

Schools Forum

**14th June 2011
4.00pm**

Sapphire Room, the Emerald Suite,
North London Business Park

Agenda, Papers and
Minutes of the last meeting

CONTENTS

AGENDA.....	3
SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS	4
4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (10th May).....	5
6. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION/DECISION.....	14
Item 6 Schools Budget for 2011/12 and Use of Projected Underspend from 2010/11	14
Appendix A - Schools Budget Analysis 2010/11 and 2011/12.....	19
Appendix B - S251 Analysis of Centrally Retained Expenditure of London Boroughs 2008-11	22

AGENDA

Meeting to start at 4pm with no training session

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of interest
3. Minutes of previous meeting: 10th May 2011
4. Matters arising
- 5.1 Actions from previous meeting

5. Items for Consultation

The additional meeting of the Schools Forum has been called to consider two items:

Item 6.1 - The Schools Budget for 2011/12. The Forum asked for the budget, as it is currently proposed, to be set out in full for the Forum to more clearly see it 'in the round.'

Item 6.2 - The use of the projected underspend from 2010/11

6. Any Other Business

SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERS

Sector	Position	Name	School	Member Until
Nursery Schools (1)	Headteacher	Jane Chew		
Primary Schools (11)	Community – Headteacher 1	Jeanette Adak	Monkfrith	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Headteacher 2	Helen Schmitz	Cromer Road	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Headteacher 3	Vacant		
	Community – Headteacher 4	Vacant		
	Community – Governor 1	Liz Pearson	Holly Park & Livingstone	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Governor 2	Kim Garrod	Church Hill	07 Dec 2013
	Community – Governor 3	Catrin Dillon	Martin Primary	07 Dec 2013
	VA – Headteacher 1	Clare Neuberger	Menorah Foundation	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Headteacher 2	Dee Oelman	St Mary's & St John's	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Headteacher 3	Tim Bowden	Holy Trinity	30 Sep 2013
VA – Governor	Anthony Vourou	St John's N11	30 Sep 2013	
Secondary Schools (8)	Community – Headteacher 1	Kate Webster	Queen Elizabeth Girls	30 Sep 2013
	Community – Headteacher 2	Paul Ferrie	Ravenscroft	30 Sep 2013
	VA – Headteacher 1	Vacant		
	VA – Headteacher 2	Seamus McKenna	Finchley Catholic	31 Nov 2013
	VA – Governor	Patricia French	St Mary's High	07 Dec 2013
	Foundation / Trust – Headteacher	Geoffrey Thompson	Mill Hill High	31 Nov 2013
	Foundation / Trust – Governor	Andrew Macalpine	Hendon	01 Feb 2014
Special Schools	Community – Governor	Vacant		
	Governor	Gilbert Knight (Chair)	Oakleigh	30 Sep 2013
Headteacher	Headteacher	Jenny Gridley	Oakleigh	30 Sep 2013
	Academies	Representative 1	Michael Whitworth	Wren Academy
Representative 2	Representative 2	Angela Trigg	London Academy	30 Sep 2013
	Stake-holders	14-19 Partnership	Keith Murdoch	Woodhouse
Private Early Years	Private Early Years	Sarah Vipond	Middlesex Uni	30 Sep 2013
	Unions	Alan Homes (Vice Chair)	NASUWT	30 Sep 2013
	Stakeholder	Vacant		
Non Voting Observers	Cabinet Member for Children	Cllr Andrew Harper	Deputy Leader	
	Director of Children's Service	Robert Mc-Culloch Graham	Children's Service	
	Consultant to Schools Forum	Geoff Boyd	Consultant	
Barnet Officers	Deputy Chief Executive	Andrew Travers	Finance Directorate	
	Assistant Director,	Val White	Children's Service	
	Assistant Director, Schools and Learning	Mick Quigley	Children's Service	
	Principal Education Psychologist	Brian Davis	Children's Service	
	Joint Head of Finance	Linda Parker	Finance Directorate	
	School Funding Manager	Carol Beckman	Finance Directorate	
	Schools Finance Services Manager	Nick Adams	Finance Directorate	
	Joint Head of Finance	Kerry-Anne Smith	Finance Directorate	
	Clerk and minutes	Mark Callaghan	Finance Directorate	

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (10th May)

Meeting of the Schools Forum

Tuesday 10th May 2011

(4.00 pm, Conference Room 2, Building 2 NLBP)

