

Schools Forum

7th July 2009: 4:30pm

Sapphire Room, Emerald Suite
North London Business Park, London N11 1NP

**Agenda, Minutes and Discussion
Papers**

Contents

Agenda	3
Members.....	4
2. Minutes of the last meeting.....	5
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 12th May	5
Minute 3.4 Insurance	5
Minute 3.7 Contracts.....	5
4. Items for agreement.....	5
4.1 School Balances as at the end of 2008/9	5
4.2 Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/9 and 2009/10 – options for use of underspend	5
4.3 Targeted Capital Fund grant for improvements to school kitchens and dining rooms	5
4.4 Consultation on the Schools Forum Regulations.....	5
5. Items for information	5
5.2 Report of the Early Years Working Group meeting on 1 July 2009.....	5
5.3 Administration of Free Milk in Schools.....	5
5.4 Building Schools for the Future – Update July 2009	5

Agenda

4:00pm Training session by Geoff Boyd (not minuted)

Subject: School balances

4.30pm Schools Forum meeting

1. Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of previous meeting: 12th May 2009
3. Matters arising
 - 3.1. Contracts
 - 3.2. Insurance
4. Items for Agreement
 - 4.1. School balances as at 31 Mar 2009
 - 4.2. Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/9 and 2009/10 – options for use of underspend
 - 4.3. Capital funding – School Kitchens
 - 4.4. Consultation on the Schools Forum Regulations
5. Items for Information
 - 5.1. Nursery Nurses – progress of negotiations
 - 5.2. Report of the Early Years Working Group
 - 5.3. Free Milk in Schools
 - 5.4. BSF Update
6. Any Other Business

Dates for future meetings:

Tue 6 th October 2009	4:00pm
Tue 24 th November 2009	4:00pm
Tue 2 nd February 2010	4.00pm
Tue 18 th May 2010	4.00pm
Tue 13 th July 2010	4.00pm

Members

Schools Forum Membership

As 4th February 2009

Ms	Anthea	Abery	Rosh Pinah	Head	Primary	VA
Ms	Jo	Djora	Coppetts Wood	Head	Primary	Community
Ms	Jayne	Franklin	Childs Hill School	Head	Primary	Community
Mr	Kevin	Hoare	Finchley Catholic High School	Head	Secondary	VA
Ms	Kate	Webster	Queen Elizabeth Girls School	Head	Secondary	Community
Ms	Dee	Oelman	St Mary's & St John's	Head	Primary	VA
Dr	John	Marincowitz (Chair)	Queen Elizabeth's School, Barnet	Head	Secondary	Foundation
Ms	Jeanette	Adak	Monkfrith	Head	Primary	Community
Mrs	Helen	Schmitz	Cromer Road Primary School	Head	Primary	Community
Ms	Jodi	Gurney	Hampden Way	Head	Nursery	Community
Mrs	Lynda	Walker	Oak Lodge School	Head	Special	Community
Mr	Tim	Bowden	Holy Trinity	Head	Primary	VA
Mr	Gary	Tucker	Christ's College Finchley	Head	Secondary	Community

GOVERNORS

Mr	Derrick	Brown	Headteacher, Ashmole	Governor	Secondary	Foundation
Ms	Hazel	Godfrey	Governor, Broadfields	Governor	Primary	Community
Mr	Jonathan	Hewlings	Governor, East Barnet School	Governor	Secondary	Community
Mr	Ken	Huggins	Governor, The Compton	Governor	Secondary	Community
Mr	Gilbert	Knight	Governor, Oakleigh	Governor	Special	Community
Mr	Stephen	Parkin (Vice Chair)	Governor, St Mary's CE High	Governor	Secondary	VA
Ms	Elizabeth	Pearson	Governor, Holly Park & Livingstone	Governor	Primary	Community
Mr	Anthony	Vourou	Governor, St John's N11	Governor	Primary	VA

NON-SCHOOL MEMBERS

Mr	Martin	Baker	Deputy Director of Children's Service	Other	Stakeholder – SIPs	
Mr	Alan	Homes	NASUWT	Other	Union	
Ms	Angela	Murphy	Bishop Douglass	Other	14-19 Partnership	
Ms	Sarah	Vipond	Middlesex University Nursery	Other	Private Early Years Providers	

OBSERVERS

Ms	Angela	Trigg	London Academy	Principal	Academies	
Ms	Lucy	Saloman	Learning Skills Council	Other		
Cllr	Fiona	Bulmer	Cabinet Member for Children	Other		

OTHER ATTENDEES

Mr	Robert	McCulloch Graham	Director of Children's Service		Officer	
Ms	Linda	Parker	Joint Head of Finance – Children's Service		Officer	
Ms	Denise	Murray	Joint Head of Finance – Children's Service		Officer	
Mr	Nick	Adams	Schools Finance Services Manager, Children's Service		Officer	
Ms	Carol	Beckman	School Funding Manager – Children's Service		Officer	
Ms	Sarrosch	Malik	School Resources & Support Officer – Children's Service		Officer	Minutes
Mr	Graham	Durham	Assistant Director of Children's Service		Officer	
Mr	Geoff	Boyd	Consultant		Other	
Ms	Stav	Yiannou	Divisional Manager, BRSI		Officer	
Mr	Ieuan	Renowden	Special Projects		Officer	
Mr	Tony	Lampert	HR Manager		Officer	

2. Minutes of the last meeting

Schools Forum Tuesday 12th May 2009 (4.00 pm, Training Room 2, Building 2 at NLBP)

Attended

Members:

Alan Homes (NASUWT)
Angela Murphy (14-19Partnership, Head Bishop Douglas)
Anthony Vourou (Governor, St John's N11)
Dee Oelman (Head, St Mary's & St John's)
Derrick Brown (Governor, Ashmole)
Elizabeth Pearson (Governor, Livingstone)
Gilbert Knight (Governor, Oakleigh)
Helen Schmitz (Head, Cromer Road)
Jayne Franklin (Head, Childs Hill)
Jo Djora (Head, Coppetts Wood)
Jodi Gurney (Head, Hampden Way)
John Marincowitz (Head, QE Boys)
Johnathan Hewlings (Governor, East Barnet)
Kate Webster (Head QE Girls)
Ken Huggins (Governor, The Compton)
Kevin Hoare (Head, Finchley Catholic)
Mick Quigley (Principal Inspector, Children's Service)
Sarah Vipond (Early Years Working Group)
Stephen Parkin (Governor, St Mary's High)
Tim Bowden (Head, Holy Trinity)

LA Officers:

Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager)
Denise Murray (Strategic Finance Manager)
Graham Durham (Assistant Director, Inclusion)
Linda Parker (Strategic Finance Manager)
Val White (Assistant Director,)
Sheila Abbott (Extended Services Remodelling Manager)
Stav Yiannou (BRSI Divisional Manager)
Ieuan Renowden (Special Projects Consultant)
Tony Lampert (HR Manager)

Consultant: Geoff Boyd (Consultant)

Observer Status: Lucy Salaman (LSC Partnership Manager)

Clerk: Sarrosh Malik (School Resources & Support Officer)

<u>Not Present</u>	Members:	Anthea Abery (Head, Rosh Pinah) Gary Tucker (Head, Christ's College Finchley) Hazel Godfrey (Governor, Broadfields) Jeanette Adak (Head, Monkfrith) Lynda Walker (Head, Oak Lodge)
	LA Officers:	Martin Baker (Acting Director of Children's Service)
	Observers:	Cllr Fiona Bulmer Angela Trigg (London Academy)

1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Anthea Abery, Cllr Bulmer, Martin Baker and Lynda Walker.

2. Minutes of previous meeting (10th February 2009)

Proposer: JH
Seconder: AH

3. Matters Arising

- 3.1 Minute 4.2.1 –Pupil Number Projections
JM questioned whether the pupil numbers were accurate. AH said that there was a very small percentage change, 20-35 children amongst 20,000. JH said the question last meeting was more longer term than just around the budget cycle, looking ahead to regeneration and the number of residents increasing. CB explained that the council makes these projections, but the 'child yield' is difficult to estimate accurately. AH said that the economic downturn may have an impact on demand for provision. The numbers staying on in 6th forms may have a greater impact on SEN provision.

- 3.2 Minute 4.2.1 – SEN Benchmarking Data
The SEN Choice Strategy, which will be consulted on soon, will contain SEN benchmarking information.

- 3.3 Minute 4.2.1 – Centrally Retained DSG – clarification of items
LP explained that the total centrally retained budget increased by 2.5% and these changes are simply movements between budgets. AH asked about the CERA percentage decrease. LP replied that it should be 900% not 90%. JH asked for the variance commentary to be done every year.

AH questioned the increase in cost of PRUs. He said that the figures could increase further and it may not possible to retain pupils in school resulting in an increase need for provision.

JM asked if the centrally retained total has always excluded the under 5s budget. LP replied that it has always been like this. JM asked about the extra cost of extending nursery education. CB explained that a Standards Funds would cover that.

KH asked how many applications are processed by the admissions team. CB said that there are 2,500 in any year group. KH commented that it seems like a lot of money to process a few thousand. GD said that a benchmarking figure can be provided. He added that there is an appeals committee running permanently and dealing with worried parents. AH asked if the cost of appeals was included and that if it is a growing area then costs would also increase. GD explained that foundation and VA schools take that cost on.

3.4 Minute 4.2.1 – Insurance

AM asked if all schools had been contacted. LP said she would check what notification has been sent out to schools. JM asked what the situation would be for foundation and VA schools. DO requested information on VA schools to be provided as she feared they may be paying twice.

