

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING**  
**HELD ON 24 OCTOBER 2012**  
**AT ST PAUL'S SCHOOL**

**Schools Members**

Governors: Mr M Cocks (Academy), *Ms N Conway (Primary)*, *Mr C Gill (Academy)*,  
Mrs J Leach (Special), Mrs P Price (Primary), Mrs L Sless (Primary),  
*Mr J Steven (Primary)*, Mr G Stubberfield (Secondary),  
Mr A Woodhall (Secondary)

Headteachers: Mrs P Alder (Primary), *Ms J Cullen (Secondary)*,  
Mr B Goddard (Secondary), *Mr G Lefley (Pupil Referral unit)*,  
Mrs S Moore (Primary), Mrs P Rutherford (Secondary),  
*Mrs P Sowter (Academy)*, Mrs S Tripp (Special),

---

**Non-Schools Members**

Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Panel	Cllr R Simbodyal
Early Years Provider	Mrs S Roberts
14-19 Partnership	<i>Mr K Hintz</i>
Teachers' Committee	<i>Mr R Gow</i>
Assistant Director, Education	Ms J Tosh
Head of Behaviour Support	Mr J Carrick

---

**Observers**

Member (Observer):	Cllr A Orhan
Assistant Director, Commissioning & Com. Engagement:	Ms E Stickler
Assistant Finance Business Partner:	Mrs Y Medlam
Resources Development Manager:	Mrs S Brown

Also attending:  
Finance Manager Mrs L McNamara

*Italics denotes absence*

1. INTRODUCTIONS and APOLOGIES for ABSENCE  
Apologies for absence were received from Ms Conway, Mr Gill, Ms Cullen, Mr Lefley and Mr Gow.

**Noted** the absences of Mrs Sowter, Mr Steven and Mr Hintz.

2. MEMBERSHIP

**Reported** as part of the changes to the regulations to the Schools Forum, there was a requirement that the membership includes the Headteacher of the Pupil Referral Unit.

The Forum was asked to note Mr Lefley, Headteacher of the Pupil Referral Unit would be joining the Forum as a Schools Member.

Noted Mr Lefley had extended his apologies from this meeting due to a prior engagement.

3. SCHOOLS FORUM – TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Received** a report providing information on the revisions to the Schools Forum's Terms of Reference, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

**Noted**

- (a) The changes to the Terms of Reference had to be carried out during the summer in order to meet the statutory requirements. There was little local flexibility in terms of the arrangements for the membership and administration of the Forum. It was questioned when were the new regulations due to come into force. It was stated the regulations came into force on 1 October 2012.
- (b) The revisions had been presented to full Council for approval in September 2012 and Council had recommended that the revisions be presented to the next meeting of the Schools Forum.
- (c) It was questioned how the proposals for five secondary Headteachers / Governors schools members would be managed. It was stated the aim of the proposed membership for secondary schools members was to create as little turbulence as possible to the current arrangements and as vacancies occurred or changes were required due to pupil numbers, these would be managed in discussion with the relevant sector representatives.
- (d) It was questioned why arrangements for the academy representation had to change. It was stated that the regulations required academies to be consulted separately when seeking representation for the Forum and the current arrangements were not permissible. This had been discussed at length with the DfE but it was not possible to maintain the current arrangements. Following this meeting, the membership of academies would be reviewed in line with the regulations.
- (e) Council Members sought the guidance in the Terms of Reference with regards the length of time a member held the position of Chair be amended from advising to recommending it should be a maximum of two years. It was questioned when would be the next time an election would be held for the position of Chair. It was confirmed that this would be the first meeting held in the new financial year and the Forum would be reminded of this guidance when considering nominations.
- (f) It was questioned if the Forum meetings were considered to be public meetings and anyone could attend whether they should be held in the Civic. It was stated that for a number of years, the information relating to Forum meetings had been published on the Council's website and anyone wanting to attend was asked to contact and confirm their attendance with the Clerk so that appropriate administrative arrangements could be put in place.

Members were of the view that the meetings of the Forum should be held in different parts of the borough to ensure there was sufficient opportunity for members of the public to attend by holding them in their local areas. It was unlikely that the Civic would provide this opportunity if Enfield residents had to travel to the Civic.

The Forum noted and accepted the revised terms of reference without any further amendments.

**Clerk's Note:** Cllr Orhan arrived at this point.

## 2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Reported some Forum members still needed to complete the register of business interest form.

**NOTED** Mrs Roberts was a proprietor of a day nursery and whilst it was accepted that there may be some level of conflict, but Mrs Roberts' role on the Forum was to represent the views of her colleagues in the private, independent and voluntary sector.

Agreed to request members who had not completed the register of business interest form to do so.

**Action: Mrs Brown**

### 3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

- (a) Schools Forum meetings held on 27 June 2012  
**Received** the minutes and action sheet of the meetings of the Schools' Forum held on 27 June 2012, which were confirmed as a correct record.
- (b) Commissioning Group meetings held on 22 June and 12 September 2012  
**Received** the minutes of the meetings of the Commissioning Group held on 22 June and 12 September 2012.
- (c) Matters arising from the minutes  
Combined Services Budget (Item 7b)  
**Reported** that a meeting between the PVI representatives and Ms Stickler and Mr Ramjhun had been arranged to discuss provision for children with special educational needs.

### 4. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- (a) School Budget 2011/12 Outturn  
**Received** a report, which provided information on outturn position for revenue expenditure for 2011/12, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

**Noted:**

- (i) The total carry forward from 2011/12 to 2012/13 was £3.845m;
- (ii) There had been an increase in the number of three and four year olds accessing the free nursery entitlement and this had led to an overspend in the budget for this area.
- (iii) Schools budget had reported an underspend of £1749m;

The Forum noted and accepted the report outlining the year end position for Schools Budget 2011/12.

- (b) School Balances & Recycling of Balances for financial year 2011/12  
**Received** a report, which provided information on balances as reported by maintained schools for 2011/12, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

**Noted:**

- (i) There had been an increase in balances held by maintained schools from the previous financial year. The balances held by schools as at 31 March 2012 totalled £17.4m which represented an increase of £5.7m from the previous year;
- (ii) Whilst the comparison of balances held with Enfield's statistical neighbours and other Outer London Authorities showed Enfield had experienced a greater increase, the total balances held were still lower in comparison;
- (iii) Following an assessment of the information provided by schools, there was no recommendation to recycle any balances from schools;
- (iv) The information provided by schools for retaining high levels of balances. It was questioned whether the reasons were assessed and how could the Forum be confident that these were legitimate reasons. It was stated that the balances were

assessed in line with the criterion outlined in the Scheme for Financing and where the information provided by a school did not meet the requirements of the Scheme then further information was sought from the school;

- (v) as reported last year schools which were expanding to support the need for additional pupils had reported surplus balances in the early years of expansion due to the need to plan the admission of the additional pupils and delaying projects;
- (vi) it was questioned whether the funding received from the pupil premium may have impacted the balances. It was stated in the analysis in the report suggested that it was uncertain this was the case as there was no direct correlation. It was reported that it was planned to provide support to schools on the use of the pupil premium;
- (vii) it was questioned whether schools were retaining money due to financial uncertainty. It was stated that it was difficult to comment if this was the case. Members suggested that the situation be monitored;

The Forum noted and accepted the report outlining the position on balances held by schools at the end of 2011/12.

(b) School Budget 2013/14

**Received** a report providing information on the issues which would influence the Schools Budget for 2013/14, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

**Noted:**

- (i) the financial information provided is in line with the new funding framework. The information is still indicative as detailed information is still awaited on some of the new areas of funding as well as confirmation from the EFA of the data set to be used following the October Census. The experience to date on the use of the data EFA had not been good with delays in receiving the data and when it was received the data being inaccurate;
- (ii) information on central budgets and requests for de-delegation would be provided to the next meeting;
- (iii) funding for the free nursery entitlement for disadvantaged two year olds was to be added to the DSG. It had been confirmed that this would be funded by reducing the Early Intervention Grant provided to the LA. It was questioned where the funding for £100m capital grant would be met. It was stated that this may also be funded from the Early Intervention Grant and thereby adding pressure to the services provided by the LA;
- (iv) it was still unclear whether the funding which would be provided for Post 16 pupils with SEN would be sufficient to meet the need identified;
- (v) the funding identified for the three notional blocks was not ring fenced;

**Clerk's Note:** Ms Tosh left the meeting at this point.

- (vi) information had been provided to the DfE on the projected growth to meet the needs of pupils with SEN, but no information had been received as to whether this growth would be supported by providing additional funding;
- (vii) the funding of the PRU would be delegated in a similar way to a maintained school;

- (viii) the DfE had taken the funding which supports 90% of the resident population to access free nursery education from the DSG. This has led to a removal of £2.5m. The DfE in publishing the School funding Reforms had stated that there would be transitional arrangements to support this change. To date no information had been received on the transitional arrangements;
- (ix) there had been an increase announced in the pupil premium for 2012/13 from £600 to £619 per pupil and for 2013/14 from £619 to £900 per pupil;

The Forum noted and accepted the report outlining the position on the Schools Budget 2013/14.

