31,953	36	10.0%		
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89	1.7%	£0	£0	£0	£113,905	£113,905	96	9.7%		
Wesse	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100	0.0%	£0	£0	£0	£90,156	£90,156	53	8.7%		
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	1081	944	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115	1.0%	£0	£0	£0	£118,198	£118,198	71	7.5%		
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarendon	1218	1,046	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98	0.3%	£0	£0	£0	£129,328	£129,328	76	7.3%		
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95	2.3%	£0	£0	£0	£119,857	£119,857	70	6.9%		
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60	0.7%	£0	£0	£0	£174,359	£174,359	60	5.3%		
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuish	1645	1,320	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65	2.6%	£0	£0	£0	£132,183	£132,183	67	5.1%		
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108	7.4%	£0	£0	£0	£119,700	£119,700	52	4.5%		
Wesse	4070	Amesbury The Stoneheng	730	730	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68	10.4%	£0	£0	£0	£79,398	£79,398	32	4.4%		
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42	3.3%	£0	£0	£0	£74,738	£74,738	45	4.3%		
North	5406	Calne John Bentley	1200	1,043	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98	3.2%	£0	£0	£0	£120,334	£120,334	43	4.1%		
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41	2.6%	£0	£0	£0	£47,985	£47,985	27	3.9%		
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Laur	1312	1,073	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47	1.4%	£0	£0	£0	£83,858	£83,858	41	3.8%		
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86	11.6%	£0	£0	£0	£150,352	£150,352	48	3.8%		
Wesse	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48	0.0%	£0	£0	£0	£38,231	£38,231	19	3.3%		
Wesse	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48	38.1%	£0	£0	£0	£91,372	£91,372	20	3.1%		
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of G	1222	1,041	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131	0.2%	£0	£0	£0	£130,207	£130,207	30	2.9%		
Wesse	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53	3.9%	£0	£0	£0	£63,348	£63,348	22	2.8%		
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88	4.8%	£0	£0	£0	£131,136	£131,136	39	2.8%		
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	1423	1,140	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91	14.2%	£0	£0	£0	£119,944	£119,944	27	2.4%		
Wesse	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.C	394	394	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28	1.5%	£0	£0	£0	£37,354	£37,354	8	2.0%		
Wesse	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32	6.2%	£0	£0	£0	£32,068	£32,068	5	1.5%		
Wesse	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordswo	884	599	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2	6.4%	£0	£0	£0	£49,853	£49,853	7	1.2%		
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55	0.0%	£0	£0	£0	£118,248	£118,248	11	0.9%		
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	972	769	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10	2.8%	£0	£0	£0	£74,168	£74,168	5	0.7%		
Wesse	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9	7.5%	£0	£0	£0	£57,672	£57,672	0	0.0%		
		Totals	29783	25334	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822		£0	£0	£0	£2,668,707	£2,668,707	1,163	4.6%		

4. YPSS Delegation models: 100% distributed by Free Meals recorded on January 2011 census

Pot to delegate*		£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Per pupil		£0	£0.00	0.00%
Free meals		£2,668,707	£1,464.71	100.00%
Deprivation		£0	£0.00	0.00%
		£2,668,707		100.00%

Page 76

			F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Area	DfEE No. '865'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	ELP 1	ELP 2	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(c atering)
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	874	745	6	0	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53
Wesse	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	17	7	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35
Wesse	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	359	359	6	0	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	12	4	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89
Wesse	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	9	4	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	1081	944	9	7	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarendon	1218	1,046	11	6	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	15	0	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	5	5	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuish	1645	1,320	16	7	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	6	5	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108
Wesse	4070	Amesbury The Stonehenge	730	730	12	4	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	9	1	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42
North	5406	Caine John Bentley	1200	1,043	14	7	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	8	3	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Laurence	1312	1,073	13	3	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	17	2	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86
Wesse	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	9	2	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48
Wesse	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	6	0	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of Glastonbury	1222	1,041	12	6	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131
Wesse	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	7	2	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	10	3	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	1423	1,140	8	1	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91
Wesse	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.C.	394	394	5	1	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28
Wesse	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	7	2	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32
Wesse	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordsworth	884	599	0	0	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	11	3	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	972	769	5	2	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10
Wesse	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	0	0	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9
		Totals	29783	25334	265	87	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822

Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusions as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)
£0	£0	£77,630	£0	£77,630	89	11.9%
£0	£0	£51,265	£0	£51,265	64	11.1%
£0	£0	£39,547	£0	£39,547	36	10.0%
£0	£0	£130,359	£0	£130,359	96	9.7%
£0	£0	£146,471	£0	£146,471	53	8.7%
£0	£0	£168,442	£0	£168,442	71	7.5%
£0	£0	£143,542	£0	£143,542	76	7.3%
£0	£0	£139,148	£0	£139,148	70	6.9%
£0	£0	£87,883	£0	£87,883	60	5.3%
£0	£0	£95,206	£0	£95,206	67	5.1%
£0	£0	£158,189	£0	£158,189	52	4.5%
£0	£0	£99,600	£0	£99,600	32	4.4%
£0	£0	£61,518	£0	£61,518	45	4.3%
£0	£0	£143,542	£0	£143,542	43	4.1%
£0	£0	£60,053	£0	£60,053	27	3.9%
£0	£0	£68,842	£0	£68,842	41	3.8%
£0	£0	£125,965	£0	£125,965	48	3.8%
£0	£0	£70,306	£0	£70,306	19	3.3%
£0	£0	£70,306	£0	£70,306	20	3.1%
£0	£0	£191,877	£0	£191,877	30	2.9%
£0	£0	£77,630	£0	£77,630	22	2.8%
£0	£0	£128,895	£0	£128,895	39	2.8%
£0	£0	£133,289	£0	£133,289	27	2.4%
£0	£0	£41,012	£0	£41,012	8	2.0%
£0	£0	£46,871	£0	£46,871	5	1.5%
£0	£0	£2,929	£0	£2,929	7	1.2%
£0	£0	£80,559	£0	£80,559	11	0.9%
£0	£0	£14,647	£0	£14,647	5	0.7%
£0	£0	£13,182	£0	£13,182	0	0.0%
£0	£0	£2,668,707	£0	#####	1,163	4.6%

5. YPSS Delegation models: 48.25% Free meals/50% deprivation index + 1.75% Service Pupil element

Pot to delegate*			£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate			£0	£0.00	0.00%
Per pupil			£0	£0.00	0.00%
Service factor			£46,702	£105.52	1.75%
Free meals			£1,287,651	£706.72	48.25%
Deprivation			£1,334,354	£1.09	50.00%
			£2,668,707		100.00%