Attended

- Members: Jeanette Adak (Head, Monkfrith)
Tim Bowden (Head, Holy Trinity)
Chris Brook (Barnet LNI)
Paul Ferrie (Head, Ravenscroft)
Jayne Franklin (Head, Childs Hill)
Patricia French (Governor, St Mary's High)
Kim Garrod (Governor, Church Hill Primary School)
Jenny Gridley (Head, Oakleigh)
Alan Homes (NASUWT)
Gilbert Knight (Governor, Oakleigh)
Andrew Macalpine (Governor, Hendon School)
Seamus McKenna (Head, Finchley Catholic)
Keith Murdoch (Principal, Woodhouse College)
Clare Neuberger (Head, Menorah Foundation)
Dee Oelman (Head, St Mary's & St John's)
Elizabeth Pearson (Governor, Livingstone)
Helen Schmitz (Head, Cromer Road)
Geoffrey Thompson (Head, Mill Hill High)
Anthony Vourou (Governor, St John's N11)
Kate Webster (Head, QE Girls)
Michael Whitworth (Principal, Wren Academy)
- LA Officers: Nick Adams (Schools Finance Services Manager)
Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager)
Brian Davis (Principle Educational Psychologist)
John Hooton (Deputy Director of Finance, Barnet)
Robert McCulloch-Graham (Director of Children's Service)
Jay Mercer (Deputy Director - Children's Services)
Linda Parker (Joint Head of Finance Children and Adults)
Mick Quigley (Assistant Director Schools and Learning)
Kerry-Anne Smith (Joint Head of Finance Children's & Adults)
Val White (Assistant Director, PPP)
- Clerk: Mark Callaghan (School Resources and Support Officer)
- Consultant: Geoff Boyd (Independent Consultant)
- Not Present**
- Members: Jane Chew (Head, St Margaret's Nursery)
Catrin Dillon (Governor, Martin Primary)
Angela Trigg (Principal, London Academy)
Sarah Vipond (Early Years Working Group)
- LA Officers: Andrew Travers (Deputy Chief Executive)
- Other: Cllr Andrew Harper (Cabinet Member for Education, Children & Families)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence	
<p>GK opened the meeting and noted that there has been some concern regarding the recording of the previous Schools Forum meeting. GK added that it would be useful if this uncertainty could be resolved, and would like to ensure that everyone present has the opportunity to express their concerns.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Andrew Harper, Jane Chew, Catrin Dillon and Jenny Gridley.</p>	
3. Declarations of interest	
None received.	
4. Minutes of previous meeting: 1st February 2011	
<p>PFR noted that Stephen Parkin is listed on the membership list but is no longer a member of the Forum. He should also be removed from the email distribution list for the Forum papers.</p> <p>Members of the Forum raised concern about the timing of the issuing of the papers for the meeting. The timing of agenda papers was part of a discussion in agenda item 6.2.</p> <p>KW raised her concern that the minutes did not reflect the tenor of the discussions that took place during the meeting when there was a lot of debate that was not resolved. She stressed the importance of making sure that all members can take part in a full and proper debate, and that clear and full responses to questions are provided by the local authority. GK acknowledged that some other members felt the same and that consideration needs to be given to the appropriate level of supporting information in the papers (see item 6.2 below).</p> <p>A: MC to remove Stephen Parkin from the membership and distribution lists for the Forum.</p>	
5. Matters arising	
<p>AH requested an update on the issue of redundancies. VW noted that issues relating to the circumstances in which the LA funds redundancies in schools would arise under 6.6 below. She confirmed that she had checked with corporate colleagues and that at that stage, there had been no notification of any redundancies in schools arising from the budget reductions. Within the council, the cost of funding redundancies for staff leaving in March 2011 has been substantial. The council will be working to have no further redundancies from April 2012, instead it is aiming to reconfigure services and redeploy staff to achieve the necessary savings. It will be expected that where schools are looking to the LA to fund redundancies, schools will adopt a similar approach. KW noted that this is important information and asked how it will be passed on to schools. VW stated that this information can be put into the Schools Circular so it is passed on to all schools.</p> <p>A: VW to produce an article for inclusion in the Schools Circular on the authority's approach to managing cost savings to reduce redundancies in schools.</p>	
5. 1 Actions from previous meeting	
<p>GK listed the actions from the previous meeting. The Forum was updated on outstanding actions as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 1 - Letter of thanks to be issued to Jonathan Hewlings thanking him for his support, leadership and interest – RMG confirmed that a letter has been sent. • Item 4 - MC to record CD as present in the minutes of the previous meeting – CB confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting have been amended to record CD's presence. • Item 5 – VW to raise the issue of contingencies for redundancies in schools with the corporate centre – update on action provided in item 5. • Item 6.1 - RMG to look into the possibility of issuing a letter to the YPLA from the LA stressing the importance of receiving funding information as soon as possible – RMG confirmed that this has been actioned verbally, noting that the future of the YPLA is currently uncertain. • Item 6.2 - GK to speak to GB regarding whether there should be a ceiling above which detail should be provided for funding proposals to the Forum – GK advised that this will be part of the wider debate on information provided by the authority to the Forum. • Item 7.1 – Items 1.1.5 and 2.2 in the Schools Forum TOR to be amended – CB advised that this action will be incorporated into the review of the Forum's Terms of Reference in the working group as proposed in item 6.2 on the agenda of the May meeting. 	

6 ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION/DECISION

6.1 Early Intervention Strategy

Jay Mercer

JM thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Forum to provide further information on investment in early intervention work. JM delivered a presentation to the Forum highlighting the following aspects of early intervention:

The publication of the Graham Allen report has highlighted the impact of neglect, changing government and political opinions towards the importance of early intervention, particularly on a local level. The cost of early intervention can vary from £1000 for a parenting programme up to £125,000 to place a child in a children's home for a year, depending on the level of intervention required. Alongside the generic issue of investing early to save money in the long run, is the fact that there is a fast growing population in Barnet, and if there is not sufficient investment in early intervention now, then the disparity will become far greater in the future. Current planning documents predict a 23% growth in 0 to 9 year olds in the next five years. In addition to this there is also an increase in special needs and social care referrals. Although Barnet has comparatively low numbers of children in care compared to national levels, there are still significant numbers.

There is a lot of terminology related to early intervention. The presentation summarised the triangle of need which explained the process for intervention. The strategy is to intervene at all levels, but the higher up the triangle the intervention is, the higher the cost becomes.

There are currently 180 Common Assessment Frameworks (CAF) for all schools in the borough, a rate of just less than 2 per school. There is a need to make sure the CAF can work efficiently without disturbing the other work which has already been done.

A partnership approach is being developed where the Children's Service is working at 2 different levels, tackling cases with higher need as well as Family Intervention officers focusing on levels 2 and 3. The aim is to expand from working with 10 to 100 families at the higher level of need.

Two case studies were shown. A successful case where the Family Intervention Programme (FIP) provided fast tracked appointments and home tuition etc. Incidents of anti-social behaviour and offending reduced significantly and the family is no longer subject to intervention. An initial intervention cost of £7,000 led to an overall saving in 'avoidable costs' of £604,588. Also an unsuccessful case with a Child in Need, where the parents were unwilling to work with the authority, the key risk factors were not addressed and the children ended up being taken into care. RMG noted that the children involved in the unsuccessful case are now in Barnet schools with the associated financial costs this entails.

This work is funded primarily by council funding with contributions from the Schools Budget and partner agencies. The work is supported by a range of work already going on in schools. The governance is through the Children's Trust Board. It is anticipated that the intervention work will make a significant saving in the future.

JM offered to circulate the presentation to the Forum for reference.

SM asked what assumptions are made about success regarding the interventions. JM explained that the authority is currently putting together a model to assess the effectiveness of the costs, but national research shows that at a high level an investment of £1 saves £6, so Barnet are working to a rule-of-thumb of £1 invested for £2 saved. RMG added that there is a toolkit available to assess the impact. He noted that he attended a meeting to discuss the outcome of the Graham Allen report, which highlighted that everything is subject to a government cost benefit analysis, even down to examinations.

AH raised the issue of the recent local authority redundancies, stating that the Union has concerns that this will impact on the service that can be provided by the Children's Service. RMG stated that these were cuts which had to be made although the authority did not want to. Barnet are a pilot in community budgets, where all services are working together with the aim of not only reducing costs, but also to providing better services. The Graham Allen report recognised 19 programmes which should be rolled out by local authorities, and FIP is one of these which addresses costs. A saving of £2m in the 3rd year of the budget has been identified, and if

this is not met, then the savings will have to be made elsewhere.

JM left the meeting at 16:49.

A: Presentation on Early Intervention to be circulated to the Forum – MC

6.2 Headteacher Proposals regarding Schools Forum – including training for new members

Paul Ferrie

PF presented a paper proposing recommendations from secondary headteachers, which have arisen since the discussions which took place at the last meeting. The first 3 proposals relate to the CEL and the remainder relate to the general operation of the Forum. PF asked to delay discussion of the first 3 points relating to the CEL to a later agenda item.

The aim of the remaining proposals is to find a way where headteachers can have effective communications and consultation in the Forum. There have been issues particularly with the papers for the May Forum which were received on the Friday afternoon before the meeting, which did not provide enough time to read them. The paper recommended that papers are issued 10 working days prior to the meeting with all the necessary details that everyone can read and understand.

One of the recommendations in the paper is for the Terms of Reference for the Forum to be looked at. PF noted that these are difficult times with many complex issues and many schools are becoming academies.