**Clerk's Note:** Mr Carrick left the meeting at this point.

- (c) Responses to Consultation on Funding Arrangements 2013/14  
**Received** a report providing information on the responses to the proposals for the local funding formula for 2013/14, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

**Noted:**

- (i) the proposals and recommendations outlined in the report. It was questioned whether schools and academies had had sufficient time to respond to the document as the number of responses seemed low. It was stated that presentations were made to the Headteachers' conferences for the three sectors in the Summer and then during the Autumn term a workshop with Headteachers and a briefing with School Business Managers were held. Headteacher representatives on the Commissioning Group had assisted in publicising the workshop and briefing session;
- (ii) the proposed principles and formula factors would be used to complete and submit a pro forma to the EFA on the local arrangements. However, work on the funding formula, using the factors identified in the report, would continue. This would be to provide a better fit and reduce turbulence, as well as implement any adjustment required following the confirmation on the funding available for the DSG.  
  
The sector representatives and the PVI representatives noted and accepted the arrangements for the funding formula for mainstream schools;
- (iii) the proposals for support high needs pupils. It was suggested that the new funding arrangements for schools to fund the first £6k of provision for an exceptional needs pupils may mean schools may refuse or be less willing to accept these pupils. It was stated that the document outlined a recommendation to delegate the £6ks which were provided as part of the current funding arrangements.

It was noted that the new funding arrangements aimed to support the proposals contained in the SEN Green Paper which included the development of the local offer. Unfortunately, the funding arrangements were being introduced prior to the introduction of the new SEN proposals.

There was concern that the delegation of this funding would be diluted and some schools with high number of exceptional needs pupils, low number of pupils on free school meals and also high achievement will not receive the funding necessary to support these pupils.

It was stated that work was continuing on the arrangements for exceptional needs including the need to ensure there was no perverse incentive as part of the new arrangements.

It was suggested if any Forum members had any thoughts on how the arrangements for high needs could be improved that they forward these to officers.

The Forum noted that the new arrangements were very complex and expressed their thanks to Council officers and in particular Mrs Medlam and her team for their hard work in developing the local funding arrangements.

**Clerk's Note:** Ms Moore left the meeting at this point.

7. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

(a) Procurement Update and Proposals for Schools

**Received** a paper outlining proposals to assist schools in developing more effective procurement practice, a copy of which is included in the minute book

**Noted:**

- (i) the proposals provided a spend to save strategy, whereby the use of resources to develop systems and a service level agreement should provide efficiency and other savings in the future;
- (ii) it was questioned whether the use of global agreements with national and international organisations may preclude local organisations from providing services to schools in their area. It was stated that corporate procurement rules required where practicable one quote be sought from a local organisation.

Cllr Orhan confirmed that local engagement and regeneration was a priority for Members and the key aim was to ensure that the arrangements enabled local providers to quote for goods or services. For this reason, the awarding of contracts was monitored.

**Resolved** to utilise the balance of the funding agreed for this project be used to further develop the procurement proposals contained in the report including a service level agreement.

(b) Section 251 Outturn Budget Statement 2011/12

**Received** the Section 251 Outturn Budget Statement for 2011/12, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

8. WORKPLAN

**Received** the workplan of the Schools' Forum, a copy of which is included in the minute book.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Retiring Members

**Reported** Mrs Price was retiring as a governor after 40 years and therefore as a member of the Forum.

The Forum thanked Mrs Price for her hard work and valued contribution to the work of the Forum over a number of years. Her commitment to the work of the Schools Forum was greatly appreciated.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS

**Noted** the

- (a) date for the next meeting of Wednesday 12 December 2012 at 5:30pm at St Paul's School;

(b) proposed dates for the future meetings:

- 06 February 2013 at Lea Valley High School. It was noted that the date for this meeting may have to be changed or a further meeting may need to be arranged to agree the final budget and funding arrangements.
- 09 May 2013
- 11 July 2013

**Action: Mrs Brown**

10. CONFIDENTIALITY

**Resolved** that none of the above be regarded as confidential.

# MINUTES OF COMMISSIONING GROUP MEETING

## 19 October 2012

### Membership:

Eve Stickler, Janet Cullen, Bruce Goddard, *Julie Messer*, Sally Moore, *Pam Rutherford*, *Terry Scott*, *Sue Tripp*, *Claire Whetstone*, *Claire Wright*, *Marie Janaway*, *Apu Alam*, Yvonne Medlam, Sangeeta Brown

cc Schools Forum, DMT

- *Italics denote absence*

### 1. Apologies for absence

Julie Messer, Pam Rutherford, Sue Tripp, Claire Whetstone, Claire Wright, Marie Janaway, Apu Alam

### 2. Membership

Noted Tricia Alder was going to join to the group to fill the vacancy created following Carmel's retirement.

Tricia was welcomed to the group.

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes from the meeting held on 14 September 2012 were agreed.

### 4. School Budget 2013 – 14

Received a report providing information on the issues which would effect the Schools Budget for 2012/13.

Noted:

- (a) It had not been possible to provide an accurate estimate total DSG for 2013/14 because information was still awaited from DfE.
- (b) For 2013/14, funding for disadvantaged two year olds and Post 16 students with exceptional needs in schools and FE colleges would be encompassed into the DSG. It was uncertain how much funding would be provided for these two new areas and whether it would be sufficient to meet needs. It was stated that the funding for disadvantaged two year olds was being found by top slicing the Early Intervention Grant (EIG) provided to LAs. The reduction in the amount of EIG received by LAs would lead to a direct impact on the services managed by the LA.
- (c) The DfE had confirmed that the target reach for providing nursery education to disadvantaged two year olds had increased from 500 this year to 1,900 in 2013/14. It was questioned what was the criteria for assessing which two year olds would be eligible. It stated that the criteria being used for eligibility was similar to that used for assessing free school meals eligibility.
- (d) It was questioned whether the use of the October Census to calculate the funding would mean schools would receive earlier notification of their budget shares. It was stated that the aim would be to get the budget share information to schools as early as possible but it was most likely to be same time as in previous years. This was because of uncertainty as to whether the DfE / EFA would meet their deadlines, the information from the EFA regarding Post 16 funding and the funding for the pupil premium would be based on the January Census.
- (e) There is a potential risk of less headroom due to the use of new methodology for calculating the DSG. Whilst it was expected that the funding would support current commitments and funding levels for individual schools, it was uncertain whether there would sufficient funding to support the growth in pupil numbers or any other priorities.
- (f) No information had been on received on how growth in the number of pupils with high needs would be funded under the new funding arrangements.
- (g) It was confirmed that the per pupil rate for the pupil premium would increase from £600 to £619 for the current financial year and the new rate for 2013/14 would £900 per pupil.

Noted the contents of the report and the comments received at the meeting.



## **5. Funding Arrangements for School and Academies – Results of Consultation & Proposed Changes**

Received a report providing information on the responses received to the principles and proposals outlined in the two consultation documents on the new funding arrangements for schools and academies.

Noted:

- (a) During the workshop with Headteachers, further clarity was sought on the effect of the proposed funding formula. To address this, illustrative models based on the new funding formula for mainstreamed schools and academies were circulated to Headteachers and then explained to the School Business Managers at their briefing.
- (b) The inflexibility in the regulations provided little opportunity to address some of the comments received in relation to use of EAL.
- (c) To meet the strict timeline imposed by the DfE, applications for the exemptions to the minimum funding guarantee had been submitted for the funding of additional pupils, protection funding for expanding schools and also rent paid by schools for accommodation to provide places for the pupil expansion programme. The reason for seeking these exemptions was that the inclusion of these factors in the baseline for future years would have been unfair and unreasonable. Approval for these exemptions was awaited.
- (d) The proposals for considering a vacancy factor for special schools. It was questioned with the pressure for places in mainstream in schools, why were there vacancies in special schools. It was stated, in the main, the special schools were oversubscribed and vacancies occurred due to movement in pupils.

Noted the contents of the report and comments received at the meeting.

## **6. Procurement: Update and Proposals for Schools**

Received a report, which provided an update on the work commissioned to identify procurement issues faced by schools and determine the support required by schools to improve these.

Noted:

- (a) A consultant had been commissioned to carry out an initial study. The aim of the study was to gather information on arrangements for procurement currently in place in schools and identify areas which could be developed to improve procurement and derive better value for money.
- (b) The findings had identified a number of areas which could be improved by providing a package of support for schools to access. It was proposed that the support package be developed into a Service Level Agreement (SLA) during 2013 – 14 and offered from April 2014 to schools and academies. The SLA would be developed jointly with LB Waltham Forest.
- (c) Analysis of spending by 11 Enfield schools had shown that the use of framework and existing LA contracts would lead to cash savings for schools, an example of using Office Depot was provided.
- (d) The continued practice of awarding contracts on rolling basis could lead to breach of EU regulations.
- (e) It was questioned what was the purpose of the SLA and whether the LA had a responsibility to provide support and ensure compliance. It was stated that the Authority had a responsibility to provide guidance on the legal framework but it was individual schools responsibility to ensure compliance with this framework.
- (f) The SLA would be developed to include support on complying with the guidance, co-ordinating the tendering processes, spend analysis to consider areas for savings, access to e tendering and training. The current procurement training provided to schools was well received but the report has highlighted further specific training was required to support schools. As part of the development of the SLA, it was being proposed that on-line, bite size training sessions or bespoke training would be considered.

It was requested whether information and examples to support the how the changes in procurement could achieve savings.

Agreed to circulate examples of good practice + further illustrative models included in the consultant's report to the group.