Area	DfEE No. '865/'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	ELP 1	ELP 2	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(c atering)	% of service pupils	Actual service pupils	Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Service school Factor > 20%	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusions as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfie	874	745	6	0	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53	2.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£37,456	£33,443	£70,900	89	11.9%
Wess	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	17	7	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35	34.7%	200	£0	£0	£21,053	£24,735	£35,957	£81,746	64	11.1%
Wess	4001	Salisbury Wyvern Coll	359	359	6	0	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27	1.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£19,082	£15,977	£35,058	36	10.0%
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	12	4	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89	1.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£62,898	£56,952	£119,851	96	9.7%
Wess	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	9	4	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£70,672	£45,078	£115,750	53	8.7%
West	5415	Westbury The Matrave	1081	944	9	7	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115	1.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£81,273	£59,099	£140,372	71	7.5%
West	4069	Trowbridge The Claret	1218	1,046	11	6	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98	0.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£69,259	£64,664	£133,923	76	7.3%
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	15	0	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95	2.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£67,139	£59,929	£127,067	70	6.9%
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	5	5	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60	0.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£42,403	£87,179	£129,583	60	5.3%
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenh	1645	1,320	16	7	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65	2.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£45,937	£66,092	£112,029	67	5.1%
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	6	5	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108	7.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£76,326	£59,850	£136,176	52	4.5%
Wess	4070	Amesbury The Stoneh	730	730	12	4	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68	10.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£48,057	£39,699	£87,756	32	4.4%
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	9	1	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42	3.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£29,682	£37,369	£67,052	45	4.3%
North	5406	Calne John Bentley	1200	1,043	14	7	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98	3.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£69,259	£60,167	£129,426	43	4.1%
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	8	3	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41	2.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£28,976	£23,992	£52,968	27	3.9%
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St L	1312	1,073	13	3	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47	1.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£33,216	£41,929	£75,145	41	3.8%
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	17	2	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86	11.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£60,778	£75,176	£135,954	48	3.8%
Wess	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	9	2	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£33,923	£19,115	£53,038	19	3.3%
Wess	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	6	0	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48	38.1%	243	£0	£0	£25,649	£33,923	£45,686	£105,258	20	3.1%
West	4075	Trowbridge The John	1222	1,041	12	6	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131	0.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£92,581	£65,104	£157,684	30	2.9%
Wess	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	7	2	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53	3.9%	0	£0	£0	£0	£37,456	£31,674	£69,130	22	2.8%
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	10	3	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88	4.8%	0	£0	£0	£0	£62,192	£65,568	£127,760	39	2.8%
North	4067	Wootton Bassett Scho	1423	1,140	8	1	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91	14.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£64,312	£59,972	£124,284	27	2.4%
Wess	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's	394	394	5	1	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28	1.5%	0	£0	£0	£0	£19,788	£18,677	£38,465	8	2.0%
Wess	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	7	2	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32	6.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£22,615	£16,034	£38,649	5	1.5%
Wess	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wor	884	599	0	0	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2	6.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£1,413	£24,927	£26,340	7	1.2%
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	11	3	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£38,870	£59,124	£97,994	11	0.9%
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augusti	972	769	5	2	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10	2.8%	0	£0	£0	£0	£7,067	£37,084	£44,151	5	0.7%
Wess	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	0	0	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9	7.5%	0	£0	£0	£0	£6,361	£28,836	£35,197	0	0.0%
		Totals	29783	25334	265	87	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822		443	£0	£0	£46,702	£1,287,651	£1,334,354	£2,668,707	1,163	4.6%

6. YPSS Delegation models: 98.25% distributed by Free Meals recorded on January 2011 census + 1.75% service pupil element

Pot to delegate*			£2,668,707	Rate	Proportion
Flat rate			£0	£0.00	0.00%
Per pupil			£0	£0.00	0.00%
Service factor			£46,702	£105.52	1.75%
Free meals			£2,622,005	£1,439.08	98.25%
Deprivation			£0	£0.00	0.00%
			£2,668,707		100.00%