SP asked if AIG had been checked as a risk factor. DM said the company cannot renege mid contract and that it is monitored by the treasury. LP will bring back more information and ask Paul Lawrence, Head of Insurance to attend the next meeting.

3.5 Minute 5.3 – London Pay Addition

CB said the grant will be distributed to all schools and the LA will cover the costs of central staff

3.6 Minute 5.4 – JCOSS

CB told the Schools Forum no further market research has been done but we are awaiting some data from JCOSS. She said that Ashmole have 50% of children from Barnet and 50% from Enfield, so 30% may be an underestimate.

3.7 Minute 5.5 – Contracts

DM presented a list of all contracts that have an impact on schools. She said there was a wide range of traded services which are not published anywhere. She added that these were not confidential and need to be updated regularly. AM asked if tenders for renewals will be advised. DM replied that she would do this regularly, as was the case last meeting for FMSiS. AM wanted to know if traded services are compared against other tenders. DM said there is a new process to be embedded and will contact procurement about the details.

JH thanked DM for the detailed report. He wondered how the Schools Forum can use this information and what is their remit. JH said proper timing is essential for contracts. AH wanted to more information about the procurement process and what input the Schools Forum would have. DM said she would provide a summary of the process.

KH asked about the transportation service which is a £4m 10 year contract. DM said this was on lease. JM enquired about the connexions service. LP said it was an inhouse service.

3.8 Minute 6.1 – Extension to the free entitlement for nursery children (Item 6)

Item 6.1 (On Agenda) – Pilot Funding for Phase 1 Providers

CB presented a paper showing the work done by the Early years Working Group. She said Sheila Abbott and her team are working with Phase 1 settings to help them work on operational issues. All Phase 1s will receive additional funding and in 2009/10 £880,000 is available, comprised of a £480,000 ring fenced Standards Funds Grant and £400,000 reserved in the ISB. CB explained the table which showed the proposed funding for Phase 1 providers for the period September 2009 – March 2010 inclusive.

Recommendation: The Schools Forum endorses the above funding scheme for Phase 1 providers of the extension of the free entitlement.

Minute 5.3 – London Pay Addition

CB said the grant will be distributed to all schools and the LA will cover the costs of central staff.

The Schools Forum unanimously agreed.

Proposer: EP

Seconder: GK

3.9 Item 6.2 (On Agenda) – Single Funding Formula from April 2010 and Consultation with Providers

CB explained that private providers and Children's Centres are already funded by participation for the free entitlement, and they make termly claims. From 2010/11 maintained schools will also be funded on termly counts but PVIs and CCs will benefit from a formula that reflects their needs more closely than a single flat rate per child.

CB said that the EYWG recommends a consultation on a formula and she presented a table to the Schools Forum showing elements to be taken into consideration. She told the members that the consultation will be launched at the beginning of June, giving enough time for analysis and discussion in the autumn and then approval by cabinet in January.

AH asked about the qualifications of staff and if there would be training available. CB said this may be possible if there was funding from the council to provide training. SV mentioned that there are grants available to train to QTS level. EP explained that the settings must be able to afford to pay staff with QTS level.

Recommendation: The Schools Forum agrees to support this approach to the development of early years funding for 2010/11 and beyond, and monitor progress over the next 9 months.

The Schools Forum agreed unanimously. Proposer: JF Seconder: EP

4. Items for Agreement

4.1 Standards Funds 1.5 – 1-2-1 Tuition

Ieuan Renowden presented the paper explaining Standards Fund Grant 1.5. He explained the grant would be allocated to schools on a formula basis, with the exception of Key Stage Four. The LA proposed that primary and secondary schools receive a basic entitlement, plus an allocation based on the average number of pupil from 2006-2008 not making either two levels progress in primary or three levels in secondary.

AH requested clarity on the funding proposal. He asked if the funding would also be for non teaching and additional teaching staff. IR explained that the guidance says only qualified teachers would be eligible. AH asked if there would need to be an additional contract with an existing employed teacher. IR said the teachers are released and given extra pay. Any tutors from outside of the school would need a separate contract.

JF told the Schools Forum that the issues arising have already been debated and that the members should be aware that that a lot of teachers welcome the tutoring. HS agreed with JF.

AM asked why the funding will be allocated with a basic entitlement. Ieuan Renowden said it was some schools would not receive any funding if there is no basic entitlement. AM gave an example of The Ravenscroft having 126 eligible pupils and Henrietta Barnet having 1 pupil but both receiving same flat rate. GD said there is an urgency for distributing this funding and it would be helpful if the LA consulted next year. AM asked for a fair formula using past data. GD said a consultation will be sent around next year and will ask the Schools Forum for guidance.

JM explained that selective schools also have children who have difficulties in achieving. AM said exact data showing achievement could be obtained from the DCSF and would be a good basis for allocating funding. JH agreed with AM.

KH said there are other allocations which are funded according to basic entitlement. KW explained that for the 1-2-1 tuition funding it is not a DCSF requirement. DB said the net effect makes a small difference and is not worth making a fuss about. DO said the basic entitlement would help schools.

GD recommended the Schools Forum to implement the formula this year and next year the LA will bring a different proposal.

The Schools Forum agreed to the proposal.

4.2 Standards Funds 1.2 – School Lunch Grant

Val White presented the report explaining the allocation of the School Lunch Grant. VW explained the formula for funding is the same as last year, however approval is being sought to transfer the food and labour element of the funding directly to the in-house provider for schools buying into the Barnet service. VW said this request came from a number of schools and will save money on invoicing costs.

AM asked about the Barnet catering contract date. DM said this was not a service contract. DM will bring back information.

The Schools Forum agreed to the proposal.

Proposer: JH Seconder: SP

4.3 2009/10 Schools Budget including Learning and Skills Council

Linda Parker presented a report explaining the changes to the Schools Budget since the February Meeting. She added that despite the changes the central expenditure limit (CEL) is not breached.

In the report LP explained the changes were a result of the changes in the LSC Funding for 16+, minor amendments to the Section 52 analysis and projected brought forward centrally retained budget under/overspend from 2008/09. The latest position on pupil numbers was also discussed.

LP told the Schools Forum that the LSC allocation was reduced by £1,022,293 across all schools. She explained the method of how the LSC made the reductions in their funding allocations to schools.

LP continued explaining that the DCSF have yet to publish the final pupil numbers and dedicated schools grant, and it is expected that there will be no significant variances from the estimated figure used in the calculation of the Schools Budget in February. She mentioned that the lines of Section 52 changed because school salary safeguarding costs has been moved to a specific line for this activity.

LP said that at the February meeting the Schools Forum were informed that the projected outturn in the centrally retained budget was an overspend of £48,000. In the light of more up-to-date information on the outturn in setting the Schools Budget for 2009-10 the projected underspend has been removed.

JM asked about LSC funding. LS said the schools will receive what they were promised. CB said that there had been no change to the academic year funding, however schools are concerned about the financial year funding. LS said she would go back and check this. JM explained that all 6th form school need to know this information urgently. LS said she would pass the information to CB.

LP said that the learner numbers had been restored, however of the £1m reduction, £361,000 was due to numbers not being clear when changing from academic to financial year. AM said that the LA need to agree the pupil numbers with the LSC. GD said the numbers would be reported back to JM through CB.

JM asked what the underspend from 2008/09 would be used for. LP replied that once the final outturn is confirmed, options for using any underspend from 2008/09 will then be considered and brought to a future meeting. TB recommended the underspend could be used to help budget pressure for reception places. LP said that there is £400k in the school contingency budget to help increase place numbers from September 2009.

The Schools Forum was asked to approve the revised 2009/10 Schools Budget.

The Schools Forum agreed unanimously.

Proposer: AH

Secunder: GK

5 Items for Information

5.1 2008/09 DSG Outturn

LP distributed a tabled paper to the Schools Forum. She presented a report to inform the Schools Forum about the provisional outturn of the centrally retained schools budget.

AM said that there was not sufficient time to check through the analysis and more information was needed. LP told the Schools Forum that this item was for information. JM said this report can be discussed at the next meeting.

5.2 2009/10 Budget Shares

CB presented the report showing the 2009/10 Budget Shares. She told the Schools Forum that the schools received their original budget share and standards funds for 2009/10 on 4th March and indicative 2010/11 three weeks later.

CB said this report is for information and has already been sent out in the School Circular.

5.3 Building Schools for the Future

VW and DM gave a presentation informing the Schools Forum about the BSF Programme. VW said that there are huge financial opportunities for the LA, up to £330m capital investment. Workshops were held with schools during the short period available for preparing the Readiness to Deliver submission.

The next stage in the process, if Barnet is successful, will be an assessment panel with a view to joining the scheme in Autumn 2009. Although the submission is for the entire secondary estate, the scheme is allocated in waves by the DCSF and our first wave covers includes

St Marys High, PRU, Ravenscroft, Bishop Douglass, Oak Lodge and Copthall. AM asked why Copthall is eligible and not St James if the programme is aimed at deprived schools.

DM explained that BSF is the largest project in the LA and will require a project board and project teams to manage the programme. She said the Government default modes are a LEP, an ICT managed service and PFI. PFI is only for total rebuild. KH added that there had been bad press about PFI. DM replied that it is still the preferred default.

DM told the Schools Forum that a lot of specialist external advice would be needed as it is a complex programme. DM said the funding envelope includes ICT funding per pupil and the total allocation can be used across the schools as required.