Action: David Levy / Sangeeta Brown

7. **Workplan**

Noted the additional items to be included on the workplan.

ACTION: Sangeeta Brown

8. **Dates of meetings for the Commissioning Group**

Dates of the subsequent meeting confirmed as:

Date	Time	Venue	Comment
7 December 2012	8.15-10.15am	Lea Valley High School	
25 January 2013	8.15-10.15am	St Paul's School	May need to be rescheduled
8 March 2013	8.15-10.15am	Lea Valley High School	
10 May 2013	8.15-10.15am	Highlands School	
14 June 2013	8.15-10.15am	St Paul's School	

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum 12 December 2012

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Finance, Resources &amp; Customer Services

**Contact officer and telephone number:**

Yvonne Medlam 020 8379 3445

E mail: [Yvonne.medlam@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Yvonne.medlam@enfield.gov.uk)**Agenda – Part: 1****Item: 6a****Subject: Schools Funding Reforms - Funding Proposals for Pupils with Exceptional Needs****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The new schools funding reforms have introduced a new mechanism for funding schools for exceptional special educational needs (SEN). Expectation is that schools will fund the first £6,000 towards the cost of all SEN support including exceptional needs.

From April 2013, local authorities are required to delegate the appropriate additional support to meet the low level SEN requirements using the new formula funding factors e.g. Attainment, Free School Meals, Looked after Children, AWPU, Lump sum, IDACI, Pupil Mobility and English as an Additional Language.

This report will review the challenges and concerns the Local Authority has in terms of delegating the additional resources using these allowable factors to meet the identifiable need. This report provides proposals for providing support to pupils with exceptional needs

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

To note and comment on the information contained in this report and the next steps identified in Paragraph 6.

**3 Background****3.1 Schools Funding Reforms 2013/14 - SEN**

As part of the School Funding Reforms for SEN, the DfE has placed a requirement on maintained schools and academies to meet the first £6,000 of any SEN funding from April 2013. This requirement will lead to changes in the way that the Local Authority currently funds pupil with exceptional needs. The reforms define SEN provision in terms of additional funding not hours of support. The DfE definition of SEN is support in excess of £10,000 of which the first £4,000 relates to educational support and the remaining £6,000 relates to additional SEN support.

Members will recall that the Authority currently delegates 14 hours of SEN support as predictable needs. As such schools and academies have a responsibility to fund all statements up to 14 hours. Funding in relation to these requirements is allocated to schools through their individual schools budgets. However, the Local Authority currently funds the full the cost of all SEN assessed as requiring more than 14 hours.

To comply with the new regulations, it was proposed as part of the consultation process that consideration be given to the £6000's not provided as part of the exceptional needs funding be delegated to schools through the funding formula. During consultation, some schools expressed concerns that this arrangement would leave them at a financial disadvantage. This report considers the impact of the requirements of the reforms and provides a proposal to mitigate the loss for individual schools.

#### 4 **Delegation of resources using the agreed formula factors**

A series of options were considered to review the "best fit" for allocating resources using the allowable factors for need. For the purposes of this work, need is defined as "where pupils with exceptional needs have been actually placed". It has not been possible, using the prescribed factors, to find an option that will allocate resources to schools in a manner that would broadly support the actual placement of pupils with SEN. To seek a solution, statistical analysis tools such as "solver" have been used to try and find an acceptable solution. Appendix A shows the "best fit" outcome as assisted by using "solver".

It can be seen from this that there is considerable variance in how the funding will be allocated. This is because the permissible factors target additional resources only for data that supports - Low Attainment, Mobility, English as an Additional Language, Free School Meals, Looked after Children, etc

This has meant:

- Schools which have low levels of need using these factors will attract lower levels of the additional delegation even though they may currently have a high number of statemented pupils than the perceived need demonstrated by the new formula factors. The new formula makes an assumption that there is a linear relationship with disadvantage as supported by the factors and SEN placements. This is not the case for Enfield.
- Pupils with physical needs e.g. wheelchair bound may not attract any additional resources (or limited additional resources) for the school but will require the school to support additional resources towards that pupil to the value of £6,000.

#### 5 **Proposal - 2 stage delegation process for exceptional needs**

Using the information gathered from other local authorities, it is proposed for high needs pupils in mainstream schools and academies (formerly defined as exceptional need) that a two stage funding process be provided. The two stage process would operate as follows:

##### **Stage One**

- a) Schools will be allocated an additional £12,000 through the lump sum factor as an equivalent of two £6ks per school. Under the new regulations the lump sum is the only factor which will facilitate all schools receiving the same level of funding. Schools Forum is asked to note that the lump sum figure will be revised to £162,000 from its current agreed £150,000 to reflect the above additional delegation.
- b) Funding would be part of the schools funding formula and therefore met from the ISB.
- c) Funding would form part of the notional SEN block from which schools are expected to meet the initial £6,000 cost of SEN.

##### **Stage Two**

- a) Schools will be funded on the number of pupils at the school requiring SEN support in excess of £6,000 based on the January pupil count date.

- b) The difference in number between the two statements allocated as stage 1 of the process and the January count will be funded from the high needs block. As well as receiving the £6,000 for an exceptional needs pupil, the school will also receive the balance of the cost of the assessed need as a 'top up'.

Appendix B illustrates the data on a school by school basis using the October 2012 data. Members will note that this option does create nominal places that are currently unfilled resulting in a cost of £102,000 to the high needs block.

The table below provides a summary of the two stage process including the number of placements as at October 2012 count.

It should be noted that Local Authorities are required to provide sufficient funding to schools to enable them to meet the first £6,000 of SEN placements not just from the home authority but from any Local Authority. As such the table below includes statements placed from other Local Authorities. Similarly, Enfield Council will not meet the first £6k of the cost of SEN placements in schools maintained by other Local Authorities.

Summary	Number of Placements October			Place Plus Approach- Places funded				Cost of Funding Places			
	Enfield	Other Boroughs	Total Placements	Stage 1 - places	Stage 2 - Places	Funded Places	Places funded over need	Stage 1 - places	Stage 2 - Places	Funded Places	Places funded over need
Primary Schools	241	17	258	120	155	275	17	£720,000	£930,000	£1,650,000	£102,000
Secondary Maintained	123	23	146	22	124	146	0	£132,000	£744,000	£876,000	£0
Secondary Academy	72	4	76	14	62	76	0	£84,000	£372,000	£456,000	£0
<b>Total</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>£936,000</b>	<b>£2,046,000</b>	<b>£2,982,000</b>	<b>£102,000</b>

The advantages with this option are that:

- this proposal will ameliorate the position which was previously presented to the Forum and go some way towards mirroring the current funding arrangements and support those schools with high number of pupils with exceptional needs but have been identified as having low need through the funding formula
- it meets the statutory requirements but assists in the allocation of resources to schools with high levels of SEN placements.

A further point to note is that these funding reforms are being introduced in advance of the implementation of the SEN and Disabilities Green Paper. It is considered that this proposal would provide sufficient capacity to consider and implement any additional changes that may arise from the implementation of the SEN-D agenda.

## 6. NEXT STEPS

Comments are sought from the Forum, before these proposals are circulated to schools and academies for their views.

