

## Warrington Schools Forum

### Agenda

Date: ~~Tuesday 24 March 2020~~

Time: ~~5.15 pm – 7.00 pm~~

Venue: ~~Sir Thomas Boteler CE High School~~

**MEETING CANCELLED - PAPERS STILL ISSUED**

	Item	Enc / Verbal	Decision; Discussion; Information	Entitled to vote	Lead
1.	Apologies and Welcome				Chair
2.	Annual Audit Report	Enc	Information		Simon Bleckly
3.	Risk Protection Arrangements	Enc	Information and discussion		Alison Weir
4.	EYSFF Feedback	Enc	Information		Andrea Riley
5.	Minutes From the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising	Enc			Chair
6.	Membership	Enc	Decision		Garry Bradbury/ Paula Worthington
7.	DSG budgets 2020/21	Enc	Information and discussion		Garry Bradbury
8.	Special Schools Formula Review	Verbal	Information		Paula Worthington
9.	FWG dates (Tues 09/06 and Mon 28/09)	Verbal	Discussion		Garry Bradbury
10.	AOB – (if time allows) refresh terms of reference and update, particularly relating to attendance, members and who they are representing (linked to their vote)				Chair
11.	<b>Meeting schedule:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuesday 23 June 2020 at 5.15 pm</li> <li>• Tuesday 13 October 2020 at 5.15 pm</li> </ul> <b>(Venue for all meetings – Sir Thomas Boteler CE High School)</b>				



# REPORT

WARRINGTON  
Borough Council 

**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 2

**Date:** 24th March 2020

**For:** Information

**Title:** Review of School Audits 2019/20

**Author:** Simon Bleckly

**Presenter:** Simon Bleckly

---

---

# Internal Audit Service

---

## FAMILIES AND WELLBEING DIRECTORATE

### REVIEW OF SCHOOLS AUDITS 2019/20

MARCH 2020

Internal Audit  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor Quattro  
New Town House  
Buttermarket Street  
Warrington  
WA1 2NH  
<http://w2kwebint/audit>

**WARRINGTON**  
Borough Council



---

# CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Main findings – audits</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Regional and National Issues</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. The Schools Financial Value Standard</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. The Audit testing programme, 2019/20 and planning for 2020/21</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. Reducing the risk of fraud in schools</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. Conclusion and audit opinion on schools’ systems of internal control</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appendix One: Assurance opinions and risk definitions for schools reports</b>	<b>6</b>

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the main findings from the school audits carried out by Internal Audit in 2019/20 and provides an overall opinion on the governance and control frameworks in place in schools, supporting the completion of the Council's Annual Governance Statement.

## 2. MAIN FINDINGS - AUDITS

Eight schools have been audited since the last report to Schools Forum in January 2019. The table below provides a comparison of the assurance ratings with previous years. Appendix One contains the definitions for the audit assurance opinions and recommendation risk ratings.

### Summary of Audit Opinions, 2017/18 to 2019/20

	17/18	18/19	19/20	Total
High	0	0	1	1
Substantial	7	6	7	20
Limited	0	1	0	1
Minimal	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>

The table below summarises the number of recommendations made in 2019/20, by priority, in each area of the schools testing programme.

### Recommendations made in school audits in 2019/20

	Critical	High	Medium
Leadership & governance	0	0	13
Financial management and control	0	1	15
Orders and payments	0	0	8
Bank imprest and petty cash	0	0	0
People management	0	0	9
Income and banking	0	0	9
Asset and security management	0	0	16
Unofficial funds	0	0	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78</b>

The one high priority recommendation made last year related to a level of expenditure on gifts and hospitality (including alcohol) that we considered to be excessive.

We have found that schools are generally still managing to maintain effective systems of internal control in an ongoing, challenging financial environment. It is pleasing to note that the number of High and Medium priority recommendations were both lower than last year, despite one more school being audited.

There are, however, some issues that have arisen in a number of our reviews and are worth keeping under consideration by all schools. These include:

- Ensuring that schools' financial procedures clearly set out the delegated authority and authorisation limits for orders, quotations and tenders, and write off of debts
- Maintaining a complete and up to date record of all declarations of interest
- Having an adequate separation of duties / audit trail for key financial processes including payroll, banking of income, purchase card spend and maintenance of the asset register

- 
- Ensuring that there is an adequate number of debit cards at a school to meet operational needs and to avoid the use of cards by someone other than the named cardholder
  - Ensuring that governors regularly receive information on unofficial fund balances and significant movements in funds

We review the information that schools provide and publish in relation to their use of pupil premium; effective use of this funding is seen by OFSTED as a key factor in schools closing the attainment gap between pupils. From our reviews we found that all schools were publishing adequate information about how they were using this funding. We were able to verify that schools were using the funding for the stated purposes, although we do not review delivery of outcomes.

### **3. REGIONAL AND NATIONAL ISSUES**

Through our links with the North West regional schools audit group, we have identified a number of issues and matters arising that schools should be aware of. These are presented below for information.

- Awareness of IR35 and the implications for schools. IR35 defines the rules for operating PAYE tax and national insurance for a worker who directly provides a service to a client through an “intermediary”, but there is evidence that many schools are either unaware of the rules or are not applying them correctly. Guidance on IR35 has been issued to Warrington schools from the Payroll department.
- The use of unofficial fund monies for gifts to staff and to fund staff “wellbeing” events. It was noted that in many areas, schools are closing their unofficial funds and accounting for them using a separate cost centre under the official budget. In any such cases, there should be a clear policy in place to identify acceptable expenditure.
- There is an increase in the number of schools that are buying in a GDPR compliance service. It has been noted that Headteachers or Business Managers should not undertake the role of the school’s Data Protection Officer.

### **4. THE SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD**

The Standard is a list of formal questions that school governing bodies are required to discuss with their head teacher and other senior staff in order to gain assurance that funds delegated to the school are safeguarded and spent effectively. Consideration of the questions can be delegated to a Finance Committee or equivalent, but the completed assurance statement must be signed by the Chair of Governors and considered by the Governing Body.

The completed statements have to be sent to the Council’s section 151 Officer who will use this information to inform the schools audit programme and other financial assessments. The section 151 officer also has to submit a statement each year confirming the deployment of Dedicated Schools Grant.

All of the eligible Warrington schools submitted signed statements for 2018-19, and any issues were resolved before the deadline for the section 151 officer to submit his DSG statement in May 2019. The Education Finance team monitor the completion and submission of the statements and Internal Audit carry out a brief review of each school’s latest SFVS as part of the audit visits, to ensure that the self-evaluation and any improvement actions identified are broadly in line with the results of our own testing. This was generally the case for the schools that we audited in 2019/20.

---

## 5. THE AUDIT TESTING PROGRAMME, 2019/20 AND PLANNING FOR 2020/21

We review the audit testing programme each year, to ensure continued coverage of schools' key financial risks and to account for any changes in the SFVS content. In 2019/20, the programme was amended to extend testing of controls around information governance (GDPR) and payroll (IR35).

In July 2019, the DfE issued a consultation on possible changes to financial transparency arrangements for maintained schools and Academy Trusts. There were a number of questions in the consultation that directly related to both the level and timing of internal audit work in schools and the areas that would potentially be subject to review.

The most significant question in relation to Internal Audit was whether there should be a requirement for maintained schools to be subject to an internal audit at least every three years. The current level of resource available to the Local Authority to carry out schools internal audit is insufficient to meet this potential additional demand, although it was noticeable that the consultation made no reference to a minimum scope or coverage for each internal audit visit.

The DfE are currently still evaluating the feedback from this consultation. We will review the scope and coverage of our schools audit programme on receipt of any further direction from the government, which may or may not include pressures funding.

We have completed the planning process for 2020/21, and have consulted with staff in the relevant services to identify schools for review. As part of this process, we will take into account any plans for schools to become Academies. The total level of resource allocated to schools audits, and scope of coverage, is in line with recent years.

## 6. REDUCING THE RISK OF FRAUD IN SCHOOLS

In the current economic climate, schools and other public bodies can face an increased risk of fraud, from internal and external sources. Thankfully, frauds committed by school staff remain rare, both locally and nationally, but the consequences can be severe. Most cases involve an abuse of position, and are often driven by financial pressures or changes in personal circumstances. Recent examples of national cases have included staff:

- Writing and cashing cheques.
- Making payments to non-existent suppliers and colluding with tradesmen to pay inflated prices for work undertaken.
- Using school procurement or credit cards for personal purchases, and keeping or selling the goods.
- Stealing money from PTA / school fund / out of school clubs.

As in 2018/19, a notable feature of some of the cases that came to court in 2019/20 was the amounts involved – in three of the largest cases, the losses totalled £513k, £190k and £47k respectively. All of these involved systemic failures in oversight over a number of years where staff were able to perpetuate the fraud without being challenged. There is an increased public interest in frauds carried out in the public sector and a notable recent case involving a headteacher's misuse of funds was featured in the BBC's "Fraud Squad" series.

Schools do continue to be a target for external fraudsters. We regularly brief schools on national alerts issued by the National Anti-Fraud Network and other agencies, containing details of frauds



---

and attempted scams. Since 2015/16, we have issued relevant alerts via the My School Services website. Examples of scams against schools include:

- Letters or emails purporting to come from suppliers, requesting that their bank account details be changed.
- Phishing e-mails, often asking you to enter your bank account details or passwords in order to “unlock” an account with your bank or a supplier (e.g. Amazon, Apple).
- Emails stating they are from HMRC regarding tax refunds.
- Bogus calls or visits from people pretending to work for companies that schools deal with, e.g. photographers, cash collection firms, asking to pick up income held by the school.