DM said Barnet's allocations will range between £85m-£332m. The procurement costs are from £2.9m (no LEP) to £4.3m (LEP). These costs could be higher and the LA will need to find funding for this.

KH asked if Wave 2 starts after Wave 1 is complete. DM said yes, subject to DCSF allocation of funding. VW added that all waves have to be affordable within their envelopes. Waves 2 and 3 will incorporate the remaining secondary schools. GD mentioned that the general election is only one year away and it is not necessarily a priority for other political parties. AH added that the money might be used for something else.

DM talked about the affordability gap. The presentation showed a number of options, one of which was capital receipts but with land values currently low it is not deemed to be a viable option. JH said that land sales are challenging in the recession.

JM asked for the slide show to be distributed. He expressed his concern about the post general election landscape. He said that schools as a group must think strategically at the Schools Forum for different scenarios. VW mentioned that opportunities on offer must be taken. There is a chance that by November the LA will be fully committed and will need to know where the money is coming from. KH thanked the LA for submitting the application.

5.5 Update on Nursery Nurses grade review

Tony Lampert presented a paper to the Schools Forum. TL told the Schools Forum of the progress so far. He said they are at a sensitive stage of communications at present and that a settlement is nearly there.

AM said that it was not acceptable for the LA to agree a 52 week contract for 40 weeks work. JD explained that in Children's Centres Nursery Nurses actually work 52 weeks but in the associated school work only 40 weeks. JF expressed her concern for the smaller schools which will be affected badly because there are more costs associated with additional nursery hours.

AM added that if agreed it would set a precedent. DO raised the issue about unions feeling that it is a different job for nurseries in Children's Centres and Schools. TL said any agreement reached will be based on the law and not on a precedent. TL told the Schools Forum that the LA is negotiating with unions on behalf of schools and will report back.

TL explained the difficult situation which is being dealt by the LA with clear legal advice. KH asked who is dealing with this. TL replied that MB and the HR Officers. AM asked if there were any Headteacher representatives. TL said that all primary school heads were consulted and he had involved some key nursery heads.

AM said that the schools have to manage disparity and would not want to set a precedent. TL explained that there is lots of history but they have had agreement from the Headteachers Advisory Group to go ahead.

6. Report of the Early Years Working Group

6.1 Dealt with under Matters Arising

7 Any Other Business

7.1 Members requested a larger room

8. Dates of future meetings

8.1

Tue 7 th July 2009	4.30 pm (with briefing at 4pm)
Tue 6 th Oct 2009	4.30 pm (with briefing at 4pm)
Tue 24 th Nov 2009	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 12th May

Minute 3.4 Insurance

This matter has been closely monitored since the news broke in early September 2008 of the downgrade of AIG ratings particularly as we were due to renew within the terms of the agreement from 1 October 2008.

The insurance detailed on the contract schedule provided is placed with AIG UK Ltd which is a separate company from AIG Inc and as such is regulated by UK legislation and the FSA in respect of trading as an insurer in the UK. The UK company maintains solvency of three times the required minimum and retains A+ rating from Standard & Poor's.

Consequences of the insurer failing or a conscious decision being taken not to renew were evaluated in view of the emerging situation and professional advice sought prior to renewing the contract. Details were reported / agreed through senior Resources management and reported to the Leader at the time. The decision to renew was taken and our Head of Risk and Insurance remains confident of the security of the arrangements.

The situation is constantly being monitored but we do not anticipate any change to the basis of cover until tender of these arrangements effective from 1 October 2010.

Denise Murray

Minute 3.7 Contracts

Barnet Catering in-house service – Benchmarking of inputs (supplies) is undertaken within the tendering process when renewing contracts. A bench-marking exercise on total service costs will be undertaken in the autumn with the London Client Group (incorporating a number of London Boroughs) and ESPO (Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation) consortium Members.

The findings will be reported back to the Forum in October 2009.

The schedule of corporate contracts impacting on or accessible to Schools will be published in the 2009-10 guidance section of the Barnet Grid for Learning funding website by the 31st July 2009 and the database shall be maintained by the Contracts Officer, Children's Services Finance.

Accessibility details are outlined in the final column of the schedule and where relevant contract owners have been provided with the dates of future Schools Forum meetings to enable the required consultation process with the forum prior to tendering, to be incorporated within internal timetables.

It is recommended that goods and services outlined within the schedule are procured using the corporate contract for that good or service, unless following schools evaluation it can be demonstrated that better value for money can be achieved via an alternative arrangement.

Corporate Contracts - Impacting on or Accessible to Schools

Contract	Consortia	Value	Supplier	Start Date	Expiry Date	Duration	Contact	Schools Forum Gives a View	Access Details
Accessible Contracts									
Utility Contracts									
Gas									
Under 25,000 Therm	LASER	£1,990,602	Scottish & Southern Energy	01-Apr-08	31-Mar-10	2 Years	Martyn Carter 020-8359-7267		Contact Martyn Carter SPT
Electricity									
Over 100 kW	LASER	£650,000	EDF energy EON	01-Nov-07	31-Oct-09	2 Year	Martyn Carter 020-8359-7267		Contact Martyn Carter SPT
Fuel									
Heating Oil	OGC	£250,000	ESSO Petroleum Co Ltd	01-Jan-07	31-Dec-09	2 Years	Martyn Carter 020-8359-7267		Contact Martyn Carter SPT
Supply Contracts									
Fruit and Vegetables	ESPO (Authority Specific)	£450,000	H & B Hawkes	01-Jan-09	31-Dec-12	1 year + option to extend	Teresa Goodall		ESPO as above (Authority Specific) PRICES CHANGE WEEKLY AND ARE SENT VIA E-MAIL.
Service Contracts General									
Hired Transport (Including SEN) 1. Saloon Cars 2. Estate Cars 3. 7 Seater Vehicles 4. Wheel Chair Accessible 5. Minibuses 6. Tail-Lift Minibuses 7. Coaches		£4,315,000 PA (estimated)	See below:	2004	2011	7 years			Contact Transport Ricky Rebello (5116).
			H&B Travel (NW9)					Y	1,2,3 and 4.
			Lady Fare (HA3)					Y	1
			Cavendish Cars (N22)					Y	1,2,3 and 4.
			Brent Couriers (NW9)					Y	1,2,3 and 4
			Metro Cars (EN5)				Contract managed by Bernard McGreevy	Y	1,2,3 and 4
			Elite Broadway Cars (NW9)					Y	1,2,3 and 4
			Chequers Transport (NW9)					Y	1,2,3 and 4
		Bee Line Coaches (E4)					Y	5 and 7.	
								These are the preferred suppliers against Framework Agreements. Prices are negotiated annually in September.	
Transportation Services including rental of taxis and mini-buses etc		£4,000,000 (estimated)	Go Plant Ltd	04-Apr-08	03-Oct-18	10 Years + 5 year Extension Option	Contract managed by Bernard McGreevy	Y	Contact Transport Ricky Rebello (5116).
Contracts Impacting on Schools but not Accessible									
Insurance									
Fire and Terrorism		£402,000	Zurich Municipal	01-Oct-08	30-Sep-09	1 year	Paul Smyth		
Audit									
Assessment of schools' FMSiS self assessments		£180,000	Enpeyz	01-Apr-09	31-Mar-12	3 years + 2yr extension	Ian Speirs	Y	

4. Items for agreement

4.1 School Balances as at the end of 2008/9	
Author	Nick Adams
Position	Finance Services Manager
Date	7 July 2009

Summary

Revenue balances have increased by £1,779,919, 21%

Capital balances have decreased by £112,074, -3%

Total balances have increased by £1,667,845 (14%) to **£13,838,319**,

The variation by sector is illustrated below.

Sector	Revenue			Capital			Total at 31.03.09
	As at 31.03.09	As at 31.03.08	Increase / (decrease)	As at 31.03.09	As at 31.03.08	Increase/ (decrease)	
Nursery	175,472	187,996	-12,524	194,960	149,591	45,369	370,432
Primary	5,595,750	4,995,925	599,825	2,057,635	2,403,999	-346,364	7,653,385
Second'y	4,128,642	3,047,068	1,081,574	1,115,454	1,032,705	82,749	5,244,096
Special	365,616	254,572	111,044	204,790	98,618	106,172	570,406
Total	10,265,480	8,485,561	1,779,919	3,572,839	3,684,913	-112,074	13,838,319

Details

The overall position hides variations, attached as **Appendix A** is the Final Individual School Outturn Balances 2008/09.

Revenue Balances

A considerable number of measures have been taken in recent years to assist schools in their management of resources and highlight the issues around high school balances.

At the end of 2005/06 revenue balances fell by £2m, at the end of 2006/07 balances increased by £1.1m and they have increased substantially at the end of 2008/09.

The Revenue balances as a % of (2009/10) Budget Share by sector is

Nursery	11%	(last year 11%)
Primary	6%	(last year 5%)
Secondary	4%	(last year 3%)
Special	5%	(last year 4%)
All sectors	5%	(last year 4%)

The following schools with revenue deficits last year have recovered or improved as follows –

	31 3 08	31 3 09
Our Lady of Lourdes	- £65,520	-£20,192
St Mary's N3	- £25,544	-£20,314
Hasmonean High	-£154,202	£11,017

All schools which have revenue balances in excess of 8% (Nursery, Primary & Special) or 5% (secondary) of their 2008/09 Budget Shares will be asked to explain their balance and potentially face claw-back in accordance with the Scheme for Financing Schools (para 4.1) and in accordance with the procedure agreed with the Schools Forum. This will involve the following number of schools –

Nursery	3
Primary	21
Secondary	5
Special	<u>0</u>
Total	29

The results of this exercise will be reported to the Schools Forum.