**Table to show distribution of place led funding using the new DfE permissible factors**

Appendix A

School	Statements January	AEN	EAL	FSM	Mobility	AWPU	Total	places	Variance on Statements	Variance based on £6,000 per place	
		£	£	£	£	£	£			£	
ALMA	p	2	2,570	-	1,420	2,874	20,552	27,415	5	2.6	15,415
BOWES	p	6	700	-	571	1,463	22,237	24,972	4	-1.8	11,028
BRETTHENHAM	p	3	2,045	-	1,216	1,610	19,381	24,252	4	1.0	6,252
BRIMSDOWN PRIM	p	7	3,920	-	2,001	2,258	28,978	37,157	6	-0.8	4,843
BUSH HILL PARK	p	2	2,889	-	2,040	4,417	28,229	37,576	6	4.3	25,576
CAPEL MANOR	p	1	310	-	573	1,142	12,406	14,430	2	1.4	8,430
CARTERHATCH INF	p	2	1,957	-	1,031	1,470	15,355	19,814	3	1.3	7,814
CARTERHATCH JNR	p	2	2,728	-	1,096	1,271	16,853	21,949	4	1.7	9,949
CHASE SIDE	p	8	1,245	-	502	1,096	19,100	21,944	4	-4.3	26,056
CHESTERFIELD PRIM	p	18	3,476	-	2,703	3,735	35,626	45,539	8	-10.4	62,461
CHURCHFIELD	p	4	1,059	-	1,899	2,035	26,450	31,443	5	1.2	7,443
DEBOHUN	p	3	1,055	-	723	1,562	11,657	14,997	2	-0.5	3,003
EASTFIELD	p	3	2,064	-	1,299	1,043	19,334	23,741	4	1.0	5,741
ELDON INF	p	1	1,226	-	1,499	1,362	20,224	24,311	4	3.1	18,311
ELDON JNR	p	3	1,529	-	2,367	2,550	27,527	33,974	6	2.7	15,974
EVERSLEY	p	8	364	-	212	505	23,548	24,629	4	-3.9	23,371
FIRS FARM	p	5	1,026	-	816	1,355	23,735	26,932	4	-0.5	3,068
FLEECEFIELD	p	6	1,526	-	1,585	879	19,615	23,605	4	-2.1	12,395
FORTY HALL	p	1	191	-	141	209	10,955	11,495	2	0.9	5,495
FREEZYWATER ST GEORGES	p	2	198	-	302	133	10,861	11,494	2	-0.1	506
GALLIARD	p	10	1,308	-	1,376	2,276	30,664	35,624	6	-4.1	24,376
GARFIELD	p	5	914	-	957	2,712	14,606	19,189	3	-1.8	10,811
GEORGE SPICER	p	5	1,964	-	785	1,040	22,377	26,166	4	-0.6	3,834
GRANGE PARK	p	5	948	-	416	878	29,353	31,594	5	0.3	1,594
HADLEY WOOD	p	0	-	-	71	211	10,252	10,534	2	1.8	10,534
HAZELBURY INF	p	2	1,756	-	1,449	1,448	20,879	25,532	4	2.3	13,532
HAZELBURY JNR	p	5	3,699	-	1,830	2,154	27,761	35,445	6	0.9	5,445
HAZELWOOD INF	p	2	767	-	314	627	12,500	14,207	2	0.4	2,207
HAZELWOOD JNR	p	4	1,019	-	298	468	16,713	18,498	3	-0.9	5,502
HIGHFIELD	p	3	2,231	-	1,100	2,656	21,628	27,615	5	1.6	9,615
HONILANDS	p	6	2,570	-	1,624	2,330	22,284	28,808	5	-1.2	7,192
HOUNDSFIELD	p	4	2,116	-	2,150	4,732	25,701	34,698	6	1.8	10,698
LATYMER ALL SAINTS	p	3	1,268	-	1,522	1,579	28,838	33,206	6	2.5	15,206
LAVENDER	p	4	2,452	-	1,067	1,692	22,331	27,542	5	0.6	3,542
MERRYHILLS	p	3	1,321	-	518	1,012	22,003	24,854	4	1.1	6,854
OAKTHORPE	p	5	1,405	-	643	963	23,454	26,465	4	-0.6	3,535
OUR LADY OF LOURDES	p	0	36	-	133	395	9,691	10,255	2	1.7	10,255
PRINCE OF WALES	p	4	2,147	-	1,679	3,075	23,314	30,215	5	1.0	6,215
RAGLAN INF	p	1	277	-	377	272	16,760	17,686	3	1.9	11,686
RAGLAN JNR	p	4	620	-	471	442	22,518	24,050	4	0.0	50
RAYNHAM	p	6	3,315	-	1,869	3,679	32,115	40,978	7	0.8	4,978
SOUTHBURY	p	5	1,432	-	1,263	1,514	19,381	23,591	4	-1.1	6,409
ST ANDREWS ENF	p	5	183	-	133	394	19,381	20,091	3	-1.7	9,909
ST ANDREWS SOUTHGATE	p	2	445	-	126	60	9,737	10,369	2	-0.3	1,631
ST EDMUNDS	p	2	1,426	-	510	331	20,411	22,678	4	1.8	10,678
ST GEORGES RC	p	11	677	-	259	758	30,617	32,310	5	-5.6	33,690
ST JAMES ENF	p	3	577	-	290	182	9,784	10,833	2	-1.2	7,167
ST JOHNS AND ST JAMES	p	7	1,106	-	439	1,194	14,559	17,299	3	-4.1	24,701
ST JOHNS ENF	p	0	161	-	159	426	4,307	5,053	1	0.8	5,053
ST MARYS	p	1	368	-	471	582	18,164	19,585	3	2.3	13,585
ST MATTHEWS	p	2	379	-	395	381	10,299	11,454	2	-0.1	546
ST MICHAEL AT BOWES	p	3	910	-	612	571	15,168	17,261	3	-0.1	739
ST MICHAELS	p	2	176	-	243	301	12,640	13,359	2	0.2	1,359
ST MONICAS	p	3	144	-	55	91	19,709	19,998	3	0.3	1,998
ST PAULS	p	3	36	-	71	303	19,709	20,118	3	0.4	2,118
SUFFOLKS	p	0	1,341	-	788	861	12,640	15,630	3	2.6	15,630
TOTTENHALL INFS	p	1	1,082	-	455	707	12,453	14,696	2	1.4	8,696
WALKER	p	2	519	-	133	2,270	19,803	22,725	4	1.8	10,725
WEST GROVE	p	10	1,201	-	698	1,299	19,381	22,579	4	-6.2	37,421
WILBURY	p	7	5,630	-	2,777	3,307	38,388	50,102	8	1.4	8,102
WOLFSON HILLEL	p	2	392	-	55	450	18,258	19,154	3	1.2	7,154
WORCESTERS	p	1	994	-	996	1,275	19,100	22,366	4	2.7	16,366
KEYS MEADOW	p	9	1,526	-	1,396	1,421	19,615	23,958	4	-5.0	30,042
STARKS FIELD	p	2	1,210	-	761	1,955	19,241	23,167	4	1.9	11,167
CUCKOO HALL ACADEMY	p	6	1,593	-	2,001	1,496	33,707	38,796	6	0.5	2,796
BISHOP STOPFORD	s	1	1,956	-	1,486	2,733	42,853	49,029	8	7.2	43,029
BROOMFIELD	s	10	4,276	-	2,747	4,454	54,243	65,720	11	1.0	5,720
CHACE	s	16	3,657	-	2,124	3,367	51,613	60,762	10	-5.9	35,238
EDMONTON CTY	s	16	5,326	-	3,627	4,762	65,402	79,117	13	-2.8	16,883
ENFIELD CTY	s	4	1,431	-	1,706	2,036	45,823	50,996	8	4.5	26,996
HIGHLANDS	s	14	1,582	-	1,035	3,075	59,930	65,622	11	-3.1	18,378
LATYMER	s	1	-	-	317	349	44,377	45,043	8	6.5	39,043
LEA VALLEY HIGH	s	10	5,310	-	3,971	6,363	53,662	69,306	12	1.6	9,306
SOUTHGATE	s	26	2,672	-	1,161	1,919	58,913	64,665	11	-15.2	91,335
ST ANNES	s	0	1,416	-	1,170	1,919	44,020	48,525	8	8.1	48,525
ST IGNATIUS	s	4	1,153	-	968	1,047	44,218	47,386	8	3.9	23,386
WINCHMORE	s	17	3,956	-	3,158	4,013	58,722	69,849	12	-5.4	32,151
OASIS HADLEY ACADEMY	s	11	5,635	-	4,248	5,118	42,363	57,365	10	-1.4	8,635
AYLWARD	s	10	8,538	-	4,750	5,525	59,509	78,322	13	3.1	18,322
ENFIELD GRAMMAR	s	5	1,512	-	1,179	2,850	44,258	49,798	8	3.3	19,798
KINGSMEAD	s	11	4,548	-	3,087	3,082	58,587	69,304	12	0.6	3,304
NIGHTINGALE ACADEMY	s	15	5,396	-	3,008	7,095	39,691	55,191	9	-5.8	34,809
Totals		428	146,083	-	99,471	149,443	2,173,004	2,568,000	428	0.00	0