To help governors’ oversight of the financial management of their school, we have created a Schools Anti-Fraud Toolkit, containing information on identifying fraud behaviours and other potential indicators, as well as recent national fraud cases in schools. The Toolkit also has a checklist that will assist with the completion of the SFVS. The Toolkit and checklist are available via My School Services. We are looking to review and update our fraud awareness material in 2020/21 and will circulate any new material to all schools.

## **7. CONCLUSION AND AUDIT OPINION ON SCHOOLS’ SYSTEMS OF INTERNAL CONTROL**

The Council’s Annual Governance Statement has to include assurances that there are effective controls and governance arrangements in place in all schools.

The assurance for the AGS in relation to schools is largely provided from the programme of school reviews and other relevant work, as summarised in this report. This report is submitted as part of the evidence to support the AGS and therefore includes a conclusion and audit opinion (below) giving our assessment of the overall control framework in operation in schools. Assurance has also been obtained from the submission of SFVS statements from schools.

Our audit and assessment work continues to provide assurance that schools in Warrington have effective systems of financial management. The reviews that we have carried out in the last five years, covering the majority of the Council’s schools, have identified no significant risks or control issues that would require disclosure in the Council’s Annual Governance Statement.

We are satisfied that there is an effective framework for reporting our findings and recommendations to governors and senior managers and for appropriate action to be taken to improve existing controls.

**We therefore conclude that there is *Satisfactory Assurance* that Warrington schools have effective systems of governance and internal control in place.**

The Forum is asked to note and comment on the contents of the report.

**Simon Bleckly**  
**Audit and Counter Fraud Manager,**  
**Audit Services**  
**March 2020**

---

**APPENDIX ONE**  
**Assurance Opinions for Audits**

<b>Opinion</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<b>High Assurance</b>	Key controls are being applied consistently and effectively. This means that the key risks in the terms of reference are being properly managed and our review did not identify any weaknesses that would impact on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives.
<b>Satisfactory Assurance</b>	Key controls exist but there is some inconsistency in their application and some of the key risks in the terms of reference may need attention. The likely impact of these weaknesses on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives is not expected to be significant.
<b>Limited Assurance</b>	A number of key controls do not exist and/or are not applied consistently or effectively. This means that a number of the key risks in the terms of reference need attention. These weaknesses in the design and/or operation of key controls could impact upon achievement of key system, function or process objectives.
<b>Minimal Assurance</b>	A significant number of key controls do not exist and/or there are major omissions in the application of key controls. This means that a significant number of risks in the terms of reference are not being managed properly, which may put the achievement of the Council's objectives at risk.

**Recommendation Risk Definitions**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Critical</b>	A top priority owing to a control weakness that has or could have a significant impact on the achievement of key system, function, or process objectives, and also the Council's objectives.
<b>High</b>	An important issue owing to a control weakness that has or could have a significant impact on the achievement of key system, function, or process objectives.
<b>Medium</b>	A control weakness that has or could have an impact on the achievement of the key system, function or process objectives. An issue, which, if addressed, would contribute towards raising the standard of internal control.

---

---

**Low**

A minor issue which does not impact upon the achievement of key system, function or process objectives. However implementation of the recommendation would improve overall control or help to reduce a minor level of non-compliance with an existing control process.

---

# REPORT



## WARRINGTON Borough Council

<b>Report to:</b>	Schools Forum	<b>Item</b>	3
<b>Date:</b>	24 March 2020	<b>For</b>	Information
<b>Title:</b>	Risk Protection Arrangement for Schools		
<b>Author:</b>	Alison Weir	<b>Presenter</b>	Alison Weir

### 1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report:

- Outlines the Department for Education's (DfE) intention to extend the Risk Protection Arrangement (RPA) to Local Authority Maintained Schools (LAMS) from 1 April 2020.
- Identifies the matters which should be considered by the Forum and individual schools in making a decision whether or not to join the RPA.

### 2.0 Introduction and Background

2.1 The RPA was originally established on 1 September 2014 as an alternative to commercial insurance for academies. In September 2019, the DfE launched a public consultation on extending the RPA to the LAMS sector. The consultation closed in early November and in January 2020, the DfE published the outcomes of the consultation. In total, 148 responses were received, from schools, local authorities and the insurance industry.

2.2 Following the consultation exercise, ministerial approval has been given to extend the RPA to cover LAMS, on an opt-in basis, from 1 April 2020. The main argument for doing so, based on experience to date, is to reduce the cost to the public purse of protecting schools against risk. The DfE has confirmed that the RPA will be offered on a voluntary, basis, for those schools which have not already made arrangements for 2020 to 2021.

### 3.0 Current Arrangements

3.1 The Council procures insurance cover on behalf of all Council services, including schools. Insurance policies are normally procured on three year long term arrangements (LTA) with the option to extend these contracts by a further two years. Policies are then renewed on an annual basis. The current insurance portfolio is summarised at Appendix 1.

3.2 The Council has adopted an insurance year of July to June, to avoid the workload peak associated with 1 April renewals. Non liability policies including property, motor, travel and engineering were tendered from 1 July 2016 and following the three year initial LTA period plus the two year extension, are due to expire on 30 June 2021. Liability and associated policies were last tendered from 1 July 2019, so the earliest date on which the LTA can expire is 30 June 2022.

- 3.3 In common with most local authorities, the Council carries significant self-insured retention limits (also known as *deductibles* or *excess levels*) on its major policies. It is therefore self-insured for most losses, with the exception of catastrophic claims and/or excess aggregate losses. The Council maintains provisions and reserves to meet these losses and protect individual services, including schools, from the financial impact of a significant claim, or series of claims.
- 3.4 The Council also operates a voluntary arrangement, known as the Education All Risks Scheme (EARS), to meet the cost of low value property claims which are not covered by the external policy. The scheme operates on a break-even basis and is funded via an annual contribution from participating schools, calculated using pupil numbers.
- 3.5 Where schools convert to academy status, insurers are informed as part of the annual renewals process. Some insurers (for example, property, motor and engineering) have adjusted premiums to reflect the gradual withdrawal of schools from the Council's arrangements. However liability policies are priced on an assessment of overall risk, and premiums are not normally affected by incremental changes in service provision.
- 3.6 The Council contracts with Salford City Council to manage insurance and compensation claims on our behalf. The contract with Salford commenced on 1 July 2016 and runs to 30 June 2021. The Council is currently reviewing options for the provision of this service once the contract expires.
- 3.7 The Council contracts with Aon Risk Solutions for the provision of an insurance broker service. The current contract expires 31 October 2021. Most public sector insurers work through brokers, so this appointment enables the Council to access a wider and more competitive marketplace than would otherwise be the case. Access to a broker also enables the Council to spot procure policies or specialist services where a full tendering exercise might not be appropriate or economic. In the case of LAMS, this has included Directors and Officers cover for Green Lane School's charitable company, Willow Green.
- 3.8 The Council does not currently carry cyber insurance but continues to explore the need for and potential cost of a specific data and cyber liability. Our existing policies will act if we are found liable for causing injury, loss or damage to individuals, including as a result of a data breach.

#### **4.0 Service Implications**

- 4.1 The RPA is not an insurance product but an arrangement for sharing the cost of risk across its members. Unlike insurance, there is no contractual obligation to provide indemnity and meet the cost of claims.
- 4.2 In many areas the RPA intends to provide cover which seems comparable to that procured by the Council on behalf of schools. However there are some differences:
- The RPA does not provide motor cover, engineering insurance or engineering inspections. The Council does provide these covers where requested by schools.
  - The RPA charges retentions for some of its covers including property damage, business interruption, professional indemnity, and fidelity guarantee. With the exception of the EARS scheme, the Council does not charge retentions to schools.
  - The RPA provides limited cover, up to £250,000, for minor works commissioned by schools. The Council carries a blanket policy for contract works up to a value of £2,500,000.

- 4.3 By virtue of its statutory duties and because of the way in which insurance policies operate, the Council retains some responsibilities for claims made against former LAMS which have converted to academy status. These include employers and public liability claims for the period prior to conversion and for failure to educate type claims. A similar situation is expected to apply to LAMS who chose to leave the Council's arrangements and opt into the RPA. The DfE also recognises that for maintained schools, the local authority will retain ownership of school properties and the liabilities associated with employment.
- 4.4 Schools can opt into the RPA at any time. However, liability insurers have confirmed that losing schools to the RPA would not release the Council from its LTA, so we remain contractually committed to paying at least the current levels of premium until 30 June 2022. As noted above, non-liability insurers have adjusted annual premiums for the gradual loss of schools converting to academy status. There is no guarantee that insurers will continue to offer this flexibility, particularly if we experience a large scale transfer of schools into the RPA.
- 4.5 Schools can choose to leave the scheme with effect from 31 March in any year, subject to the provision of three months' notice. Our usual arrangement is to notify insurers of changes to our cover requirements on an annual basis, as part of the renewals process. Since the Council's policies run from July to June, this could potentially leave schools without cover for the period April to June. Insurers may agree to provide cover for returning schools on an incremental basis but this would have to be agreed on a case by case basis and may incur additional cost.
- 4.6 The RPA includes risk management support, provided by Willis Towers Watson on behalf of the DfE. Claims handling services are provided by Top Mark. The Council is unable to comment on the comparability of these services with those currently available to schools, and schools will need to undertake their own assessments.