Measures in place or taken to facilitate school financial planning/control school balances/highlight high balances issue

- Challenging of schools with high contingency in budget or balance in Forecast.
- Year end forecasts are required as at end of Sept and December
- LNI and SIPartners advised of schools revenue balances; SIPs advised of issues around high revenue balances and need to encourage schools to use current resources for current pupils
- FMSiS requires all schools to have medium term financial plan and medium SIPlan with costings; most schools in Barnet have met FMSiS by end of 2008/09
- Budget/ 3 Year Financial Planning spreadsheet revised to accommodate reference to SIPlan items.
- Some training provided to schools on School Planning.
- Highlighting need to use balances – items in School Circular; Director's report to Governing Bodies.

Possible contributory factors to high revenue balances

- It is difficult to ascertain the reasons for an increase in schools revenue balances but the following may be considered –
- Headteachers and governors wish to preserve a contingency as a safeguard.
- A lack of confidence/accuracy in three year planning linking the Financial Plan with the School Improvement Plan
- "Claw-back" rules allow schools to have balances of a set % plus unspent grants. Schools may see balance % allowed as a norm and "claw-back rules" may have reverse effect to that intended of "reducing"/controlling balances.
- Uncertainty of level of funding of nursery places (change from places to occupancy), encourages schools to hold balance to safeguard school's position re staff.
- Relatively few schools have significant deficits.
- In 2008/09 schools were informed direct revenue financing of capital should not be transferred to the capital budget until the school is contractually committed to the capital project. Previous analysis showed revenue transfers not used as capital project not proceeding. DRF transfers in 2007/08 totalled £3.2m, in 2008/09 totalled £1.5m although revenue can be assigned in specific circumstances.
- Budget Forecasts - all schools carry out in-year financial monitoring and submit two forecasts. Whilst most schools forecast balance was accurate to

within 1 or 2 % of their Budget Share a few schools had a large variation. However overall the net effect of all these variations was that revenue balances were under estimated; the position in total was –

September 08 £5,973,998

December 08 £7,106,865

Actual March 09 £10,265,480

- 8 Schools had Year end balances that were 5% greater than their December Forecast balances – these accounted for £874,195. Further work is required to try and understand the reasons for this inaccuracy.

The emphasis of improved school planning has lead a few schools to raise the need for additional revenue provision in the event of falling rolls to maintain staffing levels. Whilst schools are asked to use detailed planning to prevent excess surpluses, schools are also expected to plan to avoid deficits and this approach is supported.

Previous consideration by Schools Forum

Reports on School Balances were submitted to the Forum on 1 July, 23 September and 9 December 2008. These reports noted, inter alia, that under the use of the current clause on possible claw-back of surplus balances, no "claw-back" had been required at the end of 2006/07 or 2007/08. It was noted that in the review at the end of 2007/08, 24 schools were reviewed and of their revenue balances of £3.8m, £1m were unspent Standards Funds, which was 17% of their SF allocations giving rise to concerns that schools were deferring spending SF and spending delegated Budget Share first. Concern was expressed that some SF grants were allocated late in the financial year but investigation showed 91% of allocations were done in March and only 1% were allocated in the last quarter. It was agreed that in the event of a significant increase in balances a review of the Scheme was supported.

Capital Balances

The position with Capital balances in recent years as shown below.

Sector	As at 31 3 2009	As at 31 3 2008	As at 31 3 2007	As at 31 3 2006	As at 31 3 2005
Nursery	194,960	149,591	104,700	135,564	109,168
Primary	2,057,635	2,403,999	1,902,116	1,116,943	1,036,364
Secondary	1,115,454	1,032,705	1,515,674	819,896	495,368
Special	204,790	98,618	89,140	34,367	-39,827
Total	3,572,839	3,684,913	3,611,631	2,106,770	1,601,073

The following 9 schools have significant capital balances and account for approx 50% of capital balances -

Colindale	£296,645	(contribution to Primary Cap Prog project)
Fairway	£103,118	(additional work re new school)
Hyde	£165,528	(PSCIP contribution + Children's Centre)
Parkfield	£103,448	(PSCIP contribution + library in new build)
Copthall	£170,994	
East Barnet	£116,636	(contribution to school rebuild)
Mill Hill High	£136,696	
QEGirls	£552,274	(new 6 th form block)

The DCSF Technical Note on Devolved Formula Capital states amongst other matters –

“It is a general principle that schools should make best use of DFC as soon as it is received. However, given the nature and size of capital projects, schools may set aside their annual allocations up to three years to fund medium sized projects. Where, exceptionally, a school wishes to accumulate DFC for more than three years to finance a specific large project, it may do so. This applies both to unspent funds from previous periods, and to future allocations. In these circumstances, we expect the school to advance the excess funding temporarily available to its local authority to be spent on capital projects, with the right to reclaim the amount when the school needs the money.

Any DFC unspent at the end of this period, either the three year period or the longer period regarding a specific large project, must be returned to the Department.”

Conclusion

The rise in balances if repeated nationally may cause the government to take action as set out in the Ministerial statement 24 February 2009.

The Forum is asked to note action being taken as follows

1. A report on school revenue balances and action required to Governors in next Director’s report to Governors. Also School Finance Support Officers and LNIs will be briefed about school revenue and capital balances and reminded of LA’s role of challenge re effective use of resources
2. All schools which have revenue balances in excess of 8% (Nursery, Primary & Special) or 5% (secondary) of their 2008/09 Budget Shares will asked to explain their balance in accordance with the Scheme for Financing Schools
3. All schools with revenue balances over 5% will be required to complete a Planned Use of Revenue Balances form in accordance with the Scheme, and that the covering letter explains the importance of accurate plans and implementation, except schools required to justify balances in conjunction with potential claw-back under 2 above.
4. It is proposed to consult schools on a change to paragraph 4.1 of the Scheme for Financing Schools (attached as **Appendix B**) in the following respects
 - Add the word “contractual” before “commitment to pay
 - Delete the words “and any unspent Standards Funds grant for the previous financial year” in 4.1 paragraph b.
 - Add a paragraph allowing deferred expenditure in respect of reasonable revenue provision to maintain staffing levels in respect of a school which is able to demonstrate a falling roll

A report on this and the results of the review of all schools with revenue balances over 8 or 5% will be submitted to a future meeting.

5. Ascertain the reason for the accumulation of DFC funding and details of the proposed project with its timescale. Subject to this being acceptable to the authority, arrangements will be made for the DFC to be repaid to the authority for use on alternative school capital projects and repaid to the school when required.