## Appendix B

## Spreadsheet to ascertain additional delegation per School based on £6,000 per costed statement in excess of 14 hours

SCHOOL NAME	October count Total Statements	Oct Count =statement s greater than 14 hours	outborough placements	Total Funded Statements	Total Value of Delegation	Proposed Formula		
						Stage 1	Stage 2	Places Funded but currently not used
						Schools Block	High Needs Block	
						2 statements per School @£6,000 per statement		
					£6,000			
Alma	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Bowes	5	5	1	6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Brettenham	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Brimsdown	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
Bush Hill Park	2	2	2	4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Capel Manor				0	£0	£12,000	£0	2
Carterhatch Infants	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000	£0	1
Carterhatch Junior	3	3	1	4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Chase Side	9	8		8	£48,000	£12,000	£36,000	
Chesterfield	14	14		14	£84,000	£12,000	£72,000	
Churchfields	4	4		4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
De Bohun	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Eastfield	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
Eldon Infants				0	£0	£12,000		2
Eldon Junior	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Eversley	8	8	1	9	£54,000	£12,000	£42,000	
Firs Farm	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Fleecefield	10	10		10	£60,000	£12,000	£48,000	
Forty Hill	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Freezywater St.G's	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Galliard	8	8	1	9	£54,000	£12,000	£42,000	
Garfield	4	4	2	6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
George Spicer	3	3	1	4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Grange park	6	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Hadley Wood			1	1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Hazelbury Infants	3	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Hazelbury Juniors	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Hazelwood Infants	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Hazelwood Junior	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Highfield	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Honilands	6	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Houndsfield	9	9	1	10	£60,000	£12,000	£48,000	
Keys Meadow	9	9	1	10	£60,000	£12,000	£48,000	
Latymer All Saints	4	4		4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Lavender	4	4		4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Merryhills	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Oakthorpe	3	3	3	6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Our Lady Of Lourdes	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Prince Of Wales	4	4		4	£24,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Raglan Infants	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Raglan Juniors	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
Raynham	6	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Southbury	6	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
St.Andrew's Enf	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
St.Andrew's N14	1	1	2	3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
St.Edmund's	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
St.George's	11	11		11	£66,000	£12,000	£54,000	
St.James	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
St.John & St.James	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
St.John's				0	£0	£12,000		2
St.Mary's	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
St.Matthew's	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
St.Michael at B.	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
St.Michael's	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
St.Monica's	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
St.Paul's	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Starks Field	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Suffolks	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Tottenham	1	1		1	£6,000	£12,000		1
Walker	2	2		2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
West Grove	7	7		7	£42,000	£12,000	£30,000	
Wilbury	6	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Wolfson Hillel	3	3	0	3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Worcesters	3	3		3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
<b>TOTAL PRIM</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>£1,548,000</b>	<b>£12,000</b>	<b>£1,536,000</b>	<b>17</b>
Bishop Stopford	2	2	1	3	£18,000	£12,000	£6,000	
Broomfield	9	9	5	14	£84,000	£12,000	£72,000	
Chace	15	15		15	£90,000	£12,000	£78,000	
Edmonton	17	17		17	£102,000	£12,000	£90,000	
Enfield County	7	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Highlands	16	16	1	17	£102,000	£12,000	£90,000	
Latymer	1	1	1	2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
Lea Valley High	9	9		9	£54,000	£12,000	£42,000	
Southgate	29	28	7	35	£210,000	£12,000	£198,000	
St.Anne's			2	2	£12,000	£12,000	£0	
St.Ignatius	5	5	4	9	£54,000	£12,000	£42,000	
Winchmore	16	15	2	17	£102,000	£12,000	£90,000	
<b>TOTAL SEC</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>£876,000</b>	<b>£12,000</b>	<b>£864,000</b>	<b>0</b>
Kingsmead	10	10	0	10	£60,000	£12,000	£48,000	
Aylward Academy	11	10	3	13	£78,000	£12,000	£66,000	
Nightingale Academy	16	16		16	£96,000	£12,000	£84,000	
Cuckoo Hall	7	6		6	£36,000	£12,000	£24,000	
Oasis Academy Enfield	17	17	1	18	£108,000	£12,000	£96,000	
Oasis Academy Hadley	8	8		8	£48,000	£12,000	£36,000	
Enfield Grammar	5	5		5	£30,000	£12,000	£18,000	
<b>TOTAL ACADEMY</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>£456,000</b>	<b>£12,000</b>	<b>£444,000</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL SCHOOLS</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>£2,880,000</b>	<b>£36,000</b>	<b>£2,844,000</b>	<b>17</b>

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum - 12 December 2012

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Finance, Resources &amp; Customer Services

**Contact officer & telephone number:**

Yvonne Medlam 020 8379 3445

E mail: [Yvonne.medlam@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Yvonne.medlam@enfield.gov.uk)

Agenda – Part: 1

Item: 6b

**Subject: Update Schools Budget****1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The government funding settlement for 2013-14 has not yet been announced. However, some information is already available on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which enables initial projections of DSG for 2013-14 to be prepared, but does not allow for final confirmation of allocations.

The report provides a preliminary outline of the pressures on the 2013-14 Dedicated Schools Grant.

The report seeks the agreement, by phase, on the de delegation of funding to deliver some central services.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Schools Forum is asked to note:

- a) The draft budget position for 2013-14
- b) The information awaited from the DFE in particular
  - Provisional DSG settlement for 2013-14
  - Data sets based on the October 2012 census
  - Finalisation of the transitional protection for 3 year old funding.
  - Consideration of growth funding for the High Needs Block.
  - Post 16 SEN funding in relation to FE colleges and independent Service Providers (ISP) sectors.
  - Draft Schools Funding Regulations due mid December.

The Schools Forum is asked to agree:

- a) The de-delegation of services as outlined in paragraph 3.1
- b) The retention of statutory and historical budgets allowable under the new reforms as outlined in paragraph 3.2
- c) The operation of the Growth Fund

A final report will be presented to Schools Forum in January 2013 to agree the application of the DSG for 2013-14, including finalisation of the Schools Funding Formula, to enable the submission of the funding proforma to the DFE by the deadline of 18<sup>th</sup> January 2012.



### 3 Summary

This report provides an update on the pressures reported to the last meeting which will influence the schools budget for 2013/14, and includes information supplied by schools in the October Census and other developments. The position will again be updated at the next meeting using the pupil data provided by the DfE which is expected on 10<sup>th</sup> December. The school funding settlement for 2013/14 is due to be announced on 17<sup>th</sup> December and could result in some changes to these figures

#### 3.1 Resources Available

##### 3.1 2012/13 baseline of the new funding blocks.

A major exercise has been undertaken by the DfE to split the DSG into three separate blocks, the School Block, Early Years Block and High Needs Block. The Authority has submitted data to, and negotiated with, the DfE as part of this process.

The 2012/13 DSG baseline has resulted in the estimated GUF (Guaranteed Unit of Funding rates) of £3,906 for Early Years and £5,139 for Schools. It should be noted that the high needs block is fixed at the 2012/13 level subject to the DfE review for growth. The 2012/13 GUF is £5,569.

#### 3.2 Information outstanding

The 2013/14 DSG and DfE data sets based on the October 2012 census have not been announced and some adjustments to the baseline are yet to be confirmed.

The 2013/14 DSG has been estimated using information from our own October 2012 census records. An initial schools budget has been calculated using October 12 pupil numbers. The profile for the other factors has been based on the October 11 dataset. It must be emphasised that the unit rates currently being used are based on the initial modelling of the new funding formula. The confirmation of the 2013/14 DSG and October 2012 data sets could result in revised units of funding for each of the factors.

The key areas outstanding are listed below and could potentially impact on the 2013/14 DSG:

- Post 16 SEN - The increased responsibilities for DSG include the funding for post 16 SEN provision including FE colleges and Independent Specialist Providers. Currently this is funded by the EFA.
- High Needs Block - The DSG includes estimated increases in pupil numbers both in early years settings and in schools. However it does not include any increases in numbers of pupils with high needs who are now included in the High Needs Block. The Authority has lobbied the DfE and is awaiting further feedback from the DfE on any increase in the High Needs Block arising from demographic growth in consultation with the DfE.

- Transitional protection for 3 year old funding - At this stage the DfE has undertaken a reduction in the DSG funding associated with the 3 year old protection. The Local Authority is awaiting details around transitional protection in 2013/14. The estimates include a 50% level of transitional protection.

### 3.3 Revision to the DSG

The transfer of funding for 2 year olds has recently been confirmed at £5.5m and is a transfer of funding from the EiG to the DSG. Taking this into account, it is estimated that the 2013/14 DSG will increase by £11.7m. This funding does not allow for any increases in the cost of living i.e. no inflation.

The three funding blocks are not ring-fenced. This means there is flexibility within the blocks to target resources to local needs.

A further report will be provided to the Schools Forum in January 2013 to agree final application of budgets including agreement of the final schools funding formula. The Local Authority is required to submit a final proforma for 2013/14 schools budgets to the DfE by the 18 January 2013, which will set out the formula factors and unit rates used for the 2013-14 budget shares.

### 3.4 Pupil Number Data

The table below shows the movement from October 2011 pupil numbers to October 2012. The table shows that whilst early years and primary pupil numbers are increasing, there is again a decline in secondary pupil numbers.

Sector	Census October 2011	Census October 2012	Variance
Early Years	3,059	3,325	266
Primary	27,645	28,971	1,326
Secondary	17,590	17,518	-72
Total	45,294	49,814	1,520

### 3.5 Statement to show the estimated 2013/14 DSG and Budget Pressures

The following table shows the estimated DSG for 2013/14 and potential budget pressures to be met from the net estimated increase in DSG for 2013/14. It must be stressed that this is a draft budget position based on the information currently available and this will be revised as soon as any outstanding information is confirmed.

<b>2012/13</b>	<b>£'000</b>
DSG	277,837
SEN Block Grant	1,477
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>279,314</b>
<b>2013/14</b>	
Estimated DSG for 3-15 yr olds	284,251
50% protection for 3 year old funding	1,259
Transfer of 2 year old funding into DSG	5,516
Transfer post 16 SEN	TBC
<b>Total Estimated DSG</b>	<b>291,026</b>
Estimated Increase in DSG	<b>11,712</b>
<b>Proposed application of funds (pressures)</b>	
Demographic Changes:	
Schools	4,413
Early Years - 3 and 4 year old provision	640
Early Years - 2 year old provision	2,975
Cost of running new formula (MFG)	1,713
Increase in High Needs Provision	414
Growth fund – increase in pupil places	150
Rates - estimate 2.8% increase	90
Total	(10,395)
Funding to target unconfirmed pressures	1,317

### Potential Risks

The report has identified some areas which are currently not confirmed and therefore remain as potential risks, e.g. funding for High Needs growth, Post 16 funding transfers and confirmation of transitional protection for the fall out in 3 year old funding. In addition, there are other pressures which cannot at this stage be quantified. These include the impact of all the demographic changes from the October 12 census and the raising of the participation age from September 2013 to 17.

In relation to the 2 year old funding allocation, the 2 year old offer is currently being developed and the latest estimate for 2013-14 indicates that the funding required is less than the funding transferred to the DSG, releasing £2.5m. As the scheme is progressed some funding will be required to fund the full year effect 2013-14 and ongoing development of this initiative. With effect from 2015-16 it is anticipated that the funding allocation for 2 year olds will be based on participation so this level of surplus is unlikely to continue in the future.

There could potentially be additional income from high needs growth and DfE agreement of requested MFG exemptions but these are both uncertain at this stage and have not been included in the draft budget figures.