Page 78

Area	DfEE No. '865'	SCHOOL NAME	TOTAL NOR	NOR Ex 6th Form	ELP 1	ELP 2	Average number of FSM Eligible(social needs)	Proportion FSM (F x J)	Experian index (Higher score = higher deprivation)	Deprivation score (exp'n index score x nor)	20011/12 FSM Eligible(catering)	% of service pupils	Actual service pupils	Flat rate	Per pupil (rate x G)	Service school Factor > 20%	Free Meals	Deprivation (Rate x M)	Total	Number of pupils excluded (fixed & perm Sept 10 - June 11)	Exclusions as % of NOR(Ex 6th form)
North	4000	Chippenham Abbeyfields	874	745	6	0	56.00	6.41%	35.2	30,798	53	2.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£76,271	£0	£76,271	89	11.9%
Wessex	4071	Avon Valley College	647	575	17	7	43.09	6.66%	51.2	33,113	35	34.7%	200	£0	£0	£21,053	£50,368	£0	£71,421	64	11.1%
Wessex	4001	Salisbury Wyvern College	359	359	6	0	36.36	10.13%	41.0	14,713	27	1.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£38,855	£0	£38,855	36	10.0%
West	4013	Melksham Oak	1114	990	12	4	87.45	7.85%	47.1	52,448	89	1.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£128,078	£0	£128,078	96	9.7%
Wessex	6906	Sarum Academy	679	607	9	4	101.64	14.97%	61.1	41,513	100	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£143,908	£0	£143,908	53	8.7%
West	5415	Westbury The Matravers	1081	944	9	7	114.27	10.57%	50.3	54,425	115	1.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£165,494	£0	£165,494	71	7.5%
West	4069	Trowbridge The Clarendo	1218	1,046	11	6	132.45	10.87%	48.9	59,549	98	0.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£141,030	£0	£141,030	76	7.3%
North	5411	Devizes	1203	1,019	15	0	111.36	9.26%	45.9	55,188	95	2.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£136,713	£0	£136,713	70	6.9%
North	5408	Purton Bradon Forest	1124	1,124	5	5	57.73	5.14%	71.4	80,284	60	0.7%	0	£0	£0	£0	£86,345	£0	£86,345	60	5.3%
North	5414	Chippenham Hardenhuist	1645	1,320	16	7	60.45	3.68%	37.0	60,864	65	2.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£93,540	£0	£93,540	67	5.1%
North	4066	Corsham School	1427	1,147	6	5	104.09	7.29%	38.6	55,116	108	7.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£155,421	£0	£155,421	52	4.5%
Wessex	4070	Amesbury The Stoneheng	730	730	12	4	59.91	8.21%	50.1	36,559	68	10.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£97,857	£0	£97,857	32	4.4%
North	4064	Malmesbury School	1244	1,046	9	1	44.00	3.54%	27.7	34,413	42	3.3%	0	£0	£0	£0	£60,441	£0	£60,441	45	4.3%
North	5406	Caine John Bentley	1200	1,043	14	7	115.27	9.61%	46.2	55,408	98	3.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£141,030	£0	£141,030	43	4.1%
West	5402	Lavington	688	688	8	3	36.18	5.26%	32.1	22,095	41	2.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£59,002	£0	£59,002	27	3.9%
West	4537	Bradford-on-Avon St Laur	1312	1,073	13	3	52.45	4.00%	29.4	38,612	47	1.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£67,637	£0	£67,637	41	3.8%
West	4072	Warminster Kingdown	1506	1,271	17	2	84.18	5.59%	46.0	69,230	86	11.6%	0	£0	£0	£0	£123,761	£0	£123,761	48	3.8%
Wessex	4006	Trafalgar at Downton	572	572	9	2	45.91	8.03%	30.8	17,603	48	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£69,076	£0	£69,076	19	3.3%
Wessex	6905	Wellington Academy	718	638	6	0	57.36	7.99%	58.6	42,073	48	38.1%	243	£0	£0	£25,649	£69,076	£0	£94,725	20	3.1%
West	4075	Trowbridge The John of G	1222	1,041	12	6	126.00	10.31%	49.1	59,954	131	0.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£188,520	£0	£188,520	30	2.9%
Wessex	4511	Salisbury St Edmund's	776	776	7	2	48.82	6.29%	37.6	29,169	53	3.9%	0	£0	£0	£0	£76,271	£0	£76,271	22	2.8%
North	5404	Chippenham Sheldon	1801	1,409	10	3	82.91	4.60%	33.5	60,382	88	4.8%	0	£0	£0	£0	£126,639	£0	£126,639	39	2.8%
North	4067	Wootton Bassett School	1423	1,140	8	1	76.91	5.40%	38.8	55,228	91	14.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£130,956	£0	£130,956	27	2.4%
Wessex	4610	Salisbury St Joseph's R.C	394	394	5	1	30.18	7.66%	43.7	17,200	28	1.5%	0	£0	£0	£0	£40,294	£0	£40,294	8	2.0%
Wessex	5403	Pewsey Vale	339	339	7	2	26.00	7.67%	43.6	14,766	32	6.2%	0	£0	£0	£0	£46,051	£0	£46,051	5	1.5%
Wessex	5413	Salisbury Bishop Wordsw	884	599	0	0	0.55	0.06%	26.0	22,955	2	6.4%	0	£0	£0	£0	£2,878	£0	£2,878	7	1.2%
North	5405	Marlborough St.Johns	1635	1,291	11	3	52.91	3.24%	33.3	54,447	55	0.0%	0	£0	£0	£0	£79,149	£0	£79,149	11	0.9%
West	5400	Trowbridge St.Augustines	972	769	5	2	14.82	1.52%	35.1	34,151	10	2.8%	0	£0	£0	£0	£14,391	£0	£14,391	5	0.7%
Wessex	5412	Salisbury South Wilts	996	639	0	0	9.64	0.97%	26.7	26,555	9	7.5%	0	£0	£0	£0	£12,952	£0	£12,952	0	0.0%
		Totals	29783	25334	265	87	1,868.91	6.28%	1,216	1,228,811	1,822		443	£0	£0	£46,702	£2,622,005	£0	£2,668,707	1,163	4.6%