SM stated that he agreed with PF's comments, adding that he felt that due to the high turnover of Forum members lately, the group is underpowered to make decisions.

RMG thanked the group for very helpful recommendations and acknowledged that it is important to the authority to have a good relationship with the Forum, and there needs to be debate to achieve this. The LA wants to get this right.

VW noted that the 10 day agreement to issue the papers may mean some updates to papers may have to be tabled as they are dependent on budgetary information from third parties (e.g. schools and DfE). It is sometimes a balance of providing papers well in advance with draft information or delaying papers to await confirmed data. VW confirmed that any papers that needed to be tabled would be updates and revisions, not new items.

PF asked whether it would be possible to schedule the Forum meetings to tie in with dates that affect papers. VW advised that meetings are scheduled to accommodate this as far as possible, but meetings are part of a cycle that is dependent on the provision of information from elsewhere. For example, confirmed pupil figures are due from the DfE at the very end of June and allowing for the modelling and a 10 day turnaround in papers would require setting a Forum in the last week of term.

GK stated that it would be useful to have year-on-year comparisons in papers requesting financial decisions. He felt that headteachers and governors don't have the time to analyse the figures, and there are sometimes times when the way figures are presented could be improved. LP felt it would also be useful to have an expectation of some knowledge of schools funding when writing papers to make sure that everyone understands the contents. Assistance can be provided outside of the formal meetings to induct new members to the forum.

The meeting added that it is important that all members of the Forum leave the meetings with a shared agreement of actions and decisions made and that a working party should be established to look at a number of issues in relation to the operation of the forum.

AH commented that the working party should also identify a time-line to reconcile differences between the council's budget setting process and Schools Budget setting.

The Forum discussed the venue for meetings. PF suggested that the Forum could be held at a school where there is more space. PFR noted that the public are entitled to attend so it is useful to have a central location.

CM added that it is also useful to have a venue with good parking facilities. GK acknowledged that the current venue is good and the room for the meeting is a big improvement on the previous meeting. CB advised that appropriate rooms for the Forum have now been booked in advance at NLBP. The group agreed to continue to hold meetings at NLBP in appropriate rooms.

The group agreed to form a working party to hold 2 meetings prior to the next Schools Forum. VW volunteered to Chair, with PF, TB, EP, CB, MW also co-opted to the group. RMG added that it may be useful to schedule a 3rd date in for November after the results of the schools funding consultation which may affect the future of the forum.

A: Issues discussed in item 6.2 to be discussed by the working party prior to the July Forum meeting.

**6.3 Dedicated Schools Grant 2010/11 – Centrally Retained Budget
Outturn and School Balances**

Val White/Linda Parker

VW/LP presented a paper on Centrally Retained Budget Outturn and School Balances.

NA advised that there has been an increase in school balances with no primary schools having a deficit at the end of the year. Some primary schools had a recovery plan, but all had achieved the plan. Only 1 secondary school had a deficit at the end of the year, but it is now taking steps to address this. One reason for higher balances is that there is no clawback now so schools are not rushing to spend money by the end of the year. Also the authority had been advising schools to adopt good practice and prepare for financial difficulties. There are currently 2 schools with an 'excessive' balance but these schools have exceptional circumstances.

VW stated that there is now an underspend on the centrally retained budget outturn of £2.35 million from payments to 3 and 4 year old providers; special educational need (SEN) recoupment; and school contingencies (primarily related to the adjustment for statement top-ups).

CB explained that there have been a number of reasons for the underspend in payments for 3 and 4 year olds. Budgets were set when there were lots of unknowns around these payments and care was taken to set budgets so that the authority could deliver what parents and the government wanted. It was also unknown what flexibility level providers would choose, which has a large financial impact, as well as allowing for a rising number of children which has not materialised to the same extent as Reception age children. Also 6 of the biggest providers decided to withdraw, which provided savings in excess of £420,000. Initial budget setting was very cautious, and it was not until after the census in January 2011 that the true cost of provision was established and the underspend could be identified. DO asked whether Barnet is now in a position to be less cautious? CB confirmed that this is the case. KW asked whether the caution prior to the census was figured into the budget and if this now has an impact on this year's budget? CB said yes, the budget is the total of individual estimates for each school or setting. The Under 5s budget, previously separate, is now included in the total Individual Schools Budget (ISB). KW asked whether there will now be an underspend for this year as well? CB advised that we would not expect this but there is a small contingency for unexpected changes.

RMG asked the Forum whether they understood how the underspend was made up? PF asked for clarification as there was an underspend last year, but this year the authority want to spend more money. CB explained how the ISB is constructed and that it doesn't include payments to independent special schools or to academies. Previously the ISB only included funding that went to maintained schools, but since April 2011, private voluntary and independent early years settings (PVI) are now in the ISB as well as SEN statements for academies and there is more pressure on the ISB. LP explained that Section 251 is the government regulation return for how local authorities spend their Schools Budgets which has standard line definitions across the country, and the government has now put all ISB spending on a single line.

AM asked why the private providers withdrew from the scheme? CB explained that it was because a lot of them disliked the way they had to invoice for payments as they could no longer use the funding for 3 & 4 year olds as a discount on the invoice to parents. GB stated that it meant they had to adhere to additional rules which they did not like and EP added it meant that as the entitlement rose to 15 hours per week, settings open for 3 hours per day could not charge a variable rate for the last half hour anymore.

LP advised that the underspend on SEN has arisen through work conducted to review outstanding liabilities.

The majority of this consists of other local authorities not billing Barnet or billing less than expected and disputed cases resolved at lower levels. Without this, the net overspend would have been over £700,000 so the offset net position is £806,000. LP reiterated that the review was a one-off. TB noted that this was well done to all concerned.

PF asked how the underspend compares to the previous year? LP advised that there was an underspend of £1m last year which was the highest underspend since the introduction of the current school funding system. It is not unusual for a local authority to have this level of underspend. DO asked for clarification around the level of SEN underspend? RMG noted that it was through the exercise relating to our cross borough and external placement debtors that the underspend had been identified this year. JA asked for clarification that this part of the underspend was money clawed back from somewhere else? RMG confirmed that this is the case reiterating that it is a one off. PF asked why this exercise had not been conducted before? VW explained that BD is a new manager and the review of liabilities was part of the process of bringing procedures up to date.

GK stated that the Forum should consider that the budget is now in a position where there is £2.3m underspend. TB stated that he did not feel that the Forum was in a position to consider how this should be spent until the item on the CEL (6.4) had been considered and the Forum had heard from GB.

6.4 DSG 2011/12 Schools Budget – (Formal acceptance of budget in July)

Val White/Linda Parker

Variations in the Schools Budget were explained to the Forum.

Since the last Forum meeting one of the significant changes to the Schools Budget has been the release of the YPLA allocations and an update on the pupil numbers from the January schools census. There has been an increase in pupil numbers of 154 which equates to £880,000. The figure will not be finalised until the June census which is why the final budget figure will not be given until the July Forum meeting.