### 3.7 Detail of pressures

- Demographic Changes

The Local Authority is required to fund schools for the increase in pupil numbers in all settings. The estimated cost including Primary Schools, Secondary schools, Early Years Provision and special Schools provision is

estimated at £8m which includes the full year effect of primary pupil growth and special school places.

- Cost of New Formula - MFG  
The new schools funding formula results in an MFG cost pressure of £1.7m based on the initial pupil number information from October 2012 census and profile of other factors from the October 2011 dataset. This formula will be revised when the October 2012 data sets have been received from the DfE, which will generate a revised MFG.
- Provision for High Needs Pupils  
The estimated increase in both pupil numbers and cost in provision is expected to be £414k.
- Growth Fund  
Under the new regulations the local authority can establish a provision for funding growth for in-year and ongoing protection for school expansions. The funding is ringfenced and the criteria for the allocation of this fund must be agreed by the Schools Forum. At this stage it is estimated that a total fund of £1.715m is required for 2013-14, which is an increase of £150k on the 2012-13 budget for expansions. Detail relating to the operation of the growth fund is discussed later in this report.
- Rates  
The Schools Funding Regulations require Local Authorities to fund the cost of rates on an actual basis. The 2013/14 rates estimates have not yet been finalised but an estimate of 2.8% has been included to cover the anticipated increase in the cost of rates.

### **3.8 Ending of Inter Authority Recoupment**

Inter-authority recoupment is the arrangement by which funding for SEN pupils educated outside their home borough are paid to the educating school by the home authority. Under the new school funding arrangements inter authority recoupment between home and educating authorities for the additional cost of SEN pupils will cease. Home authorities will still be responsible for an element of the cost of SEN high needs pupils but this will be paid direct to the educating institution by the home authority. The DfE has adjusted authorities' DSG totals for the estimated impact of these changes and the cost shown is the value of Enfield's DSG adjustment. Further work is underway to identify more precisely the budgetary impact of the change. DfE expectation is that this will be a net neutral position.

### **3.9 Use of Reserves**

Once the outstanding information is available and the final budget position has been confirmed it may be appropriate to utilise the accumulated DSG reserve of £3.8m.

## **4. Services provided by the Local Authority from centrally retained budgets**

The new regulations enable local authorities to centrally retain funding to provide some specific services.

## 4.1 Provision of Central Services (De-delegation)

The table below lists the services that can be provided centrally if the schools forum, on behalf of the maintained schools in a phase, gives agreement. It should be noted that academies are not required to agree to this process, however, may buy back services from the Local Authority from their allocated budget share.

It is proposed that the following services continue to be centrally maintained on the basis of economies of scale and consistency in support across the Authority. It should be noted that schools will incur the cost of these services if de-delegation is not agreed and services are not provided centrally.

It should be noted that each service can only be centrally supported if sufficient levels of service are de-delegated. This could have implications for special schools and nursery provision as the School Finance regulations do not permit de-delegation for maintained special or nursery schools.

The Table below shows the current levels of budget in respect of each service.

Appendix B outlines the reasons for de-delegation for each service and the table below sets out the total budgets and the approximate amounts per pupil. The maximum a school could receive is just over £16 per pupil.

Budget	Sector	Total Budget	Allocation per pupil / FSM *
Licenses & subscriptions	Primary & Secondary	£20,670	£0.75
Free School Meals Eligibility	Primary & Secondary	£69,770	£1.54 *
Maternity	Primary	£253,180	£9.15
	Secondary	£81,300	£4.63
Staff Advertising	Primary & Secondary	£13,920	£0.31
Primary Pool	Primary	£16,870	£0.61
Union Duties	Primary & Secondary	£82,620	£1.83
Public Duties	Primary & Secondary	£16,687	£0.61
Library & Museum Services	Primary	£111,082	£1.27
14-16 Practical Learning Options	Secondary	£77,222	£6.31
Long Service Awards	Primary & Secondary	£4,930	£0.11

\* Budgets will be delegated on a per pupil basis with the exception of the Free School Meal Eligibility assessment budget which will be allocated on FSM eligibility

## 4.2 Statutory Functions and Historical Commitments

The reforms allow funding to be held centrally for statutory functions and historical commitments. The regulations stipulate that the funding retained must not be greater than the 2012/13 budgeted levels, which for statutory functions and historical commitments.

Budget	Total Budget
Statutory Functions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools Admission</li> <li>Servicing Schools Forum</li> <li>Carbon Reduction Commitment</li> </ul>	£1.1m
Historical Commitments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Expenditure to Revenue</li> <li>Miscellaneous</li> <li>Contribution to combined budgets</li> </ul>	£3.9m

The DfE have recently confirmed that the school funding regulations will be subject to a further revision which will enable authorities to amend the amount centrally held in relation to Carbon Reduction Commitment. With these continuous changes and uncertainties beyond 2013/14, it is suggested that these budgets are reviewed during 2013/14 as further information becomes available from the DfE with a view to seeking opportunities for identifying savings. With this in mind, the Schools Forum is asked to agree that this funding be continued to be retained centrally.

#### **4 Growth Fund**

The Growth Fund can only be used for the purpose of supporting growth in pre 16 pupil numbers to meet basic needs. Any under spend on the growth fund has to be distributed in school budget shares the following year.

##### Pupil Growth

Funding for additional classes resulting from pupil growth is currently provided by a formula factor within budget shares. This factor cannot continue under the new arrangements and the growth fund will take on the role of delivering additional funding for schools or academies which are expanding at the request of the authority to provide additional places.

It is proposed to establish a growth fund to continue to provide funding to expanding schools according to the same formula and methodology as are used currently. This methodology is detailed in Appendix A. The estimated cost of funding pupil growth in 2013-14 on this basis is £1.715m.

Schools Forum is asked to approve the operation of the growth fund as outlined in Appendix A, and agree to the subsequent consultation with schools.

#### **6 Other Schools Funding**

##### **6.1 Pupil Premium**

The level of the Pupil Premium has been increased in 2012/13 from £600 to £623 and will increase further in 2013/14 to £900 per "Ever 6" pupil entitled to free school meals. It is expected to increase again in 2014/15. At this stage the level of increase is not confirmed but we do know that nationally the allocation will be 4 times the figure announced for 2011/12 £625m to £2.5bn by 2014/15.

##### **6.2 Sixth Form Funding**

The 2013/14 funding is expected to continue in line with DFE's three year transitional funding process. The Local Authority will continue to support schools for the 6<sup>th</sup> form AWPU rate as part of the new schools funding formula.

#### **7. Conclusion and matters for decision**

Members of the Schools Forum are reminded that only members appointed to represent maintained schools of the relevant phase should vote on de-delegation decisions affecting schools of that phase.

## **Schools Block - Growth Fund**

### **Mainstream School Expansions**

Funding will be retained in the Growth Fund to support schools that are permanently expanding and those that are admitting bulge classes.

(a) **Criteria to Access Growth Funding**

Schools will trigger growth funding

- if they are permanently expanding by 1 or more forms of entry
- if they admit a bulge class
- if a secondary school opens primary classes

(b) **Methodology for Allocations**

Funding will be allocated to schools who meet the above criteria on the following basis

(i) **In Year Funding Adjustment for Bulge Class or Additional Class admitted as start of permanent expansion**

In the year the new class opens the school will receive an in-year budget adjustment to reflect the anticipated increase in pupil numbers.

For primary schools the adjustment will be based on the planned additional pupil numbers \* primary AWPU rate \* no. months

For secondary schools admitting primary classes the adjustment will be based on the primary AWPU but the allocation will be from April rather than September. This will allow sufficient funding to cover the extra costs that a secondary school would incur in terms of set up, management time, admin staff and general resources.

(ii) **September Funding Adjustment for Permanent Expansions**

Schools that are permanently expanding will receive a funding allocation to reflect the additional class they are required to open each September until the expansion is complete. This allocation will be based on the additional pupil numbers \* primary AWPU \* 7/12 to reflect the period September to March.

(iii) **Protection for Expanding Schools**

In the 3 financial years following the start of a permanent expansion or admission of a bulge class schools are protected as follows

- Year 1 – protection to 30 pupils
- Year 2 – protection to 20 pupils
- Year 3 – protection to 15 pupils

If the number of pupils recorded on the October census prior to the financial year is below the numbers shown above, additional AWPU funding for the difference in numbers will be allocated to schools to provide some financial stability and a known minimum level of funding.