## **5.0 Financial Implications**

- 5.1 Budgets for insurance costs are held by schools and are not currently de-delegated. Schools, as other Council services, receive an annual charge to cover the costs of insurance premiums, including insurance premium tax, claims handling services, brokerage and self-insured losses. Costs are based on risk indicators (for example liability insurance costs are charged on the basis of salary budgets) and as far as possible charges are smoothed to protect schools from the impact of significant claims costs or premium increases.
- 5.2 Membership of the RPA will be charged at £18 per pupil (or per place for special schools and pupil referral units) until 31 March 2021. The DfE has proposed that for any schools opting into the RPA, the membership fees will be deducted from the Council's DSG (and effectively paid directly into the RPA on the schools' behalf). Any such deduction would in turn be removed from the relevant schools' individual budget allocations.
- 5.3 For comparative purposes, an analysis of insurance charges (excluding EARS) per pupil place (based on NOR at October 2019) is provided at Appendix 2. Costs per pupil do vary, particularly between maintained and voluntary aided schools, because the Council does not currently provide all insurances for church schools and the various diocese have some responsibility for property insurances. The RPA operates specific membership criteria for church academies, which replace the insurances provided by both the diocese and local authorities and intends to provide similar arrangements for church schools within the LAMS sector. This approach would clearly need to be agreed with the relevant diocese.

- 5.4 The analysis in Appendix 1 indicates that savings are available to some schools, based on the current RPA charge of £18 per pupil. However, the Council's costs are competitive overall, reflecting both the Council's purchasing power and its generally good reputation with insurers. It is worth noting that an element of the cost difference arises from the fact that insurance premiums are subject to insurance premium tax (IPT), which is currently set at 12% of premium. Since the RPA is not an insurance product it does not attract IPT. However at a macro level, any saving to the public purse is offset by the loss of tax revenue to the Treasury.
- 5.5 Claims are funded from the contributions paid by members and the Government Actuary's Department undertakes biannual reviews to ensure the scheme is adequately funded. The DfE has confirmed that in the event of a sustained or large scale loss, any claims which could not be met from the RPA surplus would be met from funds within the wider Department or if required, additional funds directly from the Treasury. Noting that the membership charge has reduced since the scheme was set up in 2014 on the basis of a lower than anticipated claims experience, it is expected that membership charges would increase should the claims experience deteriorate overall.

## **6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 6.1 The Council is contractually committed to LTAs with its current insurers until 30 June 2021 (non-liability policies) and 30 June 2022 (liability policies). Any movement of schools to the RPA before these dates would be unlikely to release the Council from its contractual commitments and would therefore result in an overall increase in cost for services and schools which remain with the Council.
- 6.2 The RPA is not an insurance product. It does not carry a contractual obligation to provide indemnity to and meet the cost of claims from its members. This is an important distinction which explains some of the difference in cost between the RPA and insurance policies.
- 6.3 In many areas the RPA intends to provide cover which seems comparable to that procured by the Council on behalf of schools. However there are some differences and it is for schools to confirm that the cover offered by the RPA is appropriate to their needs.
- 6.4 Savings are available to some schools, based on the current RPA charge of £18 per pupil. However, the Council's costs are competitive overall, reflecting both the Council's purchasing power and its generally good reputation with insurers. Schools should also be aware that the charge per pupil may increase to reflect any deterioration in the claims experience.
- 6.5 The following considerations are available to the Forum:
- Whether to opt into the RPA on a collective basis for all schools, or school sectors (this would require a decision to de-delegate insurance), or to allow schools to opt into the RPA on an individual basis.
  - To confirm that any decisions to opt in to the RPA either collectively or individually will not be made during the period of the Council's current LTAs with insurers.
  - To recognise that arrangements will need to be agreed for covers which are not available under the RPA.
  - To recognise that the Council will continue to retain some liabilities for LAMS schools which opt into the RPA and to commission further work to consider how these liabilities will be managed and funded.
  - To recognise that arrangements will need to be agreed for schools which have opted into the RPA and subsequently decide to return to the Council's arrangements.

## External Insurance Portfolio at March 2020

Policy/Insurer	Limit of Indemnity	LTA Period
Casualty (Employer's and Public Liability) QBE Insurance (Europe)	£50,000,000	1 July 2019 – 30 June 2022 (with option of two year extension)
Medical Malpractice QBE Insurance (Europe)	£5,000,000	1 July 2019 – 30 June 2022 (with option of two year extension)
Officials Indemnity QBE Insurance (Europe)	£5,000,000	1 July 2019 – 30 June 2022 (with option of two year extension)
Professional Negligence – Council QBE Insurance (Europe)	£5,000,000	1 July 2019 – 30 June 2022 (with option of two year extension)
Crime QBE Insurance (Europe)	£5,000,000	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Motor Fleet QBE Insurance (Europe)	Various	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Motor Legal Protection MAPS	£100,000	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Personal Accident & Travel AIG Europe	Various	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
School Journey AIG Europe	Various	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Property Protector Insurance	Sums Insured	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Terrorism Lloyds via AUM	£100,000,000	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Computers Allianz	Sums Insured	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Contract Works HSB Engineering	£2,500,000	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Fine Arts Blackwall Green	Sums Insured	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Engineering Insurance and Inspection Zurich Municipal	Various	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021
Hired In Plant Royal Sun Alliance	£500,000	N/A
Marine Equipment Navigators & General	Property: Sums Insured Liability: £2,000,000	N/A
Foster Carers Legal Protection Standard Securities	Various	N/A



SAP CODE	DESCRIPTION	EXTERNAL POLICIES [1]	SLA CHARGE [2]	INSURANCE CHARGES (1+2)=[3]	MOTOR & ENGINEERING [4]	COMPARABLE INSURANCE COST (3-4)=[5]	NOR OCT 2019 [6]	INSURANCE COST/PUPIL [5/6]
35001	Bewsey Lodge Primary School	£5,695.00	£625.00	£6,320.00	£35.00	£6,285.00	294	£21.38
35002	Dallam Primary School	£6,730.00	£625.00	£7,355.00	£560.00	£6,795.00	231	£29.42
35006	St Elphin's CE Primary School	£5,530.00	£625.00	£6,155.00	£0.00	£6,155.00	390	£15.78
35007	St Andrew's CE Primary School	£2,920.00	£625.00	£3,545.00	£0.00	£3,545.00	206	£17.21
35008	Warrington St Ann's CE Primary School	£3,560.00	£625.00	£4,185.00	£0.00	£4,185.00	187	£22.38
35009	Warrington St Barnabas CE Primary School	£3,160.00	£625.00	£3,785.00	£0.00	£3,785.00	183	£20.68
35010	St Margaret's CE Primary School	£5,270.00	£625.00	£5,895.00	£0.00	£5,895.00	417	£14.14
35011	Our Lady's Catholic Primary School	£1,340.00	£625.00	£1,965.00	£0.00	£1,965.00	169	£11.63
35012	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	£1,430.00	£625.00	£2,055.00	£0.00	£2,055.00	197	£10.43
35013	St Alban's Catholic Primary School	£1,690.00	£625.00	£2,315.00	£0.00	£2,315.00	194	£11.93
35014	St Augustine's Catholic Primary School	£1,470.00	£625.00	£2,095.00	£0.00	£2,095.00	142	£14.75
35015	St Benedict's Catholic Primarty School	£1,620.00	£625.00	£2,245.00	£0.00	£2,245.00	204	£11.00
35016	St Stephen's Catholic Primary School	£2,105.00	£625.00	£2,730.00	£515.00	£2,215.00	211	£10.50
35017	Appleton Thorn Primary School	£2,805.00	£625.00	£3,430.00	£35.00	£3,395.00	202	£16.81
35018	The Cobbs Infant and Nursery School	£5,700.00	£625.00	£6,325.00	£0.00	£6,325.00	250	£25.30
35020	St Monica's Catholic Primary School	£1,380.00	£625.00	£2,005.00	£0.00	£2,005.00	188	£10.66
35021	Grappenhall St Wilfrid's CE Primary School	£5,820.00	£625.00	£6,445.00	£0.00	£6,445.00	407	£15.84
35022	Bradshaw Primary School	£2,960.00	£625.00	£3,585.00	£0.00	£3,585.00	202	£17.75
35023	St Thomas CE Primary School	£3,120.00	£625.00	£3,745.00	£0.00	£3,745.00	210	£17.83
35024	Stockton Heath Primary School	£6,145.00	£625.00	£6,770.00	£35.00	£6,735.00	401	£16.80
35025	Streeton St Matthew's CE Primary School	£2,650.00	£625.00	£3,275.00	£0.00	£3,275.00	215	£15.23
35026	Thelwall Junior School	£2,850.00	£625.00	£3,475.00	£0.00	£3,475.00	166	£20.93
35027	Thelwall Infants School	£2,330.00	£625.00	£2,955.00	£0.00	£2,955.00	135	£21.89
35028	Statham Primary School	£2,870.00	£625.00	£3,495.00	£0.00	£3,495.00	197	£17.74
35029	Cherry Tree Primary School	£3,290.00	£625.00	£3,915.00	£0.00	£3,915.00	212	£18.47
35030	Ravenbank Primary School	£5,260.00	£625.00	£5,885.00	£0.00	£5,885.00	409	£14.39
35031	Oughtrington Primary School	£5,150.00	£625.00	£5,775.00	£0.00	£5,775.00	417	£13.85
35033	Culcheth Primary School	£3,200.00	£625.00	£3,825.00	£0.00	£3,825.00	209	£18.30
35034	Newchurch Primary School	£3,255.00	£625.00	£3,880.00	£245.00	£3,635.00	184	£19.76
35035	Twiss Green Primary School	£3,250.00	£625.00	£3,875.00	£0.00	£3,875.00	201	£19.28
35036	St Paul of the Cross Catholic Primary School	£1,270.00	£625.00	£1,895.00	£0.00	£1,895.00	147	£12.89
35038	Christ Church CE Primary School	£4,370.00	£625.00	£4,995.00	£0.00	£4,995.00	313	£15.96
35039	St Oswald's Catholic Primary School	£1,410.00	£625.00	£2,035.00	£0.00	£2,035.00	209	£9.74
35040	Brook Acre Primary School	£4,120.00	£625.00	£4,745.00	£0.00	£4,745.00	205	£23.15
35042	St Bridget's Catholic Primary School	£1,660.00	£625.00	£2,285.00	£0.00	£2,285.00	192	£11.90