Appendix A

Final Individual School Outturn Balances 2008-9

School	Revenue					Capital			Total Balance		
	As at 31.03.09	Balance as % Original Budget Share 09/10	As at 31.03.08	% of Final Budget Share 08/09	Increase / (decrease)	As at 31.03.09	As at 31.03.08	Increase / (decrease)	As at 31.03.09	As at 31.03.08	Increase / (decrease)
Brookhill	47,506	11%	37,693	9%	9,813	53,009	44,139	8,870	100,515	81,832	18,683
Hampden Way	54,243	18%	52,497	17%	1,746	47,423	38,069	9,354	101,666	90,566	11,100
Moss Hall	31,811	7%	35,240	8%	-3,429	69,746	53,305	16,441	101,557	88,545	13,012
St Margarets	41,912	9%	62,566	13%	-20,654	24,782	14,078	10,704	66,694	76,644	-9,950
Sub Total - Nursery Sector	175,472	10.69%	187,996	11.20%	-12,524	194,960	149,591	45,369	370,432	337,587	32,845
Akiva	-3,164	0%	18,590	2%	-21,754	0	0	0	-3,164	18,590	-21,754
All Saints' CE School (N20)	56,595	7%	42,868	5%	13,727	0	125	-125	56,595	42,993	13,602
All Saints' CE School (NW2)	82,138	11%	72,498	10%	9,640	598	10,754	-10,156	82,736	83,252	-516
Annunciation RC Infant School	45,558	6%	61,576	8%	-16,018	45,817	45,817	0	91,375	107,393	-16,018
Annunciation RC Junior School	61,568	8%	45,916	6%	15,652	8,967	24,000	-15,033	70,535	69,916	619
Barnet Hill School	63,310	18%	106,179	11%	-42,869	-2,285	2,046	-4,331	61,025	108,225	-47,200
Barnfield School	162,465	9%	168,662	10%	-6,197	0	48,894	-48,894	162,465	217,556	-55,091
Beis Yaakov	-64,919	-5%	7,105	1%	-72,024	0	0	0	-64,919	7,105	-72,024
Bell Lane School	115,607	9%	119,076	9%	-3,469	63,926	31,353	32,573	179,533	150,429	29,104
Blessed Dominic RC School	61,371	8%	32,012	4%	29,359	0	0	0	61,371	32,012	29,359
Broadfield Primary	138,862	6%	86,134	4%	52,728	58,026	20,366	37,660	196,888	106,500	90,388
Brookland Infant School	82,934	8%	59,927	6%	23,007	39,537	13,123	26,414	122,471	73,050	49,421
Brookland Junior School	96,920	8%	73,697	6%	23,223	28,839	13,021	13,818	123,759	86,718	37,041
Brunswick Park School	122,777	12%	88,077	10%	34,700	66,928	195,030	-128,102	189,705	283,107	-93,402
Chalgrove School	50,739	7%	46,986	7%	3,753	40,230	6,443	33,787	90,969	53,429	37,540
Childs Hill School	64,845	4%	141,220	9%	-76,375	18,264	39,667	-21,403	83,109	180,887	-97,778
Christ Church CE School	36,430	5%	11,670	2%	24,760	0	0	0	36,430	11,670	24,760
Church Hill School	34,607	4%	58,682	7%	-24,075	26,922	23,556	3,366	61,529	82,238	-20,709
Claremont Primary	39,033	3%	61,079	5%	-22,046	19,242	10,533	8,709	58,275	71,612	-13,337
Colindale School	134,209	7%	161,058	9%	-26,849	296,645	323,561	-26,916	430,854	484,619	-53,765
Coppetts Wood School	188,109	15%	192,252	16%	-4,143	73,766	96,317	-22,551	261,875	288,569	-26,694
Courtland School	51,471	7%	44,201	6%	7,270	56,429	19,425	37,004	107,900	63,626	44,274
Cromer Road School	91,423	7%	80,801	6%	10,622	16,588	25,542	-8,954	108,011	106,343	1,668
Danegrove School	150,682	7%	78,117	4%	72,565	-45,116	139	-45,255	105,566	78,256	27,310
Deansbrook Infant School	125,676	10%	84,635	7%	41,041	545	52,273	-51,728	126,221	136,908	-10,687
Deansbrook Junior School	131,322	10%	162,906	13%	-31,584	3,964	-11,263	15,227	135,286	151,643	-16,357
Dollis Infant School	61,935	6%	59,053	5%	2,882	21,216	27,229	-6,013	83,151	86,282	-3,131
Dollis Junior School	117,000	9%	80,045	6%	36,955	6,709	49,965	-43,256	123,709	130,010	-6,301
Edgware Infant School	57,762	5%	75,880	7%	-18,118	551	5,595	-5,044	58,313	81,475	-23,162
Edgware Junior School	120,000	9%	109,912	9%	10,088	82,398	74,420	7,978	202,398	184,332	18,066
Fairway School	65,105	7%	129,485	14%	-64,380	103,118	21,361	81,757	168,224	150,827	17,397
Foulds School	79,823	7%	48,120	5%	31,703	30,977	10,960	20,017	110,801	59,081	51,720
Frith Manor School	184,679	8%	88,072	4%	96,607	33,169	13,557	19,612	217,848	101,629	116,219
Garden Suburb Infant School	60,897	6%	64,389	7%	-3,492	42,272	32,567	9,705	103,169	96,956	6,213
Garden Suburb Junior School	91,271	7%	63,085	5%	28,186	665	552	113	91,936	63,637	28,299
Goldbeaters School	74,137	4%	7,493	0%	66,644	49,567	-3,374	52,941	123,705	4,120	119,585
Grasvenor Avenue Infant School	22,462	7%	37,525	12%	-15,063	26,453	31,567	-5,114	48,916	69,093	-20,177
Hasmonean Primary School	-22,915	-3%	-823	0%	-22,092	0	0	0	-22,915	-823	-22,092
Hollicwood School	54,907	7%	66,135	8%	-11,228	6,215	9,512	-3,297	61,122	75,647	-14,525
Holly Park School	50,997	3%	2,704	0%	48,293	-20	3,726	-3,746	50,978	6,431	44,547
Holy Trinity CE School	24,332	3%	29,916	4%	-5,584	0	0	0	24,332	29,916	-5,584
Hyde School	157,686	10%	188,079	12%	-30,393	165,528	191,342	-25,814	323,214	379,421	-56,207
Independent Jewish Day School	10,154	1%	-4,121	-1%	14,275	0	0	0	10,154	-4,121	14,275
Livingstone School	176,317	12%	91,276	6%	85,041	25,176	27,920	-2,744	201,493	119,196	82,297
Manorside School	50,908	5%	71,070	8%	-20,162	46,653	24,699	21,954	97,561	95,769	1,792
Martin Primary	159,141	10%	64,650	4%	94,491	39,072	59,310	-20,238	198,213	123,960	74,253
Mathilda Marks Kennedy School	27,584	3%	10,671	1%	16,913	0	0	0	27,584	10,671	16,913
Menorah Foundation School	-14,123	-2%	25,361	3%	-39,484	0	1	-1	-14,123	25,362	-39,485
Menorah Primary School	84,877	6%	38,059	3%	46,818	0	0	0	84,877	38,059	46,818
Monken Hadley CE School	3,163	1%	33,302	7%	-30,139	0	0	0	3,163	33,302	-30,139
Monkfrith School	66,485	8%	62,181	8%	4,304	4,023	69,507	-65,484	70,508	131,688	-61,180
Moss Hall Infant School	37,382	4%	22,841	2%	14,541	8,960	31,953	-22,993	46,342	54,794	-8,452
Moss Hall Junior School	6,330	0%	3,015	0%	3,315	35,328	51,765	-16,437	41,658	54,780	-13,122
Northside School	125,991	14%	86,477	9%	39,514	42,923	43,663	-740	168,914	130,140	38,774
Orion School	152,697	8%	90,919	5%	61,778	865	63,398	-62,533	153,562	154,317	-755

Oside School	92,863	7%	71,100	5%	21,763	9,217	16,830	-7,613	102,080	87,930	14,150
Our Lady of Lourdes RC School	-20,192	-2%	-65,520	-8%	45,328	0	0	0	-20,192	-65,520	45,328
Pardes House School	-138,673	-20%	-46,646	-8%	-92,027	0	0	0	-138,673	-46,646	-92,027
Parkfield School	37	0%	20,901	2%	-20,864	103,448	119,309	-15,861	103,485	140,210	-36,725
Queenswell Infant School	14,424	1%	33,589	3%	-19,165	285	48,097	-47,812	14,709	81,686	-66,977
Queenswell Junior School	66,996	5%	76,261	6%	-9,265	13,661	28,862	-15,201	80,657	105,123	-24,466
Rosh Pinah School	77,811	5%	74,755	5%	3,056	0	0	0	77,811	74,755	3,056
Sacred Heart RC School	53,518	4%	52,894	4%	624	0	322	-322	53,518	53,216	302
St. Agnes' RC School	75,656	7%	28,816	3%	46,840	0	0	0	75,656	28,816	46,840
St. Andrew's CE School	-6,933	-1%	2,900	0%	-9,833	0	0	0	-6,933	2,900	-9,833
St. Catherine's RC School	34,265	3%	14,694	1%	19,571	0	0	0	34,265	14,694	19,571
St. John's CE School (N11)	26,543	3%	40,478	5%	-13,935	0	0	0	26,543	40,478	-13,935
St. John's CE School (N20)	92,878	11%	71,308	9%	21,570	0	0	0	92,878	71,308	21,570
St. Joseph's RC Infant School	32,503	4%	11,498	2%	21,005	0	0	0	32,503	11,498	21,005
St. Joseph's RC Junior School	53,957	6%	32,248	4%	21,709	0	0	0	53,957	32,248	21,709
St. Mary's & St. Johns Primary	119,675	8%	62,042	4%	57,633	0	0	0	119,675	62,042	57,633
St. Mary's CE School (EN4)	42,596	5%	60,606	8%	-18,008	0	0	0	42,596	60,606	-18,008
St. Mary's CE School (N9)	-20,314	-1%	-25,544	-2%	5,230	0	0	0	-20,314	-25,544	5,230
St. Paul's CE School (N11)	79,085	10%	64,512	8%	14,573	3,337	3,337	0	82,422	67,849	14,573
St. Paul's CE School (NW7)	45,211	6%	56,886	8%	-11,675	0	0	0	45,211	56,886	-11,675
St. Theresa's RC School	35,976	5%	12,656	2%	23,320	0	0	0	35,976	12,656	23,320
St. Vincent's RC School	-458	0%	1,458	0%	-1,916	0	0	0	-458	1,458	-1,916
Summerside School	137,127	9%	92,975	6%	44,152	16,636	36,125	-19,489	153,763	129,100	24,663
Sunnyfields School	52,264	6%	47,025	5%	5,239	29,169	36,737	-7,568	81,433	83,762	-2,329
Trent CE School	16,855	2%	17,297	3%	-442	0	0	0	16,855	17,297	-442
Tudor School	11,758	1%	-1,876	0%	13,634	14,509	263	14,246	26,267	-1,613	27,880
Underhill Infant School	26,850	3%	51,381	8%	-24,531	53,885	92,158	-38,273	80,735	143,539	-62,804
Underhill Junior School	32,827	3%	106,970	10%	-74,143	22,336	15,640	6,696	55,163	122,611	-67,448
Wessex Gardens School	65,751	5%	44,166	3%	21,585	38,685	31,591	7,094	104,437	75,758	28,679
Whittings Hill School	106,256	7%	74,359	8%	31,897	49,278	3,196	46,082	155,534	77,555	77,979
Woodcroft Primary	120,638	7%	126,638	8%	-5,697	49,195	69,289	-20,094	169,833	195,624	-25,791
Woodridge School	60,446	8%	34,726	5%	25,720	66,344	70,326	-3,982	126,791	105,053	21,738
Sub Total - Primary Sector	5,595,750	5.68%	4,995,925	5.23%	599,825	2,057,635	2,403,999	-346,364	7,653,385	7,399,924	253,460
Ashmole School	198,348	3%	57,030	1%	141,318	686	664	22	199,034	57,694	141,340
Bishop Douglass RC High	228,514	6%	32,484	1%	196,030	1,678	34,999	-33,321	230,192	67,483	162,709
Christ's College	194,264	4%	270,592	6%	-76,328	11,980	4,723	7,257	206,244	275,315	-69,071
Compton School	1,905	0%	45,608	1%	-43,703	1,685	0	1,685	3,590	45,608	-42,018
Copthall School	417,458	8%	385,229	7%	32,229	170,993	238,968	-67,975	588,451	624,197	-35,746
East Barnet School	239,924	4%	262,604	5%	-22,680	116,636	94,936	21,700	356,560	357,540	-980
Finchley Catholic High School	579,197	11%	202,437	4%	376,760	1,500	459	1,041	580,697	202,896	377,801
Friern Barnet School	-29,866	-1%	5,662	0%	-35,528	-1,103	55,328	-56,431	-30,969	60,990	-91,959
Hasmonean High School	11,017	0%	-154,202	-3%	165,219	0	0	0	11,017	-154,202	165,219
Hendon School	370,183	3%	145,905	2%	224,278	11,628	3,589	8,039	381,811	149,494	232,317
Hennetta Barnett School	142,664	4%	91,427	3%	51,237	0	15,526	-15,526	142,664	106,953	35,711
Mill Hill High School	408,007	5%	278,251	3%	129,756	136,696	121,738	14,958	544,703	399,989	144,714
Queen Elizabeth's Girls' School	142,942	3%	525,576	10%	-382,634	552,274	370,428	181,846	695,216	896,004	-200,788
Queen Elizabeth's School, Barnet	231,587	4%	72,588	1%	158,999	-60,826	-22,832	-37,994	170,761	49,756	121,005
Ravenscroft School	486,187	10%	227,369	5%	258,818	116,695	347	116,348	602,882	227,716	375,166
St James' Catholic High School	136,506	3%	5,667	0%	130,839	0	0	0	136,506	5,667	130,839
St Mary's CE High	166,458	4%	281,397	7%	-114,939	0	100,000	-100,000	166,458	381,397	-214,939
St. Michael's Catholic Gram'r Sch.	31,051	1%	55,559	2%	-24,508	0	0	0	31,051	55,559	-24,508
Whitefield School	172,296	4%	255,885	6%	-83,589	54,932	13,832	41,100	227,228	269,717	-42,489
Sub Total - Secondary Sector	4,128,642	4.28%	3,047,068	3.23%	1,081,574	1,115,454	1,032,705	82,749	5,244,096	4,079,773	1,164,323
Mapledown School	72,078	5%	56,935	4%	15,143	3,765	4,828	-1,063	75,843	61,763	14,080
Northway School	25,938	2%	16,606	1%	9,332	27,858	7,444	20,414	53,796	24,050	29,746
Oak Lodge School	173,117	8%	144,581	7%	28,536	137,628	80,574	57,054	310,745	225,155	85,590
Oakleigh School	94,483	6%	36,450	2%	58,033	35,539	5,772	29,767	130,022	42,222	87,800
Sub Total - Special Sector	365,616	5.43%	254,572	4.00%	111,044	204,790	98,618	106,172	570,406	353,190	217,216
Sub Total All Sectors	10,265,480	5.05%	8,485,561	4.29%	1,779,919	3,572,839	3,684,913	-112,074	13,838,319	12,170,474	1,667,844