There has been an increase in expenditure due to purchase of the carbon reduction allowance which has been discussed at the Forum on a number of prior occasions. The DfE has recently issued guidance which allows for purchase of allowances to be made for the 2011/12 financial year from the centrally retained part of the budget.

The budget also incorporates updates from the contingencies and the outturn for the last financial year and there is now a better understanding of how academies are to be presented after completing Section 251. The recoupment model for academies converting during this year is also known now which will have a very significant impact on the CEL. Funding for converting academies will be deducted from the ISB therefore immediately reducing it from the previous year.

LP explained how the CEL is calculated – that the centrally retained budget is not allowed to increase by a higher percentage than the overall Schools Budget. Two developments particularly impact the CEL this year: the overall Schools Budget is going to decrease due to the funding for academies and the accounting requirements for the mainstreaming of standards funds.

DO asked what the impact would be for next year if the CEL is breached next year? GB advised that whatever the CEL is breached by in one year, it raises the barrier for the next year. GB stated that he does not agree it is inevitable that there will be a breach of the CEL because of academy funding. If ISB reduces by 10% and central expenditure reduces by the same proportion, the CEL would not be breached.

DO reminded the meeting that at the last meeting it was agreed to try to utilise any additional funding to rebalance the CEL. LP explained that cost projections based on Barnet children with SEN actually receiving support now indicate an additional £500k is required.

LP stated that the underspend could potentially be used to avoid a breach of the CEL, but this would mean a very different budget as a large proportion of centrally retained budget is spent on SEN, so unless these commitments could be met elsewhere, there would be an overspend which would be carried forward to the following year. SM stated that breaching the CEL does not sound sustainable as it implies that the situation

will get worse year on year. AM asked what the legal position is regarding breaching the CEL and who has the decision making power. LP advised that it is the Schools Forum which makes the decision. If the Forum is unable to agree to a breach of the CEL then the local authority can refer it to the Secretary of State for a final decision.

LP advised that this is likely to be the last year of the current funding arrangement and that next year there could be a whole new funding arrangement for schools. RMG is on a Government task group as part of the funding consultation and he stated that when the coalition government came into power, they felt that the current funding formula was over complicated.

VW stated that the CEL is a control mechanism, and the important debate is whether, as a group, we are putting the money in the right place to achieve the desired outcomes for Barnet's children and young people. RMG pointed out there are a whole range of statutory duties such as SEN that requires funds to be held centrally and stressed his intention of complete transparency and keenness to address any aspect of the budget or the proposals that members would like clarified.

GK stated that it comes back to the issue of detail. Officers understand the figures very well, but members do not understand to the same level and only deal with the budget for an hour or two every other month. From this point of view, the budget looks complicated and members of the Forum do not have a clear understanding of the situation to approve.

PF suggested that GB provides a holistic picture of the Schools Budget at the start of the next meeting. PF and TB noted that all headteachers want to avoid the CEL being breached. VW stated that the authority also does not want to breach the CEL and re-iterated that there is no intention of withholding information. The level of information provided this year was in line with previous years and the aim was to pull out the key issues for members to consider.

GB stated that he is not convinced that Forum members should have to go into that level of detail. The starting point should be that the LA should be able to manage on the same level of money year on year without exceptional circumstances. GB stated that the authority has masked considerable increases on budgets that have not been discussed. The retained expenditure in 2010/11 was £19m and £21m in 2011/12. VW noted that at the February meeting a paper was presented which went through all of the changes in the budget down to £10,000, and changes highlighted in this meeting relate to additional information. RMG advised that some factors change from year to year as evidenced by the 23% rise in pupil numbers over the next 5 years highlighted in JM's presentation. It is important that the correct level of detail is explored, but it is the principles that are important to be agreed on. The LA needs to know the pressures facing schools and it is job of the LA to let schools know what the LA pressures are in meeting the needs of children. There have been many years of trust in Barnet, the financial climate is changing and both the local authority and schools need to work together.

PF asked whether the Forum have to agree the use of the underspend by the July meeting? VW confirmed that this is the case as the July meeting will approve the final Schools Budget. Members felt a better understanding of the bigger picture is required before the use of the underspend can be agreed on.

Meanwhile VW outlined the LA proposals for the use of the underspend.

Schools contingency: BD is leading a piece of work around matching places and pupils and suggesting where schools are finding transition challenging. One option is to add money to this budget and also to the contingency to pay for the cost of additional pupil places to meet demographic pressures.

Revenue contribution to capital delegated to schools; a one-off allocation to schools on a per pupil basis including VA, Academies and special schools in recognition of the reduced capital allocations.

Revenue contribution to capital: permanent primary places, as a contribution to a large scale capital investment programme. VW presented the demographic pressures and outlined the mix of temporary and permanent expansions undertaken and in the pipeline. The case for investing in more permanent provision

was inescapable. Increasing use is being made of the Fair Access Protocol to place pupils and this is costly on the revenue budget, as is ghost funding pupils where temporary expansions do not fill. KW acknowledged that the figures speak for themselves and it is not possible to argue with the identified need. However, the proposal is to use money from revenue, and her understanding of revenue is that it is money to spend on children in a given year. VW stated that this is a valid argument which has to be balanced. The authority is trying to get a package of funds together from a range of sources. LP advised that it is not possible to charge borrowing costs to the Schools Budget, but it is possible to use the underspend as an opportunity to invest in this need. LP added that the authority is investing over £20m itself in this. KW raised concern that revenue money is for children across the borough, and although some of them might not have school places, all schools are experiencing budgetary pressures and there is an issue of transferring this revenue money to particular projects. There is a long history where schools have needed capital funds which they have not received. KW felt there is a risk of 'robbing Peter to pay Paul' with the Schools Budget. GK noted that this is going into capital, which is going into the CEL. RMG pointed out that if this money was to go into the ISB it would only equate to around £7,000 per primary school as opposed to targeting an identified need.

JF asked for clarification regarding what the money would be contributing to? VW advised that the money would go towards providing 7 new forms of entry. SM stated that need outstrips the ability of available funds. An option would be to combine all of the underspend and distribute it to schools. RMG stated that there is statutory duty on the authority to provide places, so if the underspend is not spent on this, there will be costs elsewhere such as ghost funding. PF asked where the money to fund these places should come from. RMG advised that the grant from the central government does not cover all of the places the authority has to provide. What is being proposed is to use some of the underspend for this as a way to make the best use of both revenue and capital resources. The money could have a big impact on funding pupil places, whereas if it was devolved to schools it would only have a very small impact on the ISB. JH added that the authority received a capital grant of £9m in 2011-12 whereas identified need is £40m, and this is a budget that is continually reducing. AH commented that the authority needs to raise representations to the appropriate authority that the basic funding is not enough. RMG stated that the authority is putting forward what it feels is a balanced use of the funding, and the consequence of not investing in pupil places for schools is great.

TB requested confirmation that the proposal in item 3.3 is for all schools including VA. VW confirmed that it is.

