

## Warrington Schools Forum - Agenda

---

**Date:** 22 March 2022

**Time:** 4.30 pm – 6.30 pm

**Venue:** via Microsoft Teams

Item	Enc / Verbal	Decision; Discussion; Information	Entitled to vote	Lead
1. Apologies and Welcome				Chair
2. Annual audit report	Enc	Information		Simon Bleckly
3. EYSFF proposal from Working Group	Enc	Information and decision		Shelley Gerrard/ Lorna Davies
4. Minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising	Enc			Chair
5. Membership confirmation	Verbal	Information		Chair
6. High Needs budget and special school review update	Enc	Information		Louise Atkin/ Kellie Williams
7. School budget confirmations	Enc	Information		Garry Bradbury
8. AOB				Chair

### Meeting schedule for 2022:

- 21 June 2022
- 11 October 2022

All Tuesdays at 5.15 – 7.00 pm unless held virtually and will then start at 4.30 pm  
(Venue or virtual arrangements TBC)

# REPORT

WARRINGTON  
Borough Council



**Report to:** Schools Forum

**Item:** 2

**Date:** 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2022

**For:** Information

**Title:** Review of School Audits 2020  
and 2021

**Author:** Simon Bleckly

**Presenter:** Simon Bleckly

---

---

# Internal Audit Service

---

## REVIEW OF SCHOOLS AUDITS 2020 and 2021

**MARCH 2022**

Internal Audit  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor One Time Square  
Warrington  
WA1 2EN

**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>4</b>
<b>5. The Audit testing programme, 2022/23</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. Reducing the risk of fraud in schools</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. Conclusion and audit opinion on schools’ systems of internal control</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendix One: Assurance opinions and risk definitions for schools reports</b>	<b>7</b>

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the main findings from the school audits carried out by Internal Audit since the start of 2020 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.

COVID has had a significant impact on the ability of the Internal Audit service to carry out school reviews in the past two years. In 2020, all visits were suspended in line with the guidance to work from home, and there has been limited scope to resume the programme since then. A significant amount of audit resource has been required to support the various grant schemes put in place to support businesses and individuals, and audit work has had to focus on key financial systems to ensure that temporary arrangements put in place during the pandemic, plus the move to more remote working, have not generated significant financial risks to the authority.

## 2. MAIN FINDINGS - AUDITS

In light of the issues identified above, only five schools have been audited since the last report to Schools Forum in March 2020. 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, 2018/19 to 2021/22 (to date)

	18/19	19/20	20/21 and 21/22	Total
High	0	1	0	1
Substantial	6	7	5	18
Limited	1	0	0	1
Minimal	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>

The table below summarises the number of recommendations made in 2020/21 and 2021/22, by priority, in each area of the schools testing programme.

### Recommendations made in school audits in 2020/21 and 2021/22 to date

	Critical	High	Medium
Leadership & governance	0	0	12
Financial management and control	0	0	19
Orders and payments	0	0	6
Bank imprest and petty cash	0	0	3
People management	0	0	7
Income and banking	0	0	6
Asset and security management	0	0	7
Unofficial funds	0	0	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67</b>

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 there were no High priority recommendations in the schools that we have audited since the start of the pandemic.

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.
  - Appropriate checks undertaken to determine the IR35 status of workers providing a service to the school.
  - 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.
  - Debit card transactions to be coded online on a timely basis ensuring that balances do not build up on the holding account.
  - Adequate documentary evidence to be retained confirming that income prepared for banking has been subject to independent verification.
  - 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.

### **Other work – BACS controls in schools**

In 2021, we carried out a review of the BACS payment process for schools using Bankline, in response to an incident where the same BACS file was accessed and authorised by two schools, resulting in duplicate payments to suppliers. The review covered:

- establishing how this incident occurred,
- reviewing the arrangements in place at schools for processing electronic payments,
- assessing the controls within the system, and
- confirming the details of action taken to resolve the issue and to safeguard against any future occurrence

A number of recommendations were made in the report to improve the control environment, including update of the guidelines covering school electronic payments, the introduction of a formal checklist process and the changing of some permissions in the Bankline system to prevent one school from being able to authorise another school's BACS files.

### **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.

- Some concerns around the new requirements for recording related party transactions as part of the completion of the Schools Financial Value Standard. Concerns that the guidance from DfE lacked clarity and may leave schools unclear as to whether they are recording the transactions properly.

- 
- Concerns around the mechanisms for ensuring that traded services bought externally meet the required quality standards, for example facilities management, HR, Insurance and IT / Information Governance.
  - Difficulties in managing and authorising purchases when site managers hold procurement or trade cards.
  - There is a demand for better electronic solutions in respect of authorisation processes. Many authorisations are currently provided by email and generate document retention and storage requirements.
  - Inappropriate use of school funds, particularly in relation to gifts and hospitality.

#### **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.

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 have audited recently.

#### **5. THE AUDIT TESTING PROGRAMME, 2022/23**

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. For 2022/23, the programme has been amended to cover testing of controls around related party transactions.

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. In its response to the consultation, the government decided not to place a minimum audit cycle on maintained schools. We are aware that the pandemic has further exacerbated the delays in our audit cycle for schools, with a number of schools not having been reviewed for several years.