Appendix B

Extract from Scheme for Financing Schools with proposed changes

4.1 The Right to carry forward Surplus Balances

Whilst schools receive delegated budget shares and other revenue funding to meet the educational needs of pupils in the school at that time, schools are allowed to carry forward from one financial year to the next any shortfall in expenditure relative to the school's budget share for the year plus/minus any balance brought forward from the previous year.

Surplus budget share balances held by schools as permitted under this scheme are subject to the following restrictions with effect from 1 April 2007:

- the authority shall calculate by 31 May each year the surplus balance, if any, held by each school as at the preceding 31 March. For this purpose the balance will be recurrent balance as defined in the Consistent Financial Reporting Framework;
- the authority shall deduct from the calculated balance any amounts for which the school already has a prior-year

Add underlined

contractual commitment to pay from the surplus balance.

Delete underlined -

and any unspent Standards Fund grant for the previous financial year;

c. the authority shall then deduct from the resulting sum any amounts which the school declares to be deferred and assigned for specific purposes as permitted under this scheme (set out below) and which the authority is satisfied are properly assigned. To count as properly assigned amounts must not be retained beyond the period stipulated for the purpose in question, without the consent of the authority. In considering whether any sums are properly assigned the authority may also take into account any previously declared assignment of such sums but may not take any change in planned assignments to be the sole reason for considering that a sum is not properly assigned.

d. if the result of steps a-c is a sum greater than whichever is the greater of 5% of the current year's budget share for secondary schools, 8% for nursery, primary and special schools or £10,000 (where that is greater than either percentage threshold), then the authority shall deduct from the current year's budget share an amount equal to the excess.

Funds deriving from sources other than the authority will be taken into account in this calculation if paid into the budget share account of the school, whether under provisions in this scheme or otherwise.

The deferred expenditure must be either

Capital expenditure, or

Revenue expenditure that will result in the acquisition of a tangible durable asset or the improvement to the school's facilities within a reasonable timescale.

Add underlined

Proposed expenditure in respect of reasonable revenue provision to maintain staffing levels in respect of a school which is able to demonstrate a falling roll

The reason for deferral must be that the cost of the project is of a size of which it is not reasonable for the school to spend from the budget share of a single year, and/or there is a genuine and documented reason for deferral of expenditure, e.g. time lag between governing body decision to proceed with a project to completion/payment (building design, planning permission etc)

The deferred expenditure must be clearly documented in the school's Improvement Plan and the school's Asset Management Plan.

Funds held in relation to a school's exercise of powers under s.27 of the Education Act 2002 (community facilities) will not be taken into account unless added to the budget share surplus by the school as permitted by the Authority.

The total of any amounts deducted from schools budget shares by the authority under this provision are to be applied to the Schools Budget by the authority.

4.2 Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/9 and 2009/10 – options for use of underspend	
Author	Linda Parker
Position	Joint Head of Finance, Children's Service, Resources Directorate
Date	26 June 2009

The final outturn for the centrally retained Schools Budget for 2008-9 was circulated at the last meeting of the Schools Forum. This report presents these figures again for information and makes proposals for the use of the DSG underspend from 2008-9. The report also presents the final Schools Budget for 2009-10 incorporating the Learning and Skills Council funding and the finalised DSG recently announced by DCSF. .

1. Centrally Retained Schools Budget Outturn 2008-9

The 2008-9 centrally retained Schools Budget was underspent by £271.3k. The variances are shown in table 1 overleaf with brief explanations for the major variances. Proposals for the use of this one-off underspend are outlined in paragraph 4 below.

2. 2009-10 Schools Budget

At the last Schools Forum meeting in May, details of the LSC 6th form allocations to schools on a financial year allocation were still awaited. Schools have now received their allocations and the LSC notified the Council that the level of funding is fully restored to the levels notified at the beginning of March 2009 i.e. £22,232,382. This figure was incorporated into the final Section 52 return for DCSF and the Schools Budget for 2009-10 is shown in Table 2.

3. Finalised DSG 2009-10

On Thursday 25 June the DCSF announced the final DSG for 2009-10. The pupil number for Barnet is 42,803 which is 1 more than the estimate used in the calculation of the DSG for the Schools Budget. The finalised DSG is therefore £202,138,000, which is £4,271 more than estimated. The proposed use of the additional grant is outlined in paragraph 4 below.

4. Proposed use of rolled forward DSG underspend and grant variance and DSG budget issues 2009-10

According to DCSF guidance on the carry forward of DSG balances, 'a surplus or deficit can be carried forward into the following year, carried forward directly to a year or two after that or a combination of the two..... It is not expected that an authority would budget to carry forward a DSG surplus or deficit beyond the first year of a new Spending Review period.' The final year of the current three year Comprehensive Spending Review is 2010-11.

Since the Schools Budget for 2009-10 was agreed a number of demands/budget pressures have been identified. These are as follows:

1. Pupil Place Planning – In certain areas of the Borough the demand for reception places in the next academic year is greater than the number of school places available. Officers are working with a number of schools to identify where capacity can be increased. The Schools Budget includes revenue contingency provision of £400,000 for schools reorganisation (which includes additional pupil places) and general risk. This funding is sufficient to fund up to an additional 200 new school places. At present we are planning to provide an additional 120 to 150 places. It is usual to continue to receive applications throughout the summer and should additional pupils be in excess of 200, funding will have to be identified elsewhere from the Schools Budget.
2. Nursery Nurses- Negotiations are ongoing regarding the grading arrears for nursery nurses. The settlement is agreed in principle with the unions and officers and unions representatives are now discussing its implementation. It is expected that the cost of the final settlement should be met from within the Individual Schools Budget element of the Schools Budget.
3. Asset Management Plans. The condition and measurement surveys for the school estate grounds and internal measurement required for the funding formula are significantly out of date. It is proposed that the underspend is utilised to fund the surveys. Details are as follows:

Background

The DCSF requires Local Authorities (LA's) and schools to maintain accurate school building information for the purpose of Asset Management Planning (AMP), prioritising planned maintenance capital works and the transparent allocation of scarce resources. DCSF requires that "condition surveys should cover five year planning periods for the purpose of AMP's. Surveys may, however, also be used for other purposes, such as the bases for investment appraisals and in such cases will need to look further ahead. Surveys should be updated annually, to take account of changing needs and priorities."