KM reiterated the importance of a holistic view of the Schools Budget, as there are other options which could have been used to balance the CEL or alternative uses for the money which had to be teased out. RMG stated that the budget options are infinite and what has been put forward is a recommendation from officers which it is believed is the best way forward in terms of pressures.

VW stated that getting an agreed and finalised Schools Budget is an iterative process and acknowledged that this can make it difficult to see 'in the round'. VW suggested having a meeting prior to the July Forum where the budget, as currently proposed, is set out in full and giving an opportunity for members to ask detailed questions. Members agreed that this would be a helpful way forward. SM stated that he would like the meeting to look at options for the underspend rather than a single proposal, and to consider 3 or 4 from which a decision could be made. DO stated that headteachers may be better placed to agree the use of the underspend if the division was more like 50/50 for the Schools Budget.

GT and AV left the meeting at 18:00.

The Forum agreed to hold an extraordinary meeting of the Forum to clarify all of the options for the budget and options for the underspend and look at it as a whole. PF stated that GB's input would be useful for this.

TB suggested that the budget issues could usefully be raised at director's meetings. RMG added that they could also be discussed at governors meeting.

A: Extraordinary meeting of the Schools Forum to be arranged prior to the July meeting to clarify the options for the Schools Budget and use of the underspend.

6.5 School Funding Reform – DfE Consultation	Carol Beckman
CB advised the group that the response to the consultation has to be submitted by 25 th May 2011.	
A: Comments on the School Funding Reform consultation to be sent to CB by the end of week commencing 16 th May.	
6.6 Scheme for Financing Schools – Changes	Nick Adams
NA presented a paper highlighting the changes to the Scheme in response to the DfE guidance, which included some minor alterations and some large changes such as getting rid of the clawback FMSiS.	
The only comment received in response to the changes related to the banking situation and the DfE guidance that all banks used must meet the authority's Treasury Management Policy, and includes both investment and current account banking.	
SM stated that he is from one of the 4 schools who bank with Allied Irish and there is confusion as to why they are on the list as their compensations are at least as strong as those for English banks. JH advised that this is a procedure which the authority has been forced to comply with. SM asked whether it is guidance or instruction. NA confirmed that it is guidance but it would be very difficult if the authority does not comply with it. JH advised that the council sets a strategy determining which banks we can use including which countries we can bank with and the strength of their economies. Our advisers have strongly advised the LA to avoid Ireland. SM stated that Allied Irish are governed by UK banking laws, and there is a double indemnity through both the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland. JH stated that the advice is that Allied Irish are not covered and this will be reinvestigated.	
SM requested that if the advice is the same that sufficient time is given to the schools involved to move accounts. JH – confirmed that sufficient time would be given.	
A: JH to re-investigate whether Allied Irish could be included in the authority's Treasury Management Policy.	
7 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION	
7.1 Schools Financial Value Standard	Nick Adams
Noted.	
7.2 Exceptional Additional SEN funding	
No issues Raised	
7.3 Contracts Affecting Schools	
No issues raised.	
8 Any Other Business	
JF advised the Forum that this will be her final meeting as she is leaving the Forum. GK thanked JF on behalf of the Forum for her contribution.	

Dates for future meetings

8 th June 2011	9.00am (Working Party to discuss Terms of Reference)
14 th June 2011	4.00pm
20 th June 2011	9.00am (Working Party to discuss Terms of Reference)
14 th July 2011	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
29 th September 2011	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
7 th December 2011	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
1 st February 2012	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)

6. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION/DECISION

Item 6 Schools Budget for 2011/12 and Use of Projected Underspend from 2010/11

Author	Val White
Position	Assistant Director Policy, performance and planning, Children's Service

Item 6.1 Schools Budget 2011/12

Each year, the Schools Budget is developed over a number of Schools Forum meetings, starting in February and concluding in July. As more information becomes available about pupil numbers and changes to regulations etc the budget is adjusted and refined, with each change being reported to the Schools Forum. The papers for the 1st February and 10th May set out the changes and the reasons for adjustments from the 2010/11 budget.

Previous Schools Forum papers over the last year have signalled that for 2011/12, there are a number of new arrangements that impact on the accounting for school funding, in particular:

- The mainstreaming of former standard funds
- The requirements to account for Academy funding
- The carbon reduction commitment

Appendix A now sets out the Schools Budget as currently proposed (excluding the underspend arising from 2010/11 – item 6.2 below). There may be some adjustments still to be made as pupil numbers are not finalised by the Department for Education until the end of June at the earliest. Early indications suggest that there may be up to an additional 50 pupils when the final figures are published.

The table in Appendix A shows

Column A: The final 2010/11 Schools Budget including in-year budget changes

Column B: The 2010/11 outturn

Column C: The variance between the 2010/11 budget and the outturn

Column D: The proposed 2011/12 budget (budget presented on the 10th May, updated with information about Post16 and pupil premium)

Column E: The change in the budget in 2011/12 compared to 2010/11

Column F: Comments on the changes

The budget will continue to be adjusted throughout the year due to the timing and number of Academy conversions.

The Central Expenditure Limit

The Schools Finance (England) Regulations 2011 state that the centrally retained funding cannot increase by a greater percentage than the Schools Budget as a whole unless agreed by the Schools Forum.

As discussed at the last two Forum meetings, the budget this year will breach the CEL. Members of the Forum have expressed concern. There are a number of particular reasons why the budget breaches the CEL this year.

- a) Budgets for Academies (both those that converted in 2010/11 and those we expect to convert in 2011/12) are recouped from the ISB part of the DSG, thereby reducing the size of the ISB. Academy converters are generally big secondary schools with large 6th form allocations from the YPLA so the effect on the ISB is very significant. This year, the current effect is a reduction of £34.5million in the ISB part of the DSG and this figure will increase as the number of schools converting to Academy status increases

For the 2011/12 financial year the DfE technical calculation requirements mean that

- The 2010/11 total budget (£270m) used to calculate the percentage change is the amount shown at the beginning of the 2010/11 financial year; it is not permitted to show this figure net of the reduction applied as a result of schools converting to academies during the 2010/11 financial year
- It is prescribed by the DfE that the 2011/12 total budget £239m used in calculating the percentage change from last year must be the total net of the reduction applied as a result of schools expecting to convert to academy status during the 2011/12 financial year;

Therefore the impact of Academy conversion alone, automatically makes the centrally retained expenditure a higher percentage of the overall Schools Budget.

- b) The pressure on the cost of SEN. Without the one-off exercise that released funds held previously against liabilities (see Forum 10th May) in 2010/11 the budget for SEN would have been overspent by £700k. For 2011/12 additional resources are needed to be put into SEN budget lines to mitigate this pressure and meet the needs of Barnet pupils already receiving services.
- c) With the mainstreaming of the Standards Fund, any retained funding (such as for Ethnic Minority Achievement) is a new element of the centrally retained budget.
- d) This year there has been a reduction in YPLA allocations for 2011/12 academic year which impacts directly on the total Schools Budget and the ISB.