Workstream/Project Name : YPSS Project

Baseline Date (Date Compiled) 5th September 2011

Workstream Lead / Project Manager : Mark Brotherton

Revised Date

Ref.	Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner	Controls fully in place to manage the risk	Current Risk Rating				Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Target Risk Rating				Date reviewed
					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	
R001	Secretary of State does not approve closure of existing YPSS	SoS feels that closure will not lead to the necessary improvements in the service; should not result in any major change of direction for the project and the new service.	Mark Brotherton	Setting up the project demonstrates clear commitment to transforming the service; Business Case contains explanation and justification; all will be captured in the application to SoS.	1	1	1	Low	Continued engagement with SoS required; acquire support from schools for the new service model and communicate to SoS	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Ongoing - application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low	
R002	Failure to implement new service due to Secretary of State decision of awarding the Power To Innovate	Failure to secure approval to become part of the pilot scheme and be granted the Power To Innovate will result in a major change of direction or possible cancellation of the project in its current form.	Mark Brotherton	Original application was submitted in early 2011; SoS invited us to re-apply, inferring good prospects of success; clear direction of travel and commitment to the pilot already demonstrated through project set-up; all to be captured in the application to SoS.	4	1	4	Low	Low risk so existing controls are expected to be sufficient; could communicate schools' support for the new delivery model if necessary; could emphasise the improved outcomes for young people	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Application on 11th Nov		4	1	4	Low	
R003	Failure to effect sufficient immediate improvements to the service through 11/12 prior to implementing new service	Failure to implement the current Ofsted Action Plan to improve the service and/or a poor Ofsted inspection could result in the DfE requesting the take-over of the service, and will disadvantage the young people currently in the service; would prove a major distraction to the Project Team and reduce capacity to work towards new service.	Martin Cooper	Manage and monitor the implementation of the Ofsted Action Plan; ensure YPSS is suitably prepared and supported for the scheduled Ofsted inspections; regular communications with and feedback from staff; YPSS Executive Board to oversee implementation of Action Plan and performance.	2	4	8	Medium	Improve communications with staff to ensure motivation and commitment towards improving the service; secure and deploy additional temporary resources to support centre staff.	Martin Cooper, DCE Finance?	First inspection in Oct/Nov date tbc		2	2	4	Low	
R004	Lack of support from all or some of the schools for the new service model due to funding concerns, capacity/ability to deliver, or on general principle.	Some schools may oppose the transfer of responsibility for YPSS; schools may fail to agree on the best way of delivering the service collectively or singularly; could result in the council remaining responsible for all or part of the service.	Mark Brotherton	Schools being provided with initial info pack including financial info; presentations to be given at WASSH and Federation meetings; specific meeting arranged with Headteachers; surgeries arranged; all measures to encourage schools to be enthused to take advantage of the opportunity.	4	3	12	High	Targeted engagement with specific schools if necessary; additional work to illustrate potential options and highlight benefits of new service; contingency to use the money that would have been devolved to schools to buy provision for the students involved.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Proposal to be considered by schools from 5th Sept. Additional actions if necessary following feedback		2	2	4	Low	
R005	Lack of support from all or some of the schools for the specific reason that capital investment is required for them to provide the necessary facilities.	Schools may not have adequate facilities from which to deliver the service and would require capital investment from us to do so; if capital is not available schools may resist taking responsibility for the service which may result in the failure of the pilot and new service.	Mark Brotherton	Audit of existing facilities that could be used by schools as off site provision is being undertaken, details will be given to schools as part of initial information.	4	2	8	Medium	Assist schools with a plan to develop accommodation with appropriate funding needs; further explore the facilities that could be made available through the council's own property portfolio; full analysis of existing/new specialist providers and the facilities they may have to support the service.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Ongoing from 5th Sept.		3	2	6	Medium	