We have now recommenced in-person school audits, but existing resource constraints will make it difficult for us to catch up on outstanding reviews. We will continue to review the testing programme to make it more efficient, so that we can cover more schools each year with the same resource.

We have completed the planning process for 2022/23, 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 pre-pandemic levels.

## 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:

- Producing fake documents detailing that the headteacher was not fit to work.
- Falsifying cheques and invoices.
- 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.

Although not a fraud, a recent case involved an IT technician who was fired by his school and subsequently carried out a cyber attack, wiping out data and changing staff passwords.

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 or employees, requesting that their bank account details be changed (known as diversion frauds).
- 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.
- Emails hacked to allow access to email accounts containing bank details for payments, then used to generate false information in support of a claim for payment.

Since the start of the pandemic, there has been an increase nationally in the number of attempted payroll and payments diversion frauds, and they have become increasingly sophisticated. Fraudsters are using social media to identify working relationships in order to make their requests seem more plausible, and they may make contact more than once, establishing a relationship with staff; sometimes asking to change their email address initially before subsequently using the new address to make a diversion attempt.

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.

The Head of Audit chairs the Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally Operational Group. This consists of representatives of the various regional counter fraud groups in operation in local government around the country. A Working Group has been set up to review the fraud risks relating

---

to schools and to develop material to support fraud awareness. On completion, we will circulate this material via My School Services.

## **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, have identified no significant risks or control issues that would require disclosure in the Council's Annual Governance Statement. However, we acknowledge the fact that restrictions imposed by the pandemic and by the level of resource available mean that we have been unable to review the majority of Warrington schools in this period.

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, subject to the limitation in scope imposed by the number of schools that we have been able to audit, 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**  
**Head of Audit, Risk & Insurance**  
**Warrington Borough Council**  
**March 2022**

---

## 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.

---



**2.4** This proposal, below, enables the LA to maintain commitments for Early Years SEND Support (Portage), Early Years SEND Inclusion Fund, Early Years SENDCO, Free school Meals.

**2.5**

<b>Early Years Block</b>	<b>Indicative Funding 2022/23</b>
Notional School Budgets (3/4 year olds)	£3,493,530
DSG Contingency to issue for FSM (50 @ £2.34)	£22,230
Notional PVI allocations (3/4 year olds)	£8,162,364
EY SEND Support	£30,000
SEND Support PLUS	£50,000
Outreach	£35,000
Area SENCO	£60,000
2 year entitlement (all setting £5.25)	£1,342,765
Early years pupil premium	£99,533
Disability access fund	£60,800
maintained nursery schools	£56,613
Contingency	£84,918
<b>Total</b>	<b>£13,505,745</b>

**2.6** Once the recalculation takes place from the January 2022 census, it will be used to inform the new funding allocation for the whole of the 2022-23 financial year. However because the census actually takes place during the 2021-22 financial year, an after-the-event adjustment is made to this financial year as well, even though accounts relating to it have been closed. The approach taken by the DfE is to take the census numbers from January 2022 to be representative of the situation between autumn 2021 and year-end (7 months).

### **3.0 FUNDING DURING SPRING TERM 2022**

- 3.1** Normally childcare providers are funded based on children who are currently accessing their provision and they are asked to only include children who are accessing their provision in census week on the early years census return.
- 3.2** The DfE issued guidance on 14/01/2022 entitled “coronavirus related support for submitting Early Years census 2022 return”. This gave instruction on what providers could claim in-light of the disruption caused by the coronavirus.
- 3.3** The DfE stated that where a child is reasonably expected to attend Early Years provision, (and that provision is made available to them by the provider) their expected hours should be recorded in the Early Years census. This means children (who were it not for the impact of coronavirus on either their own personal circumstances or on the operation of their early years setting) would be attending early years provision. This includes children who have previously attended the provision and children who were expected to start attending the provision in January 2022.

- 3.4** The DfE stated that where a setting has had to temporarily close due to coronavirus they should still make a census return for 2022, recording the contracted/expected hours provided. This can include where the provider has attempted to remain open but has temporarily closed for a period of time, or has had to temporarily restrict access for some children.
- 3.5** Warrington agreed to fund children in line with this new guidance and encouraged providers to add children to their census return where their circumstances met those described in the new guidance document.
- 4.0** **RECOMMENDATIONS:**
- 4.1** Schools Forum ratify the proposed funding allocation for 2022/23.
- 4.2** Following the validated 2022 census, a further report on this funding will be presented to Schools Forum.