For the last two years Barnet has not breached the CEL, although it was breached in 2008/9. We have undertaken an exercise to look at this issue across 32 London boroughs. In 2008/09 21 boroughs breached the CEL, in 2009/10 again 21 London boroughs breached it and last year 15 breached it. We have also looked at the level of delegation and last year, in terms of the proportion of funds delegated to schools, Barnet was ranked 9th highest delegator in London, climbing the table in each of the last 3 years. Attached is a table showing the London position from 2008/09 to 2010/11 (Appendix B), this is likely to be the last year where this information is useful as the rate of Academy conversion so heavily influences the equation.

In view of the impact of the Academy conversion on the ISB, the amount required to reduce centrally retained expenditure to a level that avoids a breach of the CEL this year would be substantial. The centrally retained expenditure as set out in Appendix A funds a whole range of statutory services that fall to the Local Authority. Based on the proposed budget, the centrally retained funding would need to be reduced in the region of 21-27% (depending on the underspend option – item 6.2). The services that can be funded by centrally retained are prescribed by the DfE and are closely defined within the regulations.

The most significant call on centrally retained resources is for SEN. 80% of the proposed centrally retained budget for 2011/12 in Barnet is for children with special educational need or for pupils excluded from schools. Barnet LA and schools together have made good progress in providing and improving inclusive provision. With a rising population of children and particularly those with complex needs, in the long run, a reduction in support services for this cohort of children could result in an increase in the number of children requiring more expensive external provision.

6% of the centrally retained budget is held in contingency accounts on behalf of schools and is distributed to schools throughout the year. The remaining funding covers such services as school admissions, early years standards, insurance, ethnic minority achievement support and insurance.

Action: The Schools Forum is asked to endorse the proposed budget in Appendix A which results in a breach of the CEL for final approval at the July meeting.

Item 6.2. The use of the rolled forward underspend in the Centrally Retained Budget

The local authority has considered the use of the rolled forward underspend from 2010-11. There are a number of budget pressures and potential additional costs that may arise during the current financial year and the local authority intends to allocate the one-off funding to the pressures detailed below:

a) Additional Funding for the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC)

On the 9th February the DfE wrote to Directors of Children's Services stating that the Financial Regulations would be amended for 2011-12 to allow the cost of schools' CRC allowances to be met from the central part of the Schools Budget. This includes CRC costs of all academies within the local authority area, even though academies are autonomous and the LA cannot influence the size of their carbon footprint. The estimated cost of the CRC allowances for Barnet schools is £350,000 (see School Forum agenda and minutes 13th July 2010, 7th December and 1st February 2011). Since the February meeting of the Schools Forum additional resources of £190,000 have been allocated towards the cost of the CRC allowances (item 6.4 of 10th May 2011). It is proposed to fund the remaining £160,000 from the DSG underspend. The ongoing funding of the CRC allowances in 2012-13 will need to be addressed when the School Budget is set for that financial year.

b) Schools Contingency held on behalf of schools: Special School and Resource Provision reorganisation

We are currently reviewing the pattern of provision for children with complex needs as the demands of the child population shifts and our intelligence with regard to projections of numbers improves. The review will ensure that funded provision meets the identified needs of children and young people in Barnet and that funding more closely matches the demand and take up of places. Moving to a new pattern of provision will require a transitional phase of funding to enable a level of stability in Schools Budgets.

c) School Contingency held on behalf of schools: Pupil Places - revenue

The pressure on school places is continuing to increase year on year. For September 2011 an additional 8 forms of entry were planned (and budgeted) but in view of the number of reception aged children that remain unplaced, an additional class is now being organised in East Finchley for September 2011. We are witnessing further pressure in Year 1 and Year 2 as children continue to apply for places throughout the school year and the numbers are kept under constant review to see if additional classes are necessary. We are making increasing use of the Fair Access Protocol to place children in areas of high pressure where there are not enough children to warrant an additional class. We need to ensure that sufficient contingency is available to fund the revenue costs of schools that agree to set up unplanned additional classes.

d) Additional one-off allocation to all schools

This year the devolved formula capital (DFC) funding for schools has been reduced significantly and to ensure schools have funding to maintain the quality of the school buildings and IT infrastructure, it is proposed to allocate one-off funding to schools. The funding would be allocated on pupil numbers and as this funding is exceptional, Schools Forum approval is requested to exclude it from the Minimum Funding Guarantee in 2012/13. The funding is not ring-fenced but schools will be encouraged to use it for the maintenance and upkeep of the school buildings and IT equipment.

e) Contribution to the Education Capital Budget for the cost of meeting the increase in pupil places (Revenue Contribution to Capital)

The provision of temporary school places to meet the increasing need is becoming unsustainable and further investment is now needed for permanent provision at both primary and secondary level (see School Forum agenda and minutes 6th October 2009, 24th November 2009, 2nd February 2010 and 10th May 2011).

The council has identified the need for approximately £36m for the next round of investment in permanent and temporary primary provision, and officers, in partnership with schools, are now devising a programme of activity for the next 3 years. This phase will invest in up to an additional 7 forms of permanent primary capacity and a range of temporary provision. There will be a need for still further investment as the latest GLA data projects that by September 2015 we will need an additional 18 forms of entry at primary level and a shortage of secondary school places will emerge around the same time. Government grant for pupil places for 2011/12 is £9m with no certainty of future years' funding. The council is seeking to develop an investment programme through borrowing and asset disposal to ensure that all children in Barnet have a school place.

f) Standards Fund – Extended Services Sustainability Grant

At the end of the financial year, £409k of the Extended Services Sustainability standards fund grant remains to be spent by the end of August 2011. The Extended Services Network Board wants to seek the view of the Schools Forum as to whether to devolve this money to schools, to be distributed on a per pupil basis. The board would wish schools to be aware of the aim of the fund to support extra curricular and holiday activity.

Three options are set out below on the distribution between the six priorities above. Having carefully considered the pressures, in view of the unprecedented demand for school places being experienced in Barnet that is well documented, the difficulty of meeting this demand within the current school provision and the increasing revenue cost of providing temporary bulge classes, the LA favours Option A to utilise the one off underspend to contribute towards the urgent permanent expansion programme.

Table 1 Options for use of underspend

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Carbon Reduction Commitment – schools element(CRC)	£160,000	£160,000	£160,000
Schools contingency held on behalf of schools: Special School and Resource Provision reorganisation	£125,000	£125,000	£125,000
Schools contingency held on behalf of schools: Pupil Places (revenue) £100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000
One-off contribution to capital cost of providing additional permanent pupil places	£1,465,000*	£1,000,000*	£800,000*
Additional one-off allocation to all schools (for capital and ICT) delegated to schools	£500,000	£965,000	£1,165,000
Extended services sustainability grant – delegated to schools	£409,000**	£409,000**	£409,000**

**or the remaining balance of the underspend should the final balance vary slightly*

***to be expended by end of Aug 2011*

Table 2 Distribution of underspend within the DSG

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Centrally retained	£1,850,000	£1,385,000	£1,185,000
Delegated to schools	£909,000	£1,374,000	£1,574,000

5. Recommendations and Comments

5.1 The Schools Forum is asked for its views on the preferred option for the use of the rolled forward underspends from 2010-11 of the Centrally Retained Budget and for the unspent Standards Fund for the Extended Services Sustainability Grant.