SAP CODE	DESCRIPTION	EXTERNAL POLICIES [1]	SLA CHARGE [2]	INSURANCE CHARGES (1+2)=[3]	MOTOR & ENGINEERING [4]	COMPARABLE INSURANCE COST (3-4)=[5]	NOR OCT 2019 [6]	INSURANCE COST/PUPIL [5/6]
35043	St Lewis Catholic Primary School	£1,290.00	£625.00	£1,915.00	£0.00	£1,915.00	163	£11.75
35045	Locking Stumps Primary School	£5,155.00	£625.00	£5,780.00	£245.00	£5,535.00	380	£14.57
35047	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	£1,730.00	£625.00	£2,355.00	£0.00	£2,355.00	283	£8.32
35048	St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	£1,320.00	£625.00	£1,945.00	£0.00	£1,945.00	177	£10.99
35050	St Peter's Catholic Primary School	£1,310.00	£625.00	£1,935.00	£0.00	£1,935.00	214	£9.04
35052	Woolston CE Primary School	£2,900.00	£625.00	£3,525.00	£0.00	£3,525.00	208	£16.95
35056	Barrow Hall Primary School	£7,430.00	£625.00	£8,055.00	£0.00	£8,055.00	606	£13.29
35057	Sankey Valley St James CE Primary School	£3,650.00	£625.00	£4,275.00	£0.00	£4,275.00	199	£21.48
35059	Winwick CE Primary School	£2,900.00	£625.00	£3,525.00	£0.00	£3,525.00	187	£18.85
35060	Birchwood CE Primary School	£3,880.00	£625.00	£4,505.00	£0.00	£4,505.00	180	£25.03
35062	Cinnamon Brow CE Primary School	£5,250.00	£625.00	£5,875.00	£0.00	£5,875.00	312	£18.83
35064	Callands Primary School	£4,270.00	£625.00	£4,895.00	£0.00	£4,895.00	346	£14.15
35065	St Phillip (Westbrook) CE Primary School	£5,675.00	£625.00	£6,300.00	£35.00	£6,265.00	545	£11.50
35066	Grappenhall Heys Primary School	£3,540.00	£625.00	£4,165.00	£0.00	£4,165.00	205	£20.32
35067	Latchford St James CE Primary School	£3,430.00	£625.00	£4,055.00	£0.00	£4,055.00	183	£22.16
35103	Culcheth High School	£26,870.00	£1,250.00	£28,120.00	£2,560.00	£25,560.00	1177	£21.72
35107	St Gregory's Catholic High School	£10,405.00	£1,250.00	£11,655.00	£1,215.00	£10,440.00	1062	£9.83
35405	Sandy Lane Nursery and Forest School	£1,980.00	£625.00	£2,605.00	£550.00	£2,055.00	80	£25.69
PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND NURSERY SCHOOLS		£210,370.00	£34,375.00	£244,745.00	£6,030.00	£238,715.00	14803	£16.13
35200	Green Lane Special School	£9,650.00	£625.00	£10,275.00	£1,580.00	£8,695.00	189	£54.74
35205	Joint 6th Form Provision	£2,680.00	£0.00	£2,680.00	£1,030.00	£1,650.00		
35201	Fox Wood Special School	£12,130.00	£625.00	£12,755.00	£6,140.00	£6,615.00	94	£76.76
35206	Fox Wood 6th Form	£1,115.00	£0.00	£1,115.00	£515.00	£600.00		
35202	Woolston Brook Special School	£7,225.00	£625.00	£7,850.00	£1,545.00	£6,305.00	55	£114.64
SPECIAL SCHOOLS		£32,800.00	£1,875.00	£34,675.00	£10,810.00	£23,865.00	338	£70.61
ALL SCHOOLS		£243,170.00	£36,250.00	£279,420.00	£16,840.00	£262,580.00	15141	£17.34

# Report



**WARRINGTON**  
Borough Council

<b>Report to:</b>	<b>Schools Forum</b>	<b>Item:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>24/03/2020</b>	<b>For:</b>	<b>Information</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Early Years Update</b>		
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Andrea Riley</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Andrea Riley</b>

## **1.0 REASON AND PURPOSE OF REPORT:**

- 1.1** The report provides Schools Forum with a summary of the changes to the local early years single funding formula (EYSFF) for 3 and 4 year olds for 2020/21,
- 1.2** The report also provides Schools Forum with a summary of the changes to the EYSFF for 2 year olds for 2020/21. Including seeking approval for the central spend of £196,601 to support early years central services and £21,850 for the provision of Free School Meals (FSM) for eligible children attending School nursery. This is estimated at 50 children being eligible for FSM each day (see appendix 1).

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1** That Schools Forum agrees with the changes to the local EYSFF for 3 and 4 year olds for 2020/21.
- 2.2** That Schools Forum agrees with the changes to the local EYSFF for 2 year olds for 2020/21.
- 2.3** That Schools Forum approves the central spend of £196,601 to retain a budget for contingency, support local early years services and £21,850 for FSM.
- 2.4** That public health attend EYSFF group in July 2020 to share data on Warrington birth rate to help the group to better plan for future childcare needs in the local area.

## **3.0 SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- 3.1** Since its introduction in April 2017, the EYSFF has set the hourly funding rates that each local authority is paid to deliver the universal and additional entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds. There is a separate formula that sets the hourly funding rates for 2 year olds.
- 3.2** On 19 December 2019, the DfE confirmed Early Years Block of Designated Schools Grant (DSG) funding rates for 2020/21. The hourly rates for Warrington will increase by £0.08 for 3 and 4 year olds; increasing from £4.30 per hour to £4.38 per hour – To settings increasing from £4.25 - £4.33. The funding rate for 2 year olds for all LAs has increased

by £0.08 per hour, Warrington's figure will rise from £5.28 to £5.36 – To settings increasing from £5.00 to £5.08.

**3.3** The DfE have also confirmed that the national funding rate for the early years pupil premium (EYPP) is £0.53 per eligible child per hour, and the Disability Access Fund (DAF) is £615 per eligible child per year. Both of these rates are unchanged from 2019/20.

**3.4** Based on the above the total DSG initial allocation for the early years block was £14,213,888. The allocation was broken down as follows:

<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>Funding 2020/21</b>
Universal entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds	£8,178,987
Additional 15 hour entitlements for eligible working parents of 3 and 4 year olds	£4,353,547
2 year entitlement	£1,443,063
Early years pupil premium	£127,133
Disability access fund	£41,205
Supplementary funding for maintained nursery schools	£69,953
<b>Total</b>	<b>£14,213,888</b>

**3.5** This initial allocation for the early years block will be recalculated during the summer, when the census data from the January 2020 Early Years census have been validated – the initial allocation is still based on January 2019 numbers. This recalculation will affect Early Years Block for 2020/21, and will also have a retrospective part-year effect on 2019/20. Because 2019/20 financial year is by then closed, this retrospective effect, whether detrimental or beneficial, will also need to be accommodated in 2020/21.

#### **4.0 EARLY YEARS BLOCK**

**4.1** The Early Years Block has increased from 2019/20 by £901,076 (see Appendix 2), however this is as a consequence of an increase in participating numbers of 3 and 4 year olds, and a significant (8p) uplift to the funded hourly base rates.

**4.2** Local authorities are required to plan to pass-through a minimum of 95% of their 3 and 4 year old funding from the government to early years providers.

**4.3** In Warrington we pass through 98.9%, retaining just 5p/hour, this is because Warrington remains at the national minimum floor rate for 3 and 4 year olds' funding; therefore retaining significant proportions from this budget would result in the universal offer to our settings being funded at a low amount, which is unpalatable to early years providers in light of rising operational costs that are non-negotiable such as increased national minimum wage, increased NI contributions and cost of pension contribution. At the EYSFF meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> February, it was agreed to pass through the full £0.08 increase per hour for 3 and 4 year olds, and retain most funding for early years services from 2 year old funding, which is funded at a higher rate.