## De-delegation of Central Services

Service	Description	Benefit of de-delegation	Impact of Delegation	Comment
Assessment of Free School Meals (FSM) Eligibility	The Authority currently assesses application for FSM eligibility for all maintained schools.	The service has access to the national systems to facilitate the assessment of applications and is able to provide an effective, efficient and consistent service to all maintained schools.	There would be loss of consistency in the assessment process and there is a concern whether some smaller schools would be able to access the same level of service for the level of funding which would be delegated.	This service is considered for de-delegation. If de-delegation is agreed, it is further recommended that the general approval is considered for a three year period. This would ensure that the service is able to provide a sustainable and effective service.
Central Licences	The Authority currently is able to attract a discount for the purchase of various licences which schools are required to purchase. These licenses included Copyright Licensing Agency, Educational Recording Agency (30%) and CLEAPSS.	The economies of scale enable these organisations to offer the discounted prices and therefore achieve value for money on behalf of schools.	Schools would not be able to access the discounted prices directly. In addition, the budget which would be delegated would be based on the discounted prices and therefore it is likely to be more costly.	This service is considered for de-delegation. If de-delegation is agreed, it is further recommended that the general approval is considered whilst the Authority is able to access the discounted prices.
Teacher Recruitment and Primary Pool	Used to advertise and market Enfield as a place to teach, encourage teachers to the Borough, support the Primary NQT pool and reduce advertising costs for schools	The centralisation allows a single person to represent Enfield at a wide range of universities, to provide up to date marketing materials, a relevant, updatable website and Primary NQTs to fill vacancies. Attached is further information regarding this provision of this service.	Enfield as a place to teach would not be promoted centrally, and the marketing and website would cease. The Primary Pool would not be continued.	This service is considered for de-delegation. If de-delegation is agreed, it is further recommended that the general approval is considered for a three year period. This would ensure that the service is able to provide a sustainable and effective service
Union Duties (Facilities)	Provides funding to allow teacher and support staff union release from duties to represent staff interests.	The central pool allows for coordinated support from unions to any staff who require it from those with local knowledge and a working relationship in Enfield.	Possible lack of representation or greater lead times for representation from those without a knowledge of Enfield presenting slower processes and slower solutions to difficulties	This service is considered for de-delegation. If de-delegation is agreed, it is further recommended that the general approval is considered for a three year period. This would ensure that the service is able to provide continuity.
Maternity	Provides a level of funding for schools to replace those on maternity with supply cover so that the school does not have to bear the full cost.	It is available to all schools and provides a pragmatic approach to managing changes of demand which could otherwise destabilise a single school	Schools would each have to fund their own maternity cover requirements or pay for suitable insurance if available	Views are sought as to whether this service should be considered for de-delegation.



Service	Description	Benefit of de-delegation	Impact of Delegation	Comment
Public Duties	Funds JP release from schools	Allows central management to encourage support for JPs	Each school would have to agree and fund release	Views are sought as to whether this service should be considered for de-delegation.
Long Service Awards	The Authority currently retains some funding to pay in recognition of staff that have been in service for 25 years.	If this funding continued to be retained then there would not be an additional administrative burden on schools.	If schools continue to maintain this policy than the financial burden would fall on individual schools and may adversely effect smaller schools.	Views are sought as to whether this service should be considered for de-delegation.
14 – 19 Intervention Service	The Authority currently provides a 14-19 intervention service that includes sixth form technical funding advice, post 16 data analysis and supports partnership arrangements between schools, colleges, other training providers and employers to develop new curriculum	This funding supports a borough wide response to the duties/ responsibilities placed on both schools and the Authority in relation to the Raising of the Participation Age (RPA) and offers technical advice in relation to post 16 funding and KS5 destination measures.	Schools may not be able to maintain an understanding of the post 16 funding methodology or have sufficient resources individually to broker curriculum development within and across the borough.	This service is considered for de-delegation. If de-delegation is agreed, it is further recommended that the Team develops a two year intervention programme to allow individual schools to fully benefit from the intervention support.
Museum Services	The Authority currently provides a Museum and Local Studies education service direct to all the Borough's schools giving access to local history and heritage through activities such as artefact loan boxes, subsidised handling sessions, interactive tours and trails, classroom resources, training and INSET sessions.	At present the Museum Service is able to develop and maintain a service particularly the artefact collections that is responsive to curriculum changes regardless of the school's size or budget. Access to heritage is viewed as a key factor in promoting a sense of place and belonging to a local community.	Schools would lose the ability to take part in locally based heritage activities. They would have to pay the market rate for options such as handling sessions and schools with smaller pupil numbers, especially special schools, will not be able to access any form of Heritage learning. Some schools may choose to use the funding to subsidise trips to regional and national museums which will mean that local money is spent outside of the Borough.	This service should be considered for de-delegation. A centrally funded service would allow the existing free and subsidised offer from Enfield's Museum and local studies Service to continue and to keep abreast of developments in the national curriculum for all Schools in the Borough regardless of size or available budget.

## Teacher Recruitment Budgets

Below are highlighted some of the uses SPS have been able to co-ordinate with the budget available:

- Attendance at various University 'Teacher recruitment fairs' across London and the South East, where we have been able to represent and promote Enfield schools to trainees in their final year of study for B.A. Education degrees, GTP and PGCE courses by answering questions about the Borough, including information about our outstanding CPD programme for Nat's and beyond.
- The development of promotional literature about Enfield and the NQT pool for distribution to Universities nationally.
- Advertising Enfield and the NQT pool in appropriate national media such as the TES and NUT booklets.
- The hosting and development of the schools vacancy website ([www.enfieldschools.co.uk](http://www.enfieldschools.co.uk)) upon which many school vacancies, secondary and primary, are advertised, and through which applicants can source information about the NQT Pool, the Supply Pool, and general information about working in Enfield.
- SPS have been able to run extremely popular NQT Open Days for Primary NQT trainees which have been supported by many schools, giving trainees an insight into working with Enfield, and the opportunity to meet Headteachers/Senior Leaders and current Nets.
- The administration of a database of Primary NQT applications for schools to access, by appointment, with the team.
- Governor Training sessions regarding Succession Planning, Recruitment and Retention issues for schools alongside the SIS team.

The impact of this work includes -

- Raising the profile of Enfield as an excellent place to live and to work across the country at various educational establishments,
- Increasing interest from high quality applicants,
- A centrally administered, easy to access NQT pool,
- Extremely low vacancy rates,
- Saving schools many of the costs of national advertising,
- Opportunities for schools to 'showcase' themselves at events such as the Open Days

Without these budgets, SPS would not be able to run open events or to promote or represent the Borough in this way. It is also questionable whether we would be able to host the Enfield schools website. Furthermore, if the money were to be devolved and split across all Enfield schools, it is unlikely that they would be able to do much with what they get individually.

# OUR ENFIELD BUDGET CONSULTATION

2013/14



Dear Resident,

Enfield Council faces huge challenges to protect Council services at a time of unprecedented spending cuts, increasing inflation and demand for services.

Enfield is also affected by the way central government calculate our grant. We lost some £8million pounds from our grant this year through a process called damping that takes funding away from councils despite it being assessed as needed.

Despite these reductions in funding we are working hard to deliver a zero increase in your Council Tax. This would mean that your Council Tax has been frozen since 2009/10.

Through very careful management of resources and a comprehensive review of everything Enfield Council does, we were able to reflect these priorities in our spending and were able to find savings without affecting the front line services our residents rely on. For example residents told us their favoured savings would come from better purchasing, reducing operating costs and restructuring and reviewing our services.

We have identified another £12million of efficiency savings for 2012/13 which again focus on these priority areas and which build on the £34million of savings we made in 2011/12.

Residents also told us they wanted to retain weekly bin collections and maintain library opening hours; we have done both these things.

We are very proud of these achievements and we aim to build on the successes of last year's budget process by again asking residents their views on a number of proposals that we are considering such as the proposed freeze on council tax next year.

We must be honest with you that the ability to make back office savings is increasingly difficult as a result of the scale of the cuts. Future decisions will be very difficult and potentially not without significant impact.

So far since 2010/11 Enfield Council has made savings of over £60m and by 2014/15 we'll have had to reduce expenditure by around £80 million over five years. We want your views to help us shape our spending plans for the future but we need residents to know that asking Enfield Council to do more with fewer resources will mean we have to make difficult and sometimes unpalatable decisions about services going forward.

**Cllr Doug Taylor**  
**Cllr Andrew Stafford**

**Leader of the Council**  
**Cabinet Member for Finance and Property**

## **Last Year You said..... we did**

We have faced a massive challenge in recent years in achieving over £60million of savings (including income generation) since 2010/11 following unprecedented spending cuts, inflation and the increasing cost of an ageing population.

You have said in previous consultations (and quite rightly) we must always look for efficiency savings first and try to do things in new and more cost effective ways before cutting services. We have done exactly that and we will do the same again in 2013/14.

Last year we asked if you have any specific suggestions as to areas for further savings. We received many responses with the most common themes set out below:

- **Introduce additional income charges**

An independent review by the financial consultants PricewaterhouseCoopers has confirmed that the Council is doing all it can to maximise income across all services. This is a particularly difficult issue when customers' incomes remain static in an extremely difficult economic climate.

- **Review the eligibility of benefit claimants**

We verify all benefit claims with other data held by Enfield Council and other Government agencies. We also visit high risk claims using a cost effective risk based approach and work with the Metropolitan Police to identify and prosecute fraudulent claims. This has resulted in a number of successful prosecutions that include custodial sentences for the offenders.

- **Introduce “Green” initiatives / rationalise the use of Council buildings**

The Council is currently reducing the number of office buildings in order to save valuable resources but also to reduce the Council's carbon footprint. In 2012, the energy saving technologies previously installed began to repay the investment and these savings are being ploughed into new energy saving technologies. Installations include lighting controls and upgrades, draught proofing, pipe work insulation and boiler management controls.

- **Better procurement and joint working with partners**

Enfield has joined forces with Waltham Forest Council in order to maximise purchasing power and increase expertise in this specialist area. From January 2013 all procurement up to £75k should where possible include a local supplier in competition for the goods / services.