## Warrington Schools Forum

Minutes – 11 January 2022 (Held via Teams – due to Covid-19)

Draft to be confirmed March 2022

### Membership

Membership with differentiated voting rights ~ Total Membership of 26, of whom 22 are entitled to vote on funding formula issues										
Sector Representation (22)	Appointed by the Council following election by:	Member	Dates and Attendance							
			19 January 2021	23 March 2021 CANCELLED	22 June 2021	12 October 2021	11 January 2022	22 March 2022	21 June 2022	11 October 2022
Maintained Nursery School Senior Staff (1)	Primary Headteachers Group	Marcia Atherton (MA)	P	C	P	P	P			
Special School Staff (1)	Special School Headteachers Group	Lucinda Duffy (LD)	P	C	P	P	P			
Special School Governor (1)	Governors Forum	Mike Frost (MF)	P	C	P	P	P			
PRU (1)	PRU Management Board	Lindsay Regan (LR)	A	C	P	P	A			
Academy – all phases (8)  Agreed this should be: (5 secondary including UTC) (3 primary)	Academy Schools	Gwyn Williams (GW)	P	C	P	A	P			
		Tim Long (TL)	P	C	A	A	P			
		John Carlin (JC)	P	C	A	A	P			
		Jon Wright (JonW)	P	C	S	A	A			
		Gary Cunningham (GC)	P	C	P	P	P			
		Paula Warding (PWa)	P	C	P	P	P			
		Cath Cooke (CC)	P	C	P	P	P			
	UTC	Chris Hatherall (CH) <i>(from 22 June 2021)</i>	X	C	P	P	P			
Maintained Primary School Sector (7)	WAPH and Governors Forum	Siobhan Bentley (SB) <i>(from 11 January 2022)</i>	P	C	P	-	P			
		Kathryn Berry (KB) <i>(from 12 October 2021)</i>	A	C	A	P	P			
		Zoe Jones (ZJ) <i>(from 11 January 2022)</i>	P	C	P	-	P			
		Ian Moss (IM)	P	C	A	P	P			
		Janet Lazarus (JL) <i>Governor</i>	P	C	P	P	P			
		Craig Burgess (CB) <i>Governor</i>	P	C	A	P	P			
		Donna Kendal (DK) <i>Governor</i>	P	C	A	A	P			
Maintained Secondary School Sector (2)	WASCL	Chris Hunt (CH)	A	C	P	P	P			
		Ed McGlinchey (EM)	X	C	A	A	A			
Private Voluntary and Independent Providers (1)	PVI Providers Forum	Kelda Willians (KW)	X	C	X	P	P			

Representing	Member	Dates and Attendance							
		19 January 2021	23 March 2021 CANCELLED	22 June 2021	12 October 2021	11 January 2022	22 March 2022	21 June 2022	11 October 2022
<b><u>Non-Schools Members (4)</u></b>									
Anglican Diocese (1)	Jane Griffiths (JG)	P	C	P	A	A			
Roman Catholic Diocese (1)	Chris Williams (CW)	A	C	X	A	A			
16-19 Institutions (1)	Damian McGuire (DM)	P	C	P	P	P			
Parent Governor (1)	Vacant	-	-	-	-	-			

<b>Independent Chair</b>	Maureen Banner (MB)	P	C	P	A	A			
--------------------------	---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--

Representing		19 January 2021	23 March 2021 CANCELLED	22 June 2021	12 October 2021	11 January 2022	22 March 2022	21 June 2022	11 October 2022
<b><u>Warrington Borough Council</u></b>									
Director, Early Help, Education and SEND	Paula Worthington (PWo)	P	C	P	A	P			
Head of Service – Quality Education and Learning	Louise Atkin (LA)	P	C	P	P	P			
Finance Manager	James Campbell (JC)	P	C	P	P	P			
Senior Accountant (Schools)	Garry Bradbury (GB)	P	C	P	A	P			
Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services	Cllr Sarah Hall <i>(from 22 June 2021)</i>	A	C	A	P	A			

### **Key**

**P** ~ Present

**S** ~ Substitute

**A** ~ Apologies

- ~ Vacancy

**X** ~ Absent with no apologies

**O** ~ Observer

**C** – Meeting cancelled

### **Trades Union**

Laura Watson (NASUWT)

Lucie Humphreys (NEU)

### **Presenting Item**

Helen Fleming (Presenting Item 2)

Jenny Owen (Presenting Item 3)

Lorna Davies (Presenting Item 4)

Kellie Williams (Presenting Item 8)

Ellen Parry (Presenting Item 8)

### **Minutes**

Gill Sykes

## 1. APOLOGIES AND WELCOME

The chairperson (Maureen Banner) gave apologies for the meeting today and Gary Cunningham chaired the meeting on her behalf. Paula recorded apologies from Cllr Sarah Hall. Gary welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that apologies would be recorded in the minutes. Paula thanked Gary for stepping in as chairperson and noted that Maureen has tendered her resignation to the forum due to her own health and wanting to spend time with her family. Paula has asked Maureen to attend in March in order to say thank you and good bye to her. Appointing another chairperson will need a conversation about whether to recruit internally or to appoint an independent chair. Maureen wanted to say thank you to members for their consummate professionalism, she has enjoyed managing forum and will continue to read the minutes from a distance as they are public documents. Gary noted that Maureen will be sadly missed and had been a great chair.

## 2. TRADE UNION FACILITIES TIME

Helen Fleming presented her paper to Schools Forum. The following was noted:

- Historically the cost to schools of teacher trade union facilities time had been set at a fixed figure of £3.67. However the HR Service has committed to reviewing this figure annually so that schools and academies receive the best rate possible within a given year.
- The predicted underspend