- 4.4** There is currently no regulatory requirement to pass through a set amount of the 2 year old funding to providers who deliver the 2 year old entitlements.
- 4.5** Warrington currently retains 28p/hour from the 2 year old funding stream. This is estimated to be sufficient to continue to fund a range of early years services for 2020/21 and pass through the additional £0.08 per hour. This was discussed and agreed at the EYSFF meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020.
- 4.6** The EYSFF group met on the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020 and agreed to allocate funding to early years services in 2020/21 as follows:
- Cease to fund the provision of funding for vulnerable 2 year olds and only fund 2 year olds who meet criteria set by the government.
  - Maintain the contribution towards SEND Inclusion Fund of £50,000
  - Maintain the contribution towards the Portage service £76,146
  - Fund the role of the early years Area SENCO £35,000
  - Fund the provision of Free School Meals for eligible children £21,850
  - Carry a contingency of £35,455

See appendix 1 for a detailed illustration.

- 4.7** 2 year old numbers have fallen again (see Appendix 2) and it is from this funding stream that the central EY initiatives are funded. If the numbers continue to fall the EYSFF group will need to consider how best to fund early years services and consult on options including whether to reduce the 3 and 4 year olds pass-through rate. This will be considered by EYSFF group in summer 2020 as this is when January 2020 census data is made available, and the effect on the early years DSG settlement can be assessed.

**Appendix 1 - Overall allocation of the £14.2 million**

Original School Budgets (3/4 year olds)	<b>£3,751,315</b>
DSG Contingency to issue for FSM (50)	<b>£21,850</b>
PVI allocations (3/4 year olds)	<b>£8,638,152</b>
	<b>£12,411,316</b>
Portage	<b>£76,146</b>
SEN Support Plus	<b>£50,000</b>
Vulnerable 2-year olds (-)	<b>£0</b>
2-year old hourly rates (all settings)	<b>£1,367,679</b>
Early Years Pupil Premium	<b>£127,133</b>
Mtd Nursery School protection	<b>£69,953</b>
Disability Access Funding	<b>£41,205</b>
Contingency	<b>£35,455</b>
Early Years SENCo	<b>£35,000</b>
	<b>£1,802,571</b>
	<b>£14,213,887</b>

**Appendix 2 – Early Years Settlement 2020 -21 and comparison to 2019 - 20**

	Value	Census Nos 2020/21	2020/21 Total	Total		2019/20 Total	Total
Early Years Block 15 hr offer 3 & 4	£4.38	3,276.05	£8,178,987		£4.30 x 3,182.29	£7,799,805	
Early Years Block extended 15 hr offer 3 & 4	£4.38	1,743.79	£4,353,547		£4.30 x 1,516.14	£3,716,067	
Early Years 2 year old	£5.36	472.33	£1,443,063		£5.28 x 523.63	£1,575,927	
Early Years Pupil Premium			£127,133			£129,117	
Early Years Disability Access Fund			£41,205			£34,440	
Nursery School Protection			£69,953	<b>£14,213,888</b>		£57,456	<b>£13,312,812</b>

## Membership

Membership with differentiated voting rights ~ Total Membership of 27, of whom 23 are entitled to vote on funding formula issues								
Tenure ends 31 August 2020								
Sector Representation (23)	Appointed by the Council following election by:	Member	Dates and Attendance					
			14 January 2020	24 March 2020	23 June 2020	13 October 2020		
Maintained Nursery School Senior Staff (1)	Primary Headteachers Group	Jane Wilkie (JaneW)	P					
Special School Staff (1)	Special School Headteachers Group	Maureen Brettell (MBr)	A					
Special School Governor (1)	Governors Forum	Mike Frost (MF)	P					
PRU (1)	PRU Management Board	Sam Rigby-White (SRW)	P					
UTC (1)	UTC	Lee Barber (LB)	X					
Academy Secondary (6)	Academy Schools	Gwyn Williams (GW)	P					
		Tim Long (TL)	P					
		John Carlin (JC)	P					
		Bev Scott-Herron (BSH)	P					
		Jon Wright (JonW)	A					
	Governors Forum	Vacant	-					
Academy Primary (3)	Academy Schools	Craig Burgess (CB)	P					
		Cath Cooke (CC)	P					
		Gary Cunningham (GC)	P					
Maintained Primary School Sector (6)	WAPH (3)	Jacqui Wightman (JacquiW)	P					
		Lesley McGann (LM)	P					
		Lyndsey Glass (LG)	P					
	Governors Forum (3)	David Hart (DH)	A					
		Janet Lazarus (JL)	P					
		Hazel Coen (HC)	A					
Maintained Secondary School Sector (2)	WASCL (2)	Chris Hunt (CH)	P					
		Ed McGlinchey (EM)	P					
Private Voluntary and Independent Providers (1)	PVI Providers Forum	Vacant	-					

Representing	Member	Dates and Attendance						
		14 January 2020	24 March 2020	23 June 2020	13 October 2020			
<b><u>Non-Schools Members (4)</u></b>								
Anglican Diocese (1)	Jane Griffiths	A						
Roman Catholic Diocese (1)	Tim Warren (TW)	P						
16-19 Institutions (1)	Vacant	-						
Parent Governor (1)	Vacant	-						

<b>Independent Chair</b>	Maureen Banner (MBa)	P						
--------------------------	----------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Representing		14 January 2020	24 March 2020	23 June 2020	13 October 2020			
<b><u>Warrington Borough Council</u></b>								
Head of Service Education and SEND	Melissa Young (MY)	P						
Finance Manager	James Campbell (JC)	P						
Senior Accountant (Schools)	Garry Bradbury (GB)	A						
Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services	Cllr Matt Smith (CllrMS)	P						

**Key**

P ~ Present

S ~ Substitute

A ~ Apologies

- ~ Vacancy

X ~ Absent with no apologies

O ~ Observer

**Trades Union**

Laura Watson

(NASUWT)

**Presenting Item:**

Paula Worthington

Director, Early Help, Education and SEND, WBC (Item 10)

Shelley Gerrard

WBC (Item 2)

Helen Fleming

WBC (Item 3)

**Apologies**

Shaun Everett

(NEU)

**Minutes:**

Gill Sykes



	<i>Item</i>	<b>Action</b>
1.	<p><b>Apologies and welcome</b></p> <p>The chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted. Cllr Matt Smith (portfolio holder for Children’s Services) was welcomed to Schools Forum.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Revised Early Years Report</b></p> <p>Shelley Gerrard (SG) presented the report to the forum on behalf of Andrea Riley, and key points were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to the Inclusion Panel – being held monthly for children identified as requiring additional support. It is the route for health and the LA to fulfil their respective responsibilities and identify children at the earliest opportunity, making sure children are school ready.</li> <li>• Settings can refer into the panel, and support packages can be identified to meet the needs of the child, and these will be reviewed and monitored.</li> </ul> <p>Questions/comments were invited from the chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG asked how this panel is different from before, is it the provision map? SG noted that the CDC had previously been directing some of the work, but this is now being addressed through the panel. Although the panel has not significantly changed, work has been done to align it with the EHCP Panel so there is a seamless flow. Some of the EHCP team will sit on the Inclusion Panel.</li> <li>• Noted that there used to be referrals for outreach at Sandy Lane, but now referrals go directly to the Panel and they decide if it is appropriate for outreach at Sandy Lane, an Educational Psychologist or for the two new SEND workers to pick up.</li> <li>• The Inclusion Panel is more of a triage approach, and referral is via the MARS form.</li> <li>• LG queried (2.3 of report) how it has been evidenced that as a result of Portage parents understand how to communicate with their child better. SG noted that this is received on the Portage feedback sheets.</li> <li>• JaneW referred to Table 1, and noted that it would be useful to have the Summer 2019 spend.</li> <li>• JaneW asked for a forecast of 1 year olds going to be turning 2 years in order to look at budgets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Shelley Gerrard to provide a forecast of how many 2 year olds may be eligible for funding next year.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG asked if some of the contingency money could be set aside for (a) a person to check free school meal eligibility, and (b) if any free school meals need to be paid for.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: JC will take this request back to Garry Bradbury for discussion at the EY Funding Formula Group meeting.</b></p> <p>Schools Forum is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Note the report. <b>NOTED</b></li> <li>(ii) Note that funding for 2021 will be discussed at single funding formula meeting and reported back to schools forum in March. <b>NOTED</b></li> </ul>	<p>SG</p> <p>JC/GB</p>