Periodically the DCSF requires LA's to provide data on schools buildings areas and condition, as the data is used to formulise Barnet's capital programme allocations and therefore accurate condition and area measurement data forms an important part of ensuring Barnet receives adequate funding in the future.

In addition the methodology for allocating school funding uses the school building area measurements to allocate schools' individual revenue and capital budgets, so errors in measured areas have a direct effect on schools budget share allocation.

Current position

Two types of survey are required: condition surveys and measurement surveys. The majority of surveys were last undertaken in 2002. Surveys typically cost around £3,500 for primary schools and £8,000 for secondary schools and incur revenue expenditure (as opposed to capital). In the financial year 2008/09 the Children's Service identified a small pot of money through efficiency measures to commission measured area surveys/production of CAD plans and condition surveys at nineteen

schools. However to continue undertaking the surveys in small waves could take up to five years to complete all schools.

Survey estimate summary

To complete a full programme of surveys across the primary and secondary estate requires a budget of approximately £400k (primary £195k, secondary £205k)

The Children's Service is aiming to allocate £100k to surveying schools buildings in 2009/10 to continue the programme. The schools Forum is asked to agree the allocation of £175.6k to enable all primary schools and some secondary schools outside of the Building Schools for the Future to be surveyed this year. Primary schools are being prioritised as the Building Schools for the Future programme will enable the commissioning of surveys for secondary schools, should Barnet's bid to join the scheme be successful.

Building Schools for the Future. At the last meeting of the Forum, a presentation was provided on Building Schools for the Future (BSF). The total funding for Barnet's BSF Programme, if agreed is likely to be circa £85m- £330m, dependant on waves of funding granted by DCSF. The Authority's contribution to BSF may be in the range £2.9m to £4.3m depending on whether a Local Education Partnership is established or not. Since the last Schools Forum the Council has been called forward for an assessment panel which is part of the sieving process for identifying authorities to formally join the scheme. If successful at the assessment panel we will need to deploy dedicated resources immediately to start the preparation process. An initial contribution of £100k is required in 2009-10. Furthermore any underspend in the centrally retained Schools Budget for 2009-10 is to be prioritised for contribution to BSF.

4. Summary

The carry forward Centrally Retained Schools Budget underspend is £271.3k and the finalised DSG is £4.3k more than estimated. The total resource available to be allocated is therefore £275.6k. The carry-forward is a one-off resource and therefore it is recommended that the use of this funding is for one-off costs.

Recommendation: The Schools Forum notes the outturn position, the final Schools Budget and the DSG for 2009-10. The Forum agrees to allocate the rolled forward underspend and additional DSG grant as follows:

Contribution to condition and measurement surveys	£175,600
Contribution to BSF	£100,000

Table 1 2008-9 Centrally Retained Dedicated Schools Budget Outturn							
				Section 52 2008-9	Final Outturn 2008-9	Variance +/(-) over/underspend	Comment
SCHOOLS BUDGET				£	£	£	
1.0.1	Individual Schools Budget			197,055,439	197,055,439	0	
1.0.9	Expenditure for Education of Children under 5s in Private, voluntary/ independent settings			3,972,090	3,917,356	(54,734)	Lower than projected payments to private & independent preschool providers
1.1.2	School-specific contingencies			1,005,430	815,484	(189,946)	Lower than expected requirement for statement top-ups
1.2.1	Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)			538,000	577,361	39,361	Increased nos. of supported SEN pupils agreed by panel
1.2.2	Provision for pupils with SEN, provision not included in line 1.2.1			2,508,760	2,415,119	(93,641)	Staffing vacancies in specialist teams pending restructuring
1.2.3	Support for inclusion			294,240	316,175	21,935	Higher than anticipated expenditure on education services for children in care
1.2.4	Fees for pupils at independent special			6,590,220	6,587,365	(2,855)	
1.2.7	Inter-authority recoupment			1,975,750	1,878,919	(96,831)	Recoupment income higher than anticipated
1.2.5	SEN transport			400,000	400,000	0	
1.2.8	Contribution to combined budgets			457,700	340,636	(117,064)	Uncommitted budget held to offset potential overspends in other centrally retained areas & shortfall in DSG.
1.3.1	Pupil Referral Units			1,375,440	1,580,094	204,654	The new statutory duty on authorities to make full time provision for students permanently excluded from school after six days commenced in September 2007.
1.3.2	Behaviour Support Services			422,250	412,601	(9,649)	
1.3.3	Education out of school			450,470	384,645	(65,825)	Staffing vacancies pending restructuring
1.3.5	Central expenditure on Education of Children u			633,000	630,869	(2,131)	
1.4.2	Free School Meals - eligibility			3,470	3,470	0	
1.4.3	Milk			38,070	12,712	(25,358)	Greater proportion of expenditure contained within grant
1.5.1	Insurance			191,000	191,000	0	
1.5.2	Museum and Library Services			42,330	31,384	(10,946)	Staff vacancies
1.5.3	School admissions			328,650	289,049	(39,601)	Staff vacancy (post is now filled)
1.5.4	Licences/subscriptions			2,750	2,750	0	
1.5.5	Miscellaneous (not more than 0.1% total net Sp			36,630	36,630	0	
1.5.8	Servicing of schools forums			17,160	17,203	43	
1.7.1	Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA)			608,430	599,240	(9,190)	
TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET				218,947,279	218,495,501	(451,778)	
Less shortfall in finalised DSG grant				(426,000)	0	426,290	
Carried forward underspend from 2007-8				246,000	0	(245,800)	
Total underspend to be carried forward to 2009-10						(271,288)	

Table 2 Section 52 2009-10 Budget		£
1.0.1	Individual Schools Budget	203,952,383
1.0.8	Threshold and Performance Pay (Devolved)	742,588
1.0.9	Expenditure for Education of Children under 5s in Private/voluntary/independent settings	4,504,388
1.1.2	School-specific contingencies	1,000,570
1.2.1	Provision for pupils with SEN (including assigned resources)	548,760
1.2.2	Provision for pupils with SEN, provision not included in line 1.2.1	2,879,461
1.2.3	Support for inclusion	300,750
1.2.4	Fees for pupils at independent special schools & abroad	6,825,739
1.2.5	SEN transport	400,000
1.2.7	Inter-authority recoupment	2,209,230
1.2.8	Contribution to combined budgets	280,000
1.3.1	Pupil Referral Units	1,553,630
1.3.2	Behaviour Support Services	343,198
1.3.3	Education out of school	414,400
1.3.5	Central expenditure on education of children under 5s	495,040
1.4.2	Free school meals - eligibility	3,533
1.4.3	Milk	17,070
1.5.1	Insurance	425,000
1.5.2	Museum and Library Services	42,330
1.5.3	School admissions	383,037
1.5.4	Licences/subscriptions	2,858
1.5.5	Miscellaneous (not more than 0.1% total of net SB)	227,825
1.5.6	Servicing of schools forums	34,150
1.5.7	Staff costs - supply cover (not sickness)	100,000
1.6.2	Other Standards Fund Allocation - Non-Devolved	82,920
1.7.1	Capital Expenditure from Revenue (CERA) (Schools)	59,040
1.8.1	TOTAL SCHOOLS BUDGET	227,827,900
Has the Central Expenditure Limit been breached?		No

4.3 Targeted Capital Fund grant for improvements to school kitchens and dining rooms

Author	Keith Rowley
Position	Head of Children's Service Capital Team
Date	24 June 2009

Last Autumn, the DCSF invited expressions of interest for a Targeted Capital Fund (TCF) grant for School Kitchens, aimed at increasing take up of school meals through improving school kitchen and dining room facilities.

The funding of projects required match funding (50% grant and 50% Local Authority/school contribution). Following an initial expression of interest, Barnet's detailed bid in February 2009 totalled £5,401,000 (£2,700,500 grant and £2,700,500 LA/school contribution).

The DCSF has recently advised that rather than select successful bidders, Ministers have now agreed that all authorities that submitted a bid should get half of the amount of their bid. Authorities have therefore been asked to submit a re-profiled bid to reflect the reduced funding, this must have the approval of the Schools Forum.

Barnet will receive £1.3 million from this funding source proportioned between financial year 2009/10 and 2010/11. Match funding will come from within the Children's Service capital programme and the Local Controlled Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP).

Barnet's bid has been revised in consultation with Diocesan partners and is contained in the table below.

School	DCSF TCF Grant	Local funding	Comments
Kosher kitchen	60,000	60,000	Refurbishment of kitchen based at Tudor school site
Garden Suburb Infant and Juniors	400,000	400,000	Replace dining and kitchen areas currently in poor condition temporary Horsa hut
Sacred Heart	135,000	250,000	Refurbishment of the kitchen, remodelling to provide compliant staff and food storage facilities.
Colindale	550,000	550,000	Replace the kitchen and dining areas currently operating out of life expired mobile/temporary buildings
Monken Hadley	218,201	262,500	Creation of new kitchen and enlargement of multi use school hall
Total	1,363,201	1,522,500	

Recommendation: The Schools Forum is asked to note and approve the projects listed in the revised bid for improvement to Barnet school kitchens and dining rooms.

4.4 Consultation on the Schools Forum Regulations	
Author	Carol Beckman
Position	School's Funding Manager
Date	7 July 2009

The DCSF has redrafted the Schools Forum regulations and are consulting on a number of changes. Full details can be found at <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?id=13568> The LA response is required by 28th August.