Ref.	Risk	Cause / Impact	Risk Owner	Controls fully in place to manage the risk	Current Risk Rating				Further Actions necessary to manage the risk	Owner of Risk Action	Date for completion of action	Progress on actions	Target Risk Rating				Date reviewed
					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk					Impact	Likelihood	Risk score	Level of risk	
R006	Loss of existing YPSS staff before the implementation of the new service due to uncertainty over future and impending 'closure' of existing YPSS	Service may suffer from haemorrhaging of staff due to uncertainty about their future employment and roles; could result in failure to provide adequate service, problems with Ofsted, and failing young people currently in the service.	Martin Cooper	Regular communication and engagement with staff throughout the project including regular newsletter, centre meetings, staff 1-to-1's; illustrate as possible the role staff may perform in the new service; encourage staff to retain focus on young people in the service	4	3	12	High	Consider contingency plans for additional temporary staff; provide opportunity for YPSS to make proposals to operate as a traded service; develop proposals to create employment opportunities for staff via schools or specialist providers.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper, DCE Finance?			3	2	6	Medium	
R007	Failure of new delivery model to provide improved service and outcomes for young people.	Individual or collections of schools may fail to deliver the service at a suitable quality standard; young people would continue to be disadvantaged as a result, potential risk of further Ofsted intervention (see R003)	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Service Specification and Framework Agreement provide clear understanding of the standards expected and the outcomes required for young people;	4	1	4	Low	Process of monitoring and reporting and over-arching governance arrangements to be developed to support the new service once implemented.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	October onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R008	Failure of alternative providers to meet required safeguarding standards.	If alternative providers are not considered to have adequate and satisfactory safeguarding measures, schools will have difficulty in buying in provision.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Assessment criteria developed and in place to ensure that providers know what is expected of them; register of potential providers being developed;	4	2	8	Medium	Need to establish, in partnership with the schools, a regime for ongoing monitoring and assessment of providers in the new service model.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	December onwards		2	1	2	Low	
R009	Insufficient number of suitable providers able to meet the demand for the new service.	As this is a new opportunity, sufficient numbers of suitable providers may not yet exist which could result in capacity problems and a failure to deliver/improve the service	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	Audit of existing providers has been undertaken	3	2	6	Medium	Review results of audit and analyse provider capacity; develop proposal to enable YPSS to operate as a traded service and therefore fill any provider capacity gap	Martin Cooper, Tom Smith	September onwards		2	2	4	Low	
R010	Ability/capacity of council to fund possible redundancies from closure of YPSS and implementation of new service	If setting up YPSS as a traded service is not successful and schools do not recruit existing YPSS staff, redundancies will be required. Funding of the redundancies would be a currently un-budgeted cost to the council.	Mark Brotherton, Martin Cooper	None in place	4	4	16	High	Develop proposal to enable YPSS to operate as a traded service and therefore retain the services of numbers of existing staff; establish the cost to the council of various redundancy scenarios and provide Corporate Finance with early warning of financial implications.	Martin Cooper, DCE and Corporate Finance	September to ensure Corporate Finance can consider alongside 2012/13 budget planning		2	3	6	Medium	
							0								0		

Appendix 5

YPSS and Primary Behaviour Support: Discussion of Options

Some Key Principles for Local Authority

- Maintaining the current system is not an option
- Tweaking the system will not make the significant differences required
- The LA’s statutory responsibilities must be delivered and protected
- The use of public money must be properly accounted for and must be used in line with the principles of best value
- The interests of vulnerable learners must be protected
- Fixed and permanent exclusions need to be reduced
- School ownership is a cornerstone of developments (OfSTED new framework)
-

Other relevant Issues for Targeted School and Learner Support Development (Schools and Learning)

- The approach to behaviour will be cross phase
- It needs to involve working with other services and therefore needs to have integrated within it the role of the Acute Needs Panel and Multi Agency forums
- Special schools have a role to play in this and a strategic development of special education in Wiltshire needs to be part of this provision. Such a development is not simple but unless it happens the reorganisation of YPSS will fail.
- There needs to be a transparent and robust allocation of funding that is adequate to meet the need.