- **Level of staff pay and numbers**

Public sector pay rates have remained unchanged over the last three years with the exception of the introduction of a minimum London living wage. The indications are that if there is a national pay rise in 13/14 it will be capped at 1%. The number of posts has reduced and will continue to reduce over the next three years.

- **Public events and improved communications**

A wide range of campaigns have been delivered in the last twelve months to keep people informed of Council services and involved in the democratic process. These have included the 'Get involved' campaign, Everybody Active, promotion of the wheeled bin rollout, direct payments, the Enfield Residents' Priority Fund, free school meals and the Futureversity. Enfield Council has also continued to expand the use of social media channels such as Facebook and Twitter, to meet the changing needs of local people and reach new audiences. The Council's website has been improved and there are now almost 500 transactions that can be completed on line.

In addition you prioritised your Council Services and top of the priorities were:

– **Road Maintenance & Street Lighting**

During 2012/13, Enfield spent £8.35m of its own capital funds on implementing planned maintenance schemes to improve the condition of Enfield's roads, pavements and highway infrastructure. During the current financial year, 52 road resurfacing/reconstruction schemes and 42 pavement renewal schemes will have been finished, as well as a range of other minor improvements. Since November 2011, Enfield has enhanced its maintenance arrangements and now does more road and pavement repairs each month to deal with potholes and broken paving.

Enfield has now finished its borough-wide programme of replacing aged and out-of-date streetlights and is embarking on a new 'trimming and dimming' project to reduce electricity consumption whilst maintaining acceptable lighting levels.

– **Social Care Services for Adults and Older People**

The scale and pace of change that has taken place in the way we deliver adult social care services in Enfield has been significant. The transformation of social care services for adults and older people puts the people who use our services at the heart of everything we do. Maintaining the level and quality of front line services and improving the choices available to people who need services is driving the changes we have made. We have continued to speak with the people of Enfield and all the key partners involved in the delivery of services to understand what the most important priorities are:

- Maintain the level and quality of front line services
- Support our staff and partners through training to deliver excellent services
- Improve access for people to information, advice and guidance to enable them to make informed choices
- Provide more self-service options for those people able to make their own arrangements for services
- Enable more people to learn or relearn the skills they need to reduce their dependence on social services
- Provide people with more choice and control over the services they access to meet their eligible assessed needs and to provide assessment and access to services more quickly.
- Be clear and up front with people about the resources available to meet their needs through a personal budget

– **Street Cleaning**

The Council recognises the importance of a clean and litter free environment for residents and visitors to the borough. Improvements in street cleansing have been achieved by more mechanised sweeping, the introduction of Tidy Teams working in busy areas and ensuring flytips are cleared on the same day as we are told about them. Enfield received a four star Clean Britain Award this year. The Council is actively seeking still further improvements, including additional mechanised sweeping by March 2013 and the tailoring of services to meet the local needs of residents across the borough.

– **Waste collection & recycling**

The Council is just finishing the final phase of the wheeled bin roll out. All properties suitable for wheeled bins now have them for refuse, recycling and mixed garden and food waste. The success of the service can be seen through:

- Making Enfield cleaner with 60% less litter on our streets by stopping animals scavenging from ripped black sacks
- Increasing recycling rates and allowing residents to recycle all types of cooked and uncooked food for the first time
- Saving council taxpayers up to £1m a year
- An 88% satisfaction rate with the service

- **Community Safety**

We continue to support the Safer and Stronger Communities Board, and have taken a lead with the police on initiatives to tackle gangs. This is our top priority for 2012-13. The work of the Gangs Action Group has been recognised as good practice regionally and nationally. The strong partnership shows that through the co-ordinated management of resources we have managed to contain the levels of crime and have reduced levels of violence with injury crimes although personal robbery has increased slightly. We have delivered four “Call- ins” which aim to persuade young people to quit gangs. 47 young people have signed up to receive further support.

We also continue to support activity to tackle domestic violence. These offences have increased slightly but we continue to see as a positive the improved rate of reporting as more victims have confidence in the partnership agencies. Independent advocates providing support to victims of domestic violence have been funded by the Council, ensuring that help is available throughout the criminal justice process. Enfield was the first London Borough to achieve “White Ribbon” status in recognition of our partnership work in this area.

Although management of offenders is a priority for the partnership and reduces crime through targeted work with the worst offenders, we do not lose sight of the needs of the victims of crime and anti-social behaviour and have provided an extra worker to offer additional support to people whose lives have been seriously affected

We cannot afford to be complacent and will continue to do everything we can to ensure that Enfield remains a safe place to live, work and visit.

- **Leisure Services**

We have looked to develop the Leisure Services for residents and customers. Our appointment of a new Leisure Centre Operator has meant that £9m has been invested in improving the quality and range of facilities at our Leisure Centres, bringing ageing facilities up to a modern standard to provide a vibrant new experience for users. Affordable new Leisure options have been instigated to allow access to gym use for young people and free swimming in school holidays. The sports development team are delivering more sessions to residents than ever and are building on the 2012 Games Legacy.

We have also added a new festival programme which has seen the development of the new Edmonton Festival and Carnival which has run for the last 2 years. Other projects have included the refurbishment of the Millfield Theatre, Dugdale Centre, QEII Stadium and Forty Hall.

## **The Financial Challenge**

From April 2013 the Government is making radical changes to how councils are funded. Councils will receive most of their income from council tax and directly from local business rates. National council tax benefits are being replaced by local council

tax support schemes run by councils. This is on top of reductions in remaining government funding as a contribution to the Government's austerity measures.

The Council has completed its consultation on council tax support. However, the government has announced more changes to their proposals which are likely to increase the cost of the local scheme if implemented.

The Government will no longer reallocate business rates between councils based on relative need. Instead, Enfield will retain 30% of business rates with 50% going to the Government and 20% to the GLA. Government will continue to redistribute part of its 50% share to councils based on need with the rest returned to councils in ways that have not yet been finalised.

### **Government Council Tax Freeze Grant 2013/14**

In October, the Government said that it would pay a grant, equivalent to a 1% increase in Council Tax if the Authority freezes Council Tax in 2013/14. The Government is not intending to issue this grant again in 2015/16 and the Council will need to find more savings to avoid increasing the Council Tax to make good the loss of this grant. The Council will lobby the Government to keep paying the grant in future years so as to help local tax payers and protect services for vulnerable people.

<b>Question 1:</b> It is increasingly difficult for the Council to make efficiency savings that do not impact on Council services. Despite this do you prefer your Council Tax for 2013/14 to be frozen?	<b>Tick preferred option</b>
<b>Yes</b>	
<b>No</b>	

<b>Question 2:</b> Do you still agree with your priorities from last year? Please rank your top three priorities 1(Highest) to 3(Lowest) using the table below (the thirteen categories are the same as last year).		
	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Ranking 1 to 3</b>
1	Adult social services & older people	
2	Children's social services	
3	Community safety (excluding police)	
4	Environmental protection	
5	Homelessness	
6	Leisure & parks	
7	Library & museum services	
8	Regeneration & planning	
9	Road maintenance, cleaning & lighting	
10	Schools and pupil support	
11	Voluntary sector	
12	Waste collection & recycling	
13	Youth services	

<b>Question 3:</b> Do you have any suggestions for making savings or improving efficiency in any Council services.

Please return this form to:  
FREEPOST NW5036  
4th Floor  
London Borough of Enfield  
Civic Centre, Silver St, Enfield, EN1 3BR

Or e-mail:  
[Budget.consultation@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Budget.consultation@enfield.gov.uk)

by **18 January 2013**, with comments on the issues in this paper.

You do not need a stamp. Thank You



## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2012/2013 REPORT NO. 19

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Schools Forum – 12 December 2012

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Schools & Children's Services

Contact officer and telephone number:

Sangeeta Brown – 0208 379 3109

E-mail: [sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:sangeeta.brown@enfield.gov.uk)

	Item: 7
<p><b>Subject:</b> <b>Schools Forum: Workplan</b></p> <p><b>Wards: All</b></p>	

**Recommendation**

To note the workplan.

<b>Meetings</b>		<b>Officer</b>
April 2012	Schools Financial Value Statement DfE – School Funding Arrangements & Local funding formula Procurement Strategy Early Years	EC SB DL PC
May 2012	School Funding Reforms	SB
June 2012	School Funding Arrangements (2013/14) Schools Forum Regulations Combined Services Budgets - Update	SB SB DH/SB
October 2012	Schools Budget: 2013/14: Update Responses to consultation on School Funding Arrangements (2013/14) Outturn Report 2011/12 Schools Balances 2011/12 Procurement - Update	YM SB DH SB DL
December 2012	Schools Budget: 2013/14: Update Local Authority Budget (2013/14) Pupil Places strategy	YM ES LC
January 2013	Schools Budget: 2013/14: Update	YM
February 2013	School Budget 2012/13: Update Enfield's Funding Formula (2013/14) Scheme for Financing Schools Audit Arrangements Early Years – Update DfE Information on S251 Benchmarking (2012/13) Enfield Services to Schools	DH SB SB SB ES SB

**Dates of Meetings**

Date	Time	Venue	Comment
12 <sup>th</sup> December 2012	5.30pm – 7.30pm	St Paul's School	
6 February 2013	5.30pm – 7.30pm	Lea Valley High School	
9 <sup>th</sup> May 2013	5.30pm – 7.30pm	TBC	
11 <sup>th</sup> July 2013	5.30pm – 7.30pm	TBC	