The main issues are

1. Whether the new regulations are clearer
2. Whether there should be regulations to ensure private early years providers receive sufficient funding
3. Whether schools forum members could represent locality teams of schools rather than phases.

Question	Comments	Response
1. Are the re-written regulations clearer than before?	The regulations are in plain English, clearly identify who can and cannot be a member and what subjects the Schools Forum must be consulted on. A new regulation states that Schools Forums must have a representative of Academies with member rather than just observer status. Academy funding is based on the local school funding formula but the actual allocations to academies are not publicly available.	Yes / No Yes / No
2.1 Should the Schools Forum be required to take a view on sufficiency of places for early years (maintained and private)?	DCSF is concerned that the views of private early years providers are not heard sufficiently, and there is a danger of under-funding leading to insufficient places. This is quite a heavy new responsibility	Yes / No
2.2 How else could we ensure early years providers are appropriately funded?	We could have more PVI members.	
3a Would it be a good idea for representatives of locality teams to be	The current arrangement is for the number of members from different phases should be proportional to the number of children in	Yes / No

members?	that phase. LAs with large or diverse areas can group their schools into partnerships or locality teams. Schools Forum members could represent the schools in their area which could have children of any age or phase.	
3b If yes, why would this be better than at present?	In Barnet this could allow each Learning Network to be represented equally	
3c If no, why do you think the current arrangements are better?	Barnet does not have large rural areas and is relatively homogenous, so it may be fairer for the number of members to continue to represent the number of children.	
4 It is likely that academies would be excluded from locality teams – would this be a problem?	The DCSF wish to ensure that academy representation is assured.	Yes / No
5 If there were representatives of locality teams how would this affect representation of pupils from different phases, and how would it affect the operation of the forum?	In Barnet it would probably not make difference as the schools are fairly evenly spread out over the geographical area. Could we ensure that there was a fair mix of heads/governors from different phases?	
6 Would you like to see the option of representatives of locality teams introduced from 2011?		Yes / No
6a If not, why not?		

Recommendation: Members are asked to discuss these issues and suggest responses

5. Items for information

5.2 Report of the Early Years Working Group meeting on 1 July 2009	
Author	Carol Beckman
Position	Schools Funding Manager
Date	2 July 09

Progress: Operational

1. A detailed project plan for increasing the free entitlement has been drawn up and circulated to members for information.
2. Second round meetings with locality groups in phase 1 have taken place; recently an accredited childminder has joined the pilot.
3. Issues raised at those meetings were collated and shared with the Finance Team. As a result a grid has been created identifying the main areas on which we need to focus.
4. Providers are beginning to decide on their models of flexibility and forwarding them to us for funding decisions.
5. Every one of the schools and settings in Phase 1 have agreed to be champions in Phase 2. This will be of enormous help in supporting the large number of providers involved in Phase 2. Once we have evaluated Phase 1 in the autumn term they will play a vital role in the planning and implementation of Phase 2.
6. Applications for Early Years Capital projects from phase 1 will receive priority hearings.
7. Geoff Boyd our government partner is very satisfied with Barnet's progress thus far.
8. A meeting has been arranged for 21st September looking at maintaining quality while delivering the extension to the free entitlement. Diane Lewis and the Early Years consultants will be available to look at models of provision for individual providers. Geoff Boyd will also be available to take direct feedback on issues arising from this agenda. EYWG members and Phase 1 providers will be invited to this meeting.

Progress: Funding

1. Funding for Phase 1 providers has been agreed.
2. Phase 1 providers have received early indications of funding allocations.
3. The Single Early Years Funding Formula consultation document has been released, although interest has been low at present.
4. The DCSF has now determined that the pupil count must be carried out at the time of the termly school census, but states that where home visits/phased admissions are undertaken, the child's entitlement to 38 weeks free education must be considered by LAs.
5. A survey of EYWG members has been undertaken regarding home visits and phased admissions.
6. Compared with other London authorities, Barnet's progress on the SEYFF is:

- a. Well advanced
- b. Has above average funding levels
- c. Similar formula to others

Summary of Discussions

1. EYWG Members were advised that despite School Circular notices to maintained settings and letters to PVI providers, the response rate to the Single Early Years Funding Formula (SEYFF) consultation has been low to date. As it is close to the end of the academic year, members were asked to encourage colleagues in their various local networks to respond and express their views on these important issues.
2. The draft LA response to the DCSF consultation on the EY Code of Practice was circulated, and will be submitted to the DCSF on 7th July 2009. Members were asked to submit any amendments to the BRSI team by Friday 3rd July 2009 at the latest.
3. The main subject for discussion at the meeting was full compliance with the Early Years Code of Practice and the effect of the new funding formula on settings' finances. The views of members were;
 - a. Maintained sector representatives expressed ongoing concerns regarding the impact of participation-led funding, particularly those settings that operate home visits, phased admissions, have a spring term intake or are not full;
 - b. PVI representatives are concerned that full compliance with the revised EY Code of Practice in relation to charges for supplementary services and require parents to take up additional childcare will have a serious impact on providers to the extent that they may opt out of offering the free entitlement..

5.3 Administration of Free Milk in Schools	
Author	Linda Burbidge
Position	Children's Service Finance Manager
Date	25 June 09

The Council currently administers the provision of free school milk to children in Barnet schools and in early years settings. There are currently 84 schools and 2 stand alone children's centres participating in the scheme. The administrative process is lengthy and cumbersome and is briefly as follows:

- Each school or setting orders its own milk requirements from the milk supplier
- The supplier invoices the school or setting which charges the cost to its delegated budget.
- The school or setting records the numbers of children under 5 in attendance each week and the volume of milk delivered. A return is then sent to the Children's Service Finance team on a weekly basis together with a copy of the paid invoice.

- The Finance team records the details of the weekly returns on to a spreadsheet and reimburses the school or setting for the full cost via a BACS transfer to their bank account.
- The school credits the reimbursement to the delegated budget.
- The Finance team makes a consolidated grant claim to the Rural Payments Agency (European Union) on a termly basis and to the Welfare Food Reimbursement Unit (Dept of Health) on a quarterly basis.
- The amount of grant claimed is based on volume of milk consumed in the period multiplied by a unit rate per litre of milk, which is set by the funding bodies.

The number of returns being completed by schools and processed by the finance team is in the region of about 3,275 per annum.

Cool Milk is a company that offers an administration scheme at no cost to local authorities, schools or settings. The company can administer the free milk at no cost because their main aim is to offer parents of older children the option of purchasing a daily delivery of milk.

The company deal directly with the schools or settings, which are free to choose whether to offer the service for the older children. Where schools opt to participate in this part of the scheme, and parents choose to purchase milk for their children, the arrangement is purely between the company and the parent. Parents are invoiced directly and can also pay by online accounts. The only requirement of the school is to provide a list of children at the beginning of term and to distribute the milk as directed by the weekly drinking list provided by the company. The company provide fridges on loan free of charge.

The proposal to use Cool Milk to administer the free school milk scheme on our behalf was discussed at the Head Teachers Advisory Board in November 2008 and a selection of primary school head teachers and support staff were invited to a presentation by the company in January 2009. Feedback has been very positive as the burden on the schools and settings to produce returns, pay invoices and general administrative duties would be greatly reduced.

The arrangement with Cool Milk does not involve a contract as there is no cost to the Council, however, we have drawn up a framework agreement complete with LB Barnet's terms and conditions to negate any risk to the Council. These Terms and Conditions have been agreed by our Legal Services team.

The transfer of the administration of the school milk scheme to an external provider carries the risk of non performance of the provider. References have been sought from 6 of the 40 local authorities currently receiving the Cool Milk service, and they have been very satisfactory. However, should the external provider fail to administer the scheme efficiently, it would be necessary for the Council to resume the administration of the scheme.

It has become custom and practice in Barnet, that all children in reception class can have free school milk, although this does not appear to be a formally recorded policy. The Council can only reclaim the cost of milk consumed by children under the age of 5. The scheme is currently costing in the region of £17k per annum for children aged over 5 receiving milk. Under the new arrangements, Cool Milk will be collating the

information for the grant claim and administering the scheme on our behalf and only the children under the age of 5 will be provided with free milk. Milk will be available for children aged 5 and over under the arrangement for parents to purchase milk.

Recommendation: That the Schools Forum note that Cool Milk will be engaged to administer the free school milk scheme as from October half term 2009 and that free milk will be available for children under the age of 5 with the option for parents of older children to purchase.

5.4 Building Schools for the Future – Update July 2009	
Author	Alice Bolton, Strategy & Planning Manager, Children’s Service
Position	Children’s Service
Date	2 July 2009

Barnet submitted the ‘Readiness to Deliver’ assessment to apply to join the BSF programme in May 2009. As a result of this, Barnet was among 9 authorities to be invited to a ‘Readiness to Deliver Assessment Panel’ on 1st July at the Department for Children, Schools & Families. The feedback at this panel was generally positive and our submission was regarded as strong.

A decision will be made on 21st July as to how many of the 9 shortlisted LAs will be able to enter the programme. This will depend on the funding available to the government at this time.

If Barnet is invited to enter the programme, the first stage will be working towards a formal entrance meeting in the Autumn. The first months of the programme will be used to develop a ‘Strategy for Change’, setting out Barnet’s vision and ambitions for BSF. The formal procurement process will begin around 12 months after we enter the programme.

If we are not invited to enter the programme at this stage, we anticipate that a further group of authorities will be invited to enter at a later stage this year.