Table A Models of Operating YPSS

Model	Approach	Governance	Quality assurance	Staff	Buildings	Funding	Comment Advantages/Disadvantages
1.	Single special school provider	School based with enhanced membership of the Governing	Internal processes of the provider. Performance against agreed	Employment rests with school/provider	School based/ current building arrangements remain with some	Direct transfer to provider against targets and	An external provider might gain greater efficiency but will they be any more responsive to local need than current system. Would

		Body – Prim/Sec Head Teacher representation and LA senior office	targets via LA agreed Service Level Agreement. Monitoring by GB processes		development of on-site additional provision	presentation of annual accounts	any provider take this on a contract
2	Outsourced provider as a single provider	Unknown but within SLA	Own processes Performance against targets agreed in SLA external monitoring by LA	Employed by provider	Transfer ownership or lease or use own premises(unlikely to be sufficient)	Direct transfer WC external audit of accounts	Does an outside provider have the capacity to run the whole service? Is there a danger of a universal approach that will again not be responsive to local need?
3	Federations take responsibility	Learning Futures via Board of directors North & Wessex would need to create legal entity something akin to an SLA and be accountable and liable.	Own processes established in Learning Futures (West Wilts Fed) through Standards Group nonexistent elsewhere Performance against targets agreed in SLA WC external monitoring. This would need to be stronger	Employed by Learning Futures ? elsewhere	Transfer use for duration of SLA	Direct transfer WC external audit of accounts	Whereas LFL has capacity to do this others do not. Would funding be sufficient to create capacity

4	Mixed delegation to Federations i.e. LFL most Wessex least	Varies with degree of delegation	Varies but WC retains a key monitoring and evaluation role	Depends on capacity	Depends on capacity	Depends on degree of delegation	Allows local solutions. Recognises different capacities but stops all having to move at the pace of the slowest. Aim- all to have the capacity. But could be a lack of consistency
5	Mixed approach between the different areas e.g. LFL runs the West, Springfields the North, external provider the South	Will vary	Will vary but WC monitor and evaluate progress of all pilots	Employed buy each arrangement	Lease or transfer use	Direct grant based on audited accounts	Makes it possible to pilot different approaches to see which is most effective. Could lead to inconsistencies and not in keeping with LA policies of equality of opportunity or YPSS as a whole.

Key Questions

1. The status of Springfields being an Academy? This will increase the submission to the DfE and require consideration by them. Is the Governing Body (including enhanced provision) able to take this on?
2. We could go to tender which may be costly and take time. Who would be likely to bid?
3. Closure of YPSS and then transfer of YPSS would be an option. What would this mean for the new provider?
4. Could a staged approach be more feasible? How would this work in practice?
5. What would constitute for Wiltshire Council adequate protection for its statutory duties?
6. Would the governance be an issue with an external provider of any type?
7. Is the issue rather that in order to sign an SLA there must be a legal entity that can enter into an agreement and be both accountable and liable. A special school can do this, LFL as a limited company can but individual lead schools cannot do this on behalf of a Federation because they have no power to enforce accountability. Either each school would have to do this individually or there would have to be a legally constituted local board set up or the other partnerships will need to develop

some kind of legal entity. Interestingly the Trowbridge cluster of schools is doing this and the BANES primary cluster is thinking about it.

8. Is it worth TUPEing staff?
9. What is the most effective way to deal with the ownership of the buildings?
10. Will there be enough money in e funding to provide some leadership and, management as well as make provision. The experience of LFL is that it is not realistic for headteachers to do this in addition to existing commitments without some additional capacity at some level.
11. What actually does delegation to the Federations mean?