5.2 Schools Forum members are asked to support the application to the Secretary of State to consider the proposals for variations to the 2012/13 minimum funding guarantee for the one-off allocation of funding for the upkeep of school buildings and IT equipment.

School Forum members are reminded that background reading and information on schools funding and school funding regulations is available at www.barnet.gov.uk/school-funding and at www.education.gov.uk/schools/adminandfinance/financialmanagement/schoolsrevenuefunding

Appendix A - Schools Budget Analysis 2010/11 and 2011/12

	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Section 251 Line	INCOME	Final 2010-11 Budget including in year budget changes*	Final Outturn 2010-11	Outturn Variance + over/ (under spend)	2011-12 Budget as presented to Schools Forum 10th May 2011 updated for post 16 and pupil premium	Change between budgets 2010/11 to 2011/12	Comments on budget changes 2010/11 to 2011/12
	Pupils (FTE)	43,378			44,437	1,059	Pupil numbers will be finalised end of June
	DSG	£			£	£	
	Per Pupil Amount (£)	4,917			4,917		
	Standard Fund (£)				725		Standards funds now mainstreamed
	Dedicated Schools Grant (£)	213,274,877			250,706,888	37,432,011	
	Less cost of DSG recoupment for schools converting to academy status	(5,647,452)			(30,679,011)	(25,031,559)	2010-11 3 schools converted; 2011-12 estimated 6 schools converting 1 in April & 5 in September). This will change as details of final conversion dates become available
	Final DSG 2010-11/Estimated DSG 2011-12	207,627,425			220,027,877	12,400,452	
	YPLA 6th Forms Schools	23,037,741			19,160,004	(3,877,737)	Reduction due to 2010-11 academy converters
	YPLA SEN	2,774,122			2,773,085	(1,037)	
	YPLA Teachers Pay Grants	762,906			572,180	(190,726)	Reduction due to 2010-11 academy converters
	YPLA reduction (Academy converters)	(1,803,233)			(3,818,159)	(2,014,926)	estimated 5 2011-12 converters
	Total Young People Learning Agency (YPLA)	24,771,536			18,687,110	(6,084,426)	
	Other- rolled forward underspend from 2009-10	1,031,000				(1,031,000)	2011-12 budget excludes 2010/11 carried forward underspend as subject to agreement over allocation
	Pupil Premium						
	Free School Meals-maintained				3,221,524		Based on January census
	FSM Non maintained				13,330		Based on January census
	LAC				72,670		Based on government 2011 LAC return
	Service Children				8,200		Based on January census
	Total Pupil Premium				3,315,724	3,315,724	Will be finalised in the autumn
	Total Schools Budget	233,429,961			242,030,711	8,600,749	

		A	B	C	D	E	F
S251 Line	EXPENDITURE	Final 2010-11 Budget including in year budget changes*	Final Outturn 2010-11	Outturn Variance + over/ (under spend)	2011-12 Budget (Schools Forum 10th May 2011 with updates)	Change between budgets 2010/11 to 2011/12	Comments on budget changes 2010/11 to 2011/12
1.0.1	ISB (Includes resources provision and statements at academies and YPLA funding)	207,396,712	207,440,227	43,515	251,841,512	44,444,800	Increased due to pupil numbers, mainstreaming of former standards funds and free entitlement 3&4 yr olds and YPLA teachers pay grant
1.0.1	Less estimated recoupment				(34,497,170)	(34,497,170)	Reduction due to academy recoupment DSG and YPLA for 2010-11 and estimate for 2011-12
1.0.1	Total for line 1.0.1	207,396,712			217,344,342	9,947,630	
1.0.3	Pupil premium allocated to school				3,248,680	3,248,680	New funding
1.0.3	Pupil premium managed centrally				67,044	67,044	New funding for pupils in non maintained schools
1.0.8	YPLA Teachers Pay Grants	762,906	762,906	0		(762,906)	2011-12 TPG subsumed into ISB line 1.0.1
1.0.9	Under 5s (PVIs etc)	5,665,588	4,620,486	(1,045,102)		(5,665,588)	Now included in ISB above 1.0.1
1.1.2	School Contingencies including LACSEG (Academy recoupment of central exp.)	505,119	22,052	(483,067)	1,026,447	62,447	*Please note the 2010/11 original budget was £1.062m of which £621k was delegated to schools New contingency due to the difficulties of estimating the level of claims for the year ahead
1.1.3	Early Years contingency				200,000	200,000	
1.2.1	Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	711,110	766,386	55,276	2,390,149	1,679,039	Transfer of SEN budgets from 1.2.2 £1.68m;
1.2.2	Provision for pupils with SEN, provision not included in line 1.2.1	2,507,971	2,567,103	59,132	494,035	(2,013,936)	Transfer of SEN budgets £1.68m to 1.2.1, £120k to 1.2.3 £77k to 1.2.6; part savings in behavioural sup.
1.2.3	Support for inclusion	307,700	337,463	29,763	489,700	182,000	Increase due to transfer of budget for special schools outreach work (moved from line 1.2.1) £120,000; Cost of virtual headteacher £31k & making good progress central co-ordination £44k (former standards fund)
1.2.4	Fees for pupils at independent special schools & abroad	7,543,149	7,318,826	(224,323)	7,806,458	263,309	Increase in SEN placement budgets; Dec 2010 nos of placements 153 and projected placements for 2011-12
1.2.5	SEN transport	400,000	400,000	(0)	400,000	0	
1.2.6	Fees to independent schools for pupils without SEN				76,575	76,575	Costs of education of looked after children- budget transferred from on line 1.2.2
1.2.7	Inter-authority recoupment	1,971,860	1,389,910	(581,950)	2,304,860	333,000	Forecast increase in LEA recoupment cost
1.2.8	Contribution to combined budgets	457,460	337,936	(119,524)	907,460	450,000	Increase due to former centrally retained standard fund -Extended Services
1.3.1	Pupil Referral Units	1,591,685	1,615,279	23,594	1,815,335	223,650	Increase in budget now includes former Standards fund £181k; increase budget for external education courses for pupils and premises costs £42k
1.3.2	Behaviour Support Services	300,340	286,762	(13,578)	237,730	(62,610)	Staffing savings in behavioural support service following restructure
1.3.3	Education out of school	431,835	419,046	(12,789)	537,971	106,136	Increase in budget includes former standards funds
1.3.4	14 - 16 More practical learning options				64,000	64,000	Foundation Learning co-ordination