	<i>Item</i>	Action
3.	<p><b>Facilities Time Agreement</b></p> <p>Helen Fleming presented her report to the forum, and noted that at the last Schools Forum it was agreed for the underspend to be carried forward into 2020/21. This updated report is now provided to propose the recalculated per pupil contribution rate for trades union facilities time in 2020/21.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Taking into account the carry forward, it is therefore proposed that Schools Forum agree, on behalf of the maintained school sector to de-delegate £1.62 per pupil for the purposes of teacher trade union facility time in 2020/21. Participating academies will be asked to contribute at the same rate. <b>AGREED</b></li> <li>(ii) This reduced rate will apply only to those schools that have supported and contributed to the shared facilities time arrangements historically. Any new schools wishing to participate in the scheme moving forward will be invited to join at the historical rate of £3.67 per pupil. <b>AGREED</b></li> </ul> <p>Over the next 12 months the £3.67 per pupil rate will be reviewed. Other local authorities will be contacted to compare the figures they use, and a report will come back to Schools Forum (possibly October 2020) to consider whether this is the right figure or if it needs to change.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Free School Meals</b></p> <p>Melissa Young presented the report on behalf of Ellen Parry, and noted that the service is facing financial challenge. We need to cover the cost of free school meals, and a decision has been made to increase the cost to offset the increases in staffing and food costs. This will mean a change in the amount of funding the LA needs to take from maintained schools' budget allocations with effect from 1 April 2020.</p> <p>CC noted that there are implications for different schools, which might mean significant costs to some schools. MY informed that Ellen Parry will meet with Garry Bradbury to map out the costs, and if untenable for some schools due to their demographic, we may have to consider a cap. CC asked if schools are aware of this change, and informed that she will mention it at the full WAPH meeting on Thursday.</p> <p><b>Action: MY to ask Ellen Parry to email all schools (primaries and secondaries) to inform of the funding change for free school meals.</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that the amount per meal was kept at the old rate of £1.86 instead of £2.30, and maintained schools will have retained funding that should have been used to feed children. Noted that academy schools are already paying the full amount of £2.30 per meal. More investigation is needed about why the old rate of £1.86 was used, and a request was made for an update at the next Schools Forum for an understanding of discrepancies in the budget.</p> <p><b>Action: MY to follow up with Garry Bradbury for an update at the next Schools Forum.</b></p>	<p>MY</p> <p>MY</p>

	<i>Item</i>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>Recommendation from the report:</p> <p>(i) Schools Forum is asked to note the change to funding being given to the School Meals Service to fund free school meals for eligible children in mainstream schools. <b>NOTED</b></p>	
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising</b></p> <p>The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting and noted that matters arising had been addressed.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Schools Forum Membership</b></p> <p>Discussion took place about the changes to membership. A number of people have stepped down, and there have been changes to allocation within maintained and academy schools. Andrea Riley will be requesting a volunteer from the PVI sector. MY asked Gwyn Williams to request that a Post 16 rep is nominated at the next WASCL. There is also a long term Parent Governor vacancy that can be from either the primary or secondary sector. MY noted that changes will be made to membership before she leaves.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Consultation outcome and implications for school budgets</b></p> <p>James Campbell presented the report on behalf of Garry Bradbury. The last Schools Forum discussed recent developments for NFF for 2020/21, and asked the Formula Working Group to meet and explore options to be considered in a consultation to schools. Three questions were identified for consultation, (i) Should we have a mobility factor in the formula for 2020/21? (agreed), (ii) if we don't receive enough funding what should be scaled back? (a decision on this was subsequently not required), and (iii) if the settlement is a greater level of funding what are the priorities for distribution? This third question was discussed further in relation to the £934K additional money, and noted the consultation favoured AWPU with lump sum a close second. More schools would benefit from the lump sum but by a smaller amount. A hybrid option was presented with 2/3<sup>rd</sup> through AWPU and the remainder through lump sum.</p> <p>Questions/comments were invited from the chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional funding is headroom which has arisen largely because of the transitional effect of finally moving fully to the new EYFS scoring framework (low prior attainment). Depending on how it is applied, it could inform the minimum funding guarantee in future years – hence we have to be careful not to risk a potential affordability issue.</li> <li>• LG noted that primaries are still working towards the sector minimum MPPFL, whereas secondaries are already receiving MPPFL.</li> <li>• GW noted that Schools Forum had already agreed to stick as close as possible to NFF, and the discussion favouring lump sum was not following the principle of the argument as discussed at the Formula Working Group. We should not just be looking at how many schools benefit.</li> <li>• GW queried what was the point of having a consultation if it was going to be ignored. JC informed that at the time of the consultation we were still waiting for the</li> </ul>	

	<i>Item</i>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>allocations from the government. GC noted that if the consultation could have given the amount of the additional funding, he is confident that the recommendation would have been for lump sum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion took place around a hybrid option.</li> </ul> <p>The forum meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes to allow sector representatives to confer. The meeting reconvened, and proposals were made and seconded for AWPU and lump sum. The votes were counted as 8 for lump sum, and 6 for AWPU, therefore the recommendation for lump sum would be made to the local authority.</p> <p>The secondary sector asked for the minutes to reflect that this decision had gone against the consultation, and they felt the methodology used was hugely weighted towards the primary sector. JC informed that the weighting was school by school.</p> <p>It was noted that this is a recommendation from Schools Forum to the local authority, and ultimately the final decision rests with the local authority.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schools Forum members representing mainstream schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Note the contents of the report; <b>NOTED</b></li> <li>(ii) Agree how the Consultation findings should affect the modification to NFF as it is applied to mainstream school budgeting, and hence individual school allocations, for 2020/21. <b>AGREED FOR LUMP SUM BY 8 VOTES TO 6</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Update to minutes following the meeting:</b></p> <p>The local authority has accepted the recommendation of Schools Forum and the uncommitted funding will be applied as a lump sum increase. In doing so, we recognise that this doesn't just reflect the preference scoring from the Consultation, but it is the option which benefits the greatest number of Warrington schools and, importantly, has least impact on future years' funding decisions because it sits outside the MFG. Many of the comments of those schools citing AWPU as their preferred option regarded it as the fairest option, and this is probably correct were it not for the distorting effect of MFG. If lump sum had been clearly and obviously disregarded by most respondents to the Consultation, the decision may have been taken differently.</p>	
8.	<p><b>DSG funding settlement 2020/21</b></p> <p>James Campbell presented the report on behalf of Garry Bradbury, and noted this report is a follow up with more information. Interesting to note that the overall DSG is £10.7m more than the year before. The EY Block is the only allocation subject to change, everything else stays the same. GB will provide a mid-year report on the EY Block. The High Needs Block has an extra £2.6m, but this will not solve the challenges with high needs.</p> <p>Questions/comments were invited from the chair, but none were forthcoming.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schools Forum members representing mainstream schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Note the contents of the report; <b>NOTED</b></li> </ul>	

	<i>Item</i>	<b>Action</b>
	(ii) Consider the NFF budget figures in the light of this evening's discussion of the autumn funding consultation, and the decision regarding allocation of headroom. <b>NOTED</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>De-delegation agreements</b></p> <p>James Campbell presented the report on behalf of Garry Bradbury and noted that the de-delegation process remains in place for 2020/21. It is important to note that when we transition to a hard formula de-delegations will not be allowed and we will move to individual trading arrangements with schools.</p> <p>The individual de-delegated items are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miscellaneous Licences</li> <li>• CLEAPSS</li> <li>• Free School Meals Assessment</li> <li>• Teachers' Panel and Union Duties</li> <li>• Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Costs</li> </ul> <p>The secondary and primary sectors all agreed to the above de-delegated items. Noted that the trades union facilities time de-delegation was agreed as noted in Item 3.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>(i) It is recommended that representatives from the maintained sectors are asked, for each phase, to decide which funding streams are to be de-delegated for 2020/21. <b>AGREED ALL ITEMS</b></p> <p>(ii) For services not agreed for de-delegation, but for which it is recognised that a demand still exists (either collectively or individually), that Schools Forum suggests an alternative model of remuneration, service delivery, or both. <b>N/A</b></p>	
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Update on High Needs (<i>standing item</i>)</b></p> <p>Paula Worthington informed that the HN budget continues to be challenging. A meeting took place with Ofsted as part of their research on the impact of funding challenges on LAs and schools to deliver an inclusive offer to our pupils. This information will feed into their survey. Noted that some representation has been made into the f40 group around the challenges with funding. Some people may see the additional funding for HN to be a panacea to all our challenges, but it won't.</p> <p>There are some difficult decisions ahead with some of the key services to young people, for example, we have had to make sure the transport policy is fully implemented. There has been some resistance to that due to financial implications and we have made some individualised arrangements (as a one-off) in order to get some young people to school.</p> <p>There is challenge around Post 16 and a report is going to the CEO regarding the transition team and work around creating a clear pipeline so we don't get a bulge Post 16. Noted that some external providers have failed to meet the needs of the children and this has increased the cost by changing provision.</p>	

	<i>Item</i>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>PW offered to provide some of the detail on current practice around key priorities for high needs, and would be guided by the forum about what they wanted to see. Noted that part of the work being done around high needs would be presented at Director’s Briefing. The LA does not want to be the arbiter of budgets at the expense of children’s needs. There are still areas of challenge e.g. health and high needs medical funding. PW noted it might be useful to share the numbers about to be submitted on the SEN2 return to the government. As other LA numbers have creased dramatically, we have remained more or less static.</p> <p>Questions/comments were invited from the chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JacquiW noted that we have better confidence than before that things have been and are being addressed, and we need to know the amounts and the headlines. MY informed that Panel decisions are being scrutinised to see how much we have spent by each sector, and that support is being provided to the right children. We can pass on the reassurance that we are seeing a difference and better outcomes for children and better support. JacquiW noted that it is reassuring that it isn’t just managing demand, it is meeting children’s needs.</li> </ul>	
11.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advance notice was given that the Leader of the Council, Cllr Russ Bowden, Steven Broomhead (CEO) and Cllr Matt Smith are hosting an evening for school leaders/governors to meet with the leaders of the council for dinner and for an opportunity for conversations. It is taking place on 3 February 2020 at 7.00 pm at Halliwell Jones, and there are places for 15-16 people. Anyone who would like to attend should let Paula Worthington know.</li> <li>Maureen Banner (Chair) thanked Melissa Young for her support and interest and commitment as she moves on at the end of the month.</li> </ul>	
12.	<p><b>Meeting schedule for 2020:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24 March 2020</li> <li>23 June 2020</li> <li>13 October 2020</li> </ul> <p>All Tuesdays at 5.15 – 7.00 pm.  <i>(Venue for all meetings – Sir Thomas Boteler CE High School)</i></p>	

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was closed.

### Schools Forum Membership briefing note

The below are specific stipulations regarding Schools Forum membership from the DfE's **Schools Forum Operational and Good Practice Guide** (latest update September 2018)

- No official maximum or minimum size for a Schools Forum. But “care should be taken to keep the Schools Forum to a reasonable size to ensure that it does not become too unwieldy”.
- Schools Forums must have 'schools members', 'academies member(s)' if there is at least one academy in the local authority's area, and 'non-schools members'.
- Schools and academies members together must number at least two-thirds of the total membership of the schools forum
- Balance of representation between maintained primary, maintained secondary and academies members must be broadly proportionate to the pupil numbers in each category
- Where a local authority maintains one or more special schools the schools forum must have at least one schools member from that sector. The same applies to nursery schools and pupil referral units (PRUs).
- Free Schools, University Technical Colleges and Studio Schools are classed as academies for Schools Forum representation.
- There is no distinction between sponsored and converter academies.
- There is no requirement for academies members to be split into primary and secondary sub-groups. However, local authorities may wish to encourage academies to consider the pupil proportions across all academies when electing their representatives.
- For maintained schools groups with more than one Member, there must be at least one headteacher (or their representative) and one governor.
- Warrington's Forum allocation of 17 members to mainstream schools derives from decisions taken in 2007 (at a time when overall pupil numbers were 29,294, and there were no Academies). Current NOR for all mainstream schools is 30,051, which is a level of growth insufficient to justify a change in membership numbers purely on arithmetic.

#### PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THIS GUIDANCE

Current available census numbers (30,051), with 17 'vacancies', results in a mainstream membership profile as below:

Primary (Maintained)	12,484	7.06
Secondary (Maintained)	3,050	1.73
Academy	<u>14,517</u>	8.21
	<u><b>30,051</b></u>	

Clearly, Membership cannot be split in exactly this way, so we would need 7 primary maintained, 2 secondary maintained, and 8 for all Academies. 8 Academies split over phases would be 3 for the primary phase, and 5 for the secondary.

How does current representation (from the Minutes) compare with the guidance?

School Membership of 22 (17 mainstream, 1 maintained nursery, 1 PRU, 2 maintained special schools, 1 PVI) from 26 overall? **OK**

6 Members for maintained primary schools? **One vacancy**

10 Members for Academies (including UTC and Academy Governor 'vacancy')? **Two Representatives too many**

2 Maintained Secondary school Members from WASCL? **Number OK, but one HT needs to be replaced by a Governor.**



# REPORT



**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 7

**Date:** 24 March 2020

**For:** Information

**Title:** Dedicated Schools Grant budgets  
2020/21

**Author:** Garry Bradbury

**Presenter:** Garry Bradbury

## 1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 The purpose of this report is to illustrate how the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for Warrington for 2020/21 has been allocated to individual budgets, and follows previous funding discussion around the Schools Block of DSG (and the resulting mainstream school budgets) at the 14<sup>th</sup> January Schools Forum meeting.

## 2. DSG BLOCK ALLOCATIONS FOR 2020/21

2.1 As has been the case in recent years, DSG settlements were confirmed by ESFA before Christmas (19<sup>th</sup> December 2019), in order to facilitate submission of the local schools funding formula by 17<sup>th</sup> January. This settlement covered all four blocks of DSG (Schools Block, Early Years Block, High Needs Block and Central Services Block). As the final Early Years Block allocation will derive from January 2020 census numbers, this element of the settlement should be considered provisional (it will not be finalised until the Summer). Initially, a Local Authority's allocation includes the budgets for all schools, including Academies, as the LA and Schools Forum collaborate to agree all individual delegations, but the Academy element is subsequently deducted (recouped) from the overall funding received by the Education & Skills Funding Agency (ESFA), and given to those settings directly.

2.2 The DSG Block allocations are shown in the table overleaf, with the previous year equivalents for comparison.

	<i>£ value</i>	<i>Census Nos</i>	<i>Total</i>	<b>2020/21 DSG</b>	<i>2019/20 DSG</i>	<i>Total</i>	
Schools Block (Primary)	£4,108.26	17,782	£73,053,080		£3,942.67 x 17,894	£70,550,137	
Schools Block (Secondary)	£5,190.27	12,268	£63,674,232		£4,975.14 x 11,930	£59,350,933	
Rates funding (17/18 levels)			£1,420,549			£1,420,549	
Split Site Funding (17/18 levels)			£297,000			£297,000	
Growth Funding			£993,074	<b>£139,437,936</b>		£631,352	£132,249,971
Early Years Block 15 hr offer 3 & 4	£4.38	3,276.05	£8,178,987		£4.30 x 3,182.29	£7,799,805	
Early Years Block extended 15 hr offer 3 & 4	£4.38	1,743.79	£4,353,547		£4.30 x 1,516.14	£3,716,067	
Early Years 2 year old	£5.36	472.33	£1,443,063		£5.28 x 523.63	£1,575,927	
Early Years Pupil Premium			£127,133			£129,117	
Early Years Disability Access Fund			£41,205			£34,440	
Nursery School Protection			£69,953	<b>£14,213,888</b>		£57,456	£13,312,812
High Needs Block				<b>£22,922,575</b>		£20,277,804	
Central Services Block	£30.26	30,050	£909,313	<b>£909,313</b>	£29.69 x 29,824	£885,475	
<b>Total DSG (before recoupments for Academies, and deductions for High Needs Places)</b>				<b>£177,483,712</b>		<b>£166,726,062</b>	

2.3 While the use of the Schools and Early Years blocks are clear and reasonably straightforward - mainstream school budgets, and (mostly) EY hourly rates respectively, the demands upon the High Needs and Central Services blocks (for convenience, we generally treat the two together) are many and wide-ranging, encompassing all activities not considered mainstream or pre-school. This includes, though is not limited to:

- Additional Support/SEN top-ups for students in mainstream settings.
- Part funding of designated/resourced provisions (added to the mainstream elements)

- Delegated budgets of special schools
- Medical and therapy costs
- Specialist support placements (pre & post-16) outside the LA, or at non-maintained special schools nationwide, or Alternative Provision (including Pupil Referral Unit and the Rainbow unit at Sandy Lane Nursery & Forest School)
- Inclusion & Access
- Additional needs support, generally
- Servers & licences (Central Services)

2.4 Schools Block of £139,437,936 has been allocated as below, using the National Funding Formula (NFF) as the basis for calculation, with additional headroom allocated following a Borough-wide schools' consultation:

	<i>LA Schools</i>	<i>Academies</i>
Primary school mainstream budgets	£52,618,415	£21,900,388
Secondary school mainstream budgets	£15,865,956	£49,053,175
<b>TOTAL MAINSTREAM BUDGETS</b>	<b>£68,484,371</b>	<b>£70,953,563</b>

Roundings £2

These figures represent the maintained/Academy profile as at end-March 2020. The recoupment from LA allocations, currently £71m, changes iteratively to reflect in-year conversions.

The formula framework for Warrington school budgets was approved by the ESFA on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

Total individual school budgets, including the mainstream Schools Block funding, as above, additions for Element 3 top-ups, funding for Designated Provision and notional allocations for nursery classes, are shown in **Appendix 1**. Also shown are the agreed budgetary deductions for dedelegated services and free school meals, where appropriate.

Schools have been provided with a Funding Pack which gives greater depth, detail and explanation of the funding process, and the calculation methodology used for school budgets for 2020/21.

2.5 Early Years Block of £14,213,888 has been allocated as overleaf. All settings are now funded at a universal rate, £5.08/hour for 2 year olds, and £4.33/hour for 3 & 4 year olds:

Maintained Nursery Classes	£2,341,886
Academy Nursery Classes	£1,113,257
Sandy Lane Early Years	£296,172
Maintained Nursery School protection	£69,953
EYPP/DAF	£168,338
Private, Voluntary, Independent, Academies	£8,638,152
Contribution to EY Free School Meals	£21,850
<b>TOTAL EARLY YEARS (3 &amp; 4 Year old)</b>	<b>£12,649,608</b>

Maintained Nursery Classes	£264,383
Academy Nursery Classes	£106,677
Sandy Lane Nursery	£39,975
Private, Voluntary, Independent	£956,644
Portage	£76,146
SEN Support Plus	£50,000
SENCo	£35,000
<b>TOTAL EARLY YEARS (2 Year old)</b>	<b>£1,528,825</b>

**Contingency** **£35,455**

**TOTAL EARLY YEARS BLOCK** **£14,213,888**

Funding of free school meals for mainstream nursery attendees was a new commitment starting 2019/20. Local Authorities do not receive funding for this, and the agreement to absorb this within the central Early Years block removes the burden of cost for schools. The earmarked allocation is sufficient for an average of 50 children taking a meal each day.

- 2.6 Compared to 2019/20, the High Needs Block settlement has increased by £2.6m following an announcement of additional funding before the election (with an additional £24K for Central Services). The table overleaf illustrates where we have varied the resulting allocations, responding to likely changes in demand, or recognising where some of the cost avoidance work may prove effective. Even with this additional funding, we still anticipate a shortfall, albeit a small one. Aspirationally (ie at DfE suggestion), the additional allocations were to be partly used to begin to eliminate Authorities' aggregated deficits in High Needs; such a usage is not immediately possible in Warrington's case, given the immediate pressures faced.