1.0.10	Central expenditure on education of children under 5s	709,210	656,521	(52,689)	840,030	130,820	Increase in costs re 3 & 4 year olds- teachers in children centres
1.4.1	Support to underperforming ethnic minority groups and bilingual learners				281,580	281,580	Former centrally retained standards fund EMA as 2010/11
1.5.1	Free school meals - eligibility	3,568	3,568	0	3,568	0	
1.4.3	Milk	1,570	491	(1,079)	-	(1,570)	Service now fully funded from parents and EU grant
1.6.1	Insurance	415,226	415,225	(1)	415,226	0	Schools public liability insurance
1.6.2	Museum and Library Services	41,760	35,286	(6,474)	32,753	(9,007)	Reduction in central budget- first phase of transition to the service becoming fully self funded
1.6.3	School admissions	429,792	439,142	9,350	394,192	(35,600)	2010-11 one-off funding for IT system
1.6.5	Miscellaneous (not more than 0.1% total of net SB)	238,974	205,305	(33,670)	211,580	(27,394)	Cessation of FMSIS & Schools and learning reorganisation;
1.6.6	Servicing of schools forums	34,680	34,680	0	34,680	0	
1.6.7	Staff costs - supply cover (not sickness)	155,620	158,696	3,076	155,620	0	TU, magistrates and other special leave
1.6.10	Purchase of carbon reduction commitment allowances				191,656	191,656	New line and new item
	Other Standards Fund Allocation - Non-Devolved	77,086	77,086	0	-	(77,086)	Schools and Learning reorganisation
1.7.1	Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Schools)	769,040	769,909	869	59,040	(710,000)	BSF reduction
	Total Planned Expenditure	233,429,961	230,310,382	(2,349,670)	242,030,711	8,141,869	Note line 1.1.2 Schools Contingency line

* includes recoupment of academies and allocation of schools contingency

Calculation of the Central Expenditure Limit	2010/11	2011/12	Change
	Restated in accordance with DfE regulations	excluding roll forward, calculated according to DfE regulations	
Schools Budget (excluding Pupil Premium)	270,143,176	238,714,987	-11.6%
Central Expenditure Budget	19,097,582	21,370,645	11.9%
CEL breached?			Yes

Appendix B - S251 Analysis of Centrally Retained Expenditure of London Boroughs 2008-11

London Borough	2008/09				2009/10				2010/11			
	Total Schools Budget £'000	Centrally Retained £'000	% Retained of TSBudget	CEL Breached ?	Total Schools Budget £'000	Centrally Retained £'000	% Retained of TSBudget	CEL Breached ?	Total Schools Budget £'000	Centrally Retained £'000	% Retained of TSBudget	CEL Breached ?
Barking and Dagenham	148,469	14,641	9.9	Yes	153,989	14,989	9.7	No	161,847	15,772	9.7	No
Barnet	218,947	21,892	10.0	Yes	227,002	23,050	10.2	No	235,677	24,296	10.3	No
Bexley	164,915	19,388	11.8	No	168,330	22,348	13.3	Yes	173,255	25,432	14.7	Yes
Brent	200,146	19,117	9.6	No	214,314	20,813	9.7	Yes	224,642	22,875	10.2	Yes
Bromley	203,316	27,433	13.5	Yes	210,468	31,429	14.9	Yes	217,741	34,738	16.0	Yes
Camden	140,127	22,851	16.3	No	144,343	24,064	16.7	Yes	149,287	25,309	17.0	Yes
Croydon	210,070	28,623	13.6	Yes	208,741	29,532	14.1	Yes	207,368	29,532	14.2	Yes
Ealing	208,423	24,167	11.6	Yes	219,203	25,110	11.5	No	227,883	26,086	11.4	No
Enfield	233,071	21,792	9.4	No	237,904	21,453	9.0	No	250,117	30,349	12.1	Yes
Greenwich	189,080	19,551	10.3	No	196,104	24,076	12.3	Yes	211,148	34,530	16.4	Yes
Hackney	151,225	30,684	20.3	No	154,784	31,085	20.1	No	160,898	33,521	20.8	Yes
Hammersmith & Fulham	92,282	11,149	12.1	Yes	97,437	12,566	12.9	Yes	98,513	12,666	12.9	No
Haringey	173,528	20,488	11.8	Yes	177,906	20,459	11.5	No	185,712	21,169	11.4	No
Harrow	134,784	14,632	10.9	No	137,662	15,025	10.9	No	142,888	14,973	10.5	No
Havering	155,700	15,382	9.9	Yes	163,059	15,909	9.8	Yes	165,826	15,711	9.5	No
Hillingdon	184,836	14,845	8.0	Yes	191,738	15,817	8.2	Yes	198,690	16,275	8.2	No
Hounslow	170,666	18,787	11.0	Yes	177,837	21,280	12.0	Yes	181,488	21,782	12.0	No
Islington	127,180	22,314	17.5	Yes	130,466	21,827	16.7	Yes	134,474	24,225	18.0	Yes
Kensington & Chelsea	69,088	8,338	12.1	No	68,512	9,115	13.3	Yes	70,681	11,266	15.9	Yes
Kingston upon Thames	95,877	8,369	8.7	No	100,407	9,390	9.4	Yes	105,586	9,503	9.0	No
Lambeth	174,772	22,918	13.1	Yes	183,466	26,420	14.4	Yes	191,490	27,623	14.4	No
Lewisham	183,228	27,730	15.1	Yes	188,635	28,174	14.9	No	196,724	29,367	14.9	No
Merton	99,396	16,186	16.3	Yes	102,628	16,529	16.1	No	107,905	18,401	17.1	Yes
Newham	250,634	24,833	9.9	No	261,199	28,048	10.7	Yes	270,952	32,592	12.0	Yes
Redbridge	201,846	17,674	8.8	Yes	213,584	20,276	9.5	Yes	223,644	24,138	10.8	Yes
Richmond upon Thames	91,552	14,097	15.4	Yes	95,468	15,263	16.0	Yes	99,844	16,197	16.2	Yes
Southwark	170,666	22,430	13.1	Yes	174,877	23,045	13.2	No	177,439	23,096	13.0	No
Sutton	140,017	17,251	12.3	Yes	146,231	18,081	12.4	Yes	153,214	19,784	12.9	Yes
Tower Hamlets	226,407	20,965	9.3	Yes	242,914	22,194	9.1	No	251,757	22,495	8.9	No
Waltham Forest	164,063	12,129	7.4	No	172,259	13,890	8.1	Yes	184,842	14,539	7.9	No
Wandsworth	156,413	6,785	4.3	Yes	162,452	7,493	4.6	Yes	170,624	8,015	4.7	No
Westminster	96,441	15,569	16.1	Yes	99,778	16,737	16.8	Yes	103,163	17,215	16.7	No
	Barnet's position	12	Breaches	21	Barnet's position	11	Breaches	21	Barnet's position	9	Breaches	15

www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/strategy/financeandfunding/section251/archive/b0069079/s251-workbooks-budget-2009-10/b