	<b>HN/CS BLOCKS 2020/21</b>	<b>HN/CS BLOCKS 2019/20</b>	<b>Change</b>
Hospital & Medical Education, per grant	£339,816	£314,640	£25,176
EOTAS/Home Tuition	£248,534	£273,710	-£25,176
Inter-authority recoupment	£400,000	£250,000	£150,000
Sensory Support Team	£164,000	£183,000	-£19,000
Independent Special School Fees	£3,900,000	£3,700,000	£200,000
Post-16 High Needs	£3,443,273	£2,700,000	£743,273
In-year high cost SEN top-ups (Element 3)	£450,000	£500,000	-£50,000
HN top-ups (Element 3) in base budgets (Primary)	£1,077,020	£1,135,883	-£58,863
HN top-ups (Element 3) in base budgets (Secondary)	£569,075	£498,927	£70,148
Designated Provision (Primary) - Place plus Top-Ups	£642,553	£1,328,214	-£685,661
Designated Provision (Academy Top-Ups)	£807,514	£477,910	£329,604
Special Schools Base Budgets	£6,379,340	£5,987,143	£392,197
Sandy Lane Outreach SLA	£25,000	£75,000	-£50,000
ESFA Places deduction	£1,895,512	£1,866,000	£29,512
Central Licences ESFA (copyright)	£159,456	£145,186	£14,270
Servers / CareFirst	£115,000	£100,000	£15,000
Non-mainstream schools' FSM contribution	£30,000	£50,000	-£20,000
Schools Block contribution		-£533,984	£533,984
Predicted shortfall	-£85,888	-£1,160,047	£1,074,159

**£2,668,623**

The deficit of £85,888 is purely the anticipated gap over the course of 2020/21. To this position must be added the accrued deficit at year end 2019/20, estimated at present as an additional £2.1 million. Clearly, difficult choices remain to be made, in spite of the welcome addition to funding.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 It is recommended that Schools Forum note the contents of the report and the financial position on High Needs.



Code	School	Per pupil Funding	Deprivation Funding	Low Prior Attainment	English as Additional Language	Mobility	Lump Sum	Rates & Other Premises Costs	NFF BASIC TOTAL 2020/21	Sector Minimum Adjustment	Minimum Funding Guarantee	TOTAL 2020/21 Schools Block	Element 3 SEN Top-Up	Designated Provision	Indicative Nursery Allocation	TOTAL 2020/21 BUDGET	Dedeedgated Funding	Primary Sector Free Meals clawback	NET 2020/21 BUDGET
Academ	Alderman Bolton Community Primary School	£751,243	£192,836	£122,599	£13,072	£2,880	£129,578	£5,476	£1,217,684	£0	£18,198	£1,235,881	£15,986		£150,572	£1,402,439			£1,402,439
Academ	Beaumont Community Primary	£1,046,579	£222,824	£155,508	£31,078	£0	£129,578	£6,354	£1,591,921	£0	£6,042	£1,597,962	£43,000		£184,785	£1,825,748			£1,825,748
Academ	Broomfields Junior School	£1,009,304	£67,636	£100,040	£1,611	£0	£129,578	£5,786	£1,313,955	£11,831	£0	£1,325,786	£21,320			£1,347,105			£1,347,105
Academ	Bruche Primary School	£613,611	£57,360	£56,247	£3,122	£0	£129,578	£3,322	£863,240	£0	£0	£863,240	£6,000		£100,448	£969,687			£969,687
Academ	Burtonwood Community Primary School	£582,070	£49,637	£68,982	£626	£0	£129,578	£3,322	£834,215	£0	£7,821	£842,035	£11,775			£853,810			£853,810
Academ	Chapelford Village Primary School	£1,597,108	£72,624	£158,259	£16,133	£0	£129,578	£10,849	£1,984,551	£115,048	£0	£2,099,599	£45,476			£2,145,075			£2,145,075
Academ	Croft Primary School	£593,539	£17,398	£54,056	£1,256	£0	£129,578	£3,867	£799,694	£0	£23,841	£823,535	£19,000			£842,535			£842,535
Academ	Evelyn Street Primary School	£805,723	£130,479	£92,213	£14,704	£0	£129,578	£3,246	£1,175,943	£0	£181,124	£1,357,067	£14,492		£112,390	£1,483,949			£1,483,949
Academ	Glazebury CE (Aided) Primary School	£260,928	£24,117	£21,757	£1,192	£3,987	£129,578	£2,782	£444,341	£0	£24,146	£468,486	£0		£59,260	£527,746			£527,746
Academ	Gorse Covert Primary School	£794,253	£48,841	£73,105	£8,396	£0	£129,578	£6,716	£1,060,889	£0	£0	£1,060,888	£4,500			£1,065,388			£1,065,388
Academ	Great Sankey Primary School	£897,477	£32,794	£59,419	£4,390	£0	£129,578	£8,731	£1,132,389	£50,093	£0	£1,182,482	£13,000		£163,740	£1,359,222			£1,359,222
Academ	H/Green St Helen's CE (Aided) Primary School	£381,356	£18,482	£40,063	£0	£0	£129,578	£3,088	£572,567	£0	£18,122	£590,688	£8,074			£598,762			£598,762
Academ	Meadowside Community Primary School	£648,019	£202,500	£141,870	£12,382	£0	£129,578	£3,573	£1,137,922	£0	£61,505	£1,199,426	£34,445	£199,698	£110,156	£1,543,724			£1,543,724
Academ	Oakwood Avenue Community Primary School	£1,789,220	£366,578	£269,572	£4,368	£0	£129,578	£8,317	£2,567,633	£0	£0	£2,567,632	£9,000	£303,170	£219,896	£3,099,698			£3,099,698
Academ	Park Road Community Primary School	£596,407	£19,044	£49,265	£1,882	£0	£129,578	£3,020	£799,196	£0	£13,853	£813,048	£7,492			£820,540			£820,540
Academ	Penketh Primary School	£556,264	£16,067	£55,974	£0	£0	£129,578	£3,347	£761,230	£0	£6,603	£767,832	£13,441			£781,273			£781,273
Academ	Penketh South Community Primary School	£573,468	£26,140	£54,072	£1,249	£1,756	£129,578	£3,674	£789,937	£0	£13,508	£803,445	£7,172		£118,688	£929,304			£929,304
Academ	Westbrook Old Hall Primary School	£1,060,916	£62,110	£85,811	£12,340	£0	£129,578	£6,819	£1,357,574	£36,745	£0	£1,394,319	£32,000			£1,426,319			£1,426,319
Academ	Woolston Community Primary School	£633,682	£43,151	£78,739	£3,747	£0	£129,578	£6,251	£895,148	£0	£11,889	£907,036	£12,836	£214,736		£1,134,609			£1,134,609
Academ	Beaumont Collegiate Academy	£3,947,874	£885,895	£369,700	£17,343	£0	£129,578	£24,280	£5,374,670	£0	£0	£5,374,669	£43,997			£5,418,666			£5,418,666
Academ	Birchwood Community High School	£3,347,896	£448,943	£272,396	£17,343	£0	£129,578	£32,546	£4,248,701	£0	£0	£4,248,701	£24,015			£4,272,716			£4,272,716
Academ	Bridgewater High School	£6,596,066	£284,166	£329,688	£11,577	£0	£129,578	£327,479	£7,678,552	£413,927	£0	£8,092,479	£66,387	£407,144		£8,566,010			£8,566,010
Academ	Great Sankey High School	£7,252,391	£269,817	£402,747	£20,268	£0	£129,578	£50,369	£8,125,170	£495,199	£0	£8,620,369	£42,975			£8,663,344			£8,663,344
Academ	King's Leadership Academy	£2,742,248	£128,718	£144,245	£4,336	£0	£129,578	£34,871	£3,183,995	£90,876	£0	£3,274,871	£16,989			£3,291,860			£3,291,860
Academ	Lymm High School	£6,515,305	£233,975	£312,948	£7,235	£0	£129,578	£44,686	£7,243,727	£475,959	£0	£7,719,686	£69,942			£7,789,628			£7,789,628
Academ	Padgate Academy Warrington	£2,061,073	£484,116	£238,196	£28,632	£6,009	£129,578	£14,981	£2,962,585	£0	£0	£2,962,586	£48,394	£134,076		£3,145,056			£3,145,056
Academ	Penketh High School	£3,739,381	£411,565	£269,874	£7,284	£0	£129,578	£20,871	£4,578,553	£0	£0	£4,578,553	£50,495	£178,768		£4,807,816			£4,807,816
Academ	Sir Thomas Boteler CE High School	£2,356,430	£460,482	£243,833	£23,290	£0	£129,578	£16,841	£3,230,454	£0	£0	£3,230,454	£97,909	£156,422		£3,484,785			£3,484,785
Academ	UTC Warrington	£617,964	£92,741	£50,990	£1,445	£51,424	£129,578	£6,664	£950,806	£0	£0	£950,807	£11,997			£962,804			£962,804
		£103,088,012	£10,254,635	£9,129,380	£735,426	£110,895	£10,625,359	£1,717,545	£135,661,252	£2,801,871	£974,811	£139,437,934	£1,646,095	£2,392,095	£3,786,228	£147,262,352	£526,750	£908,086	£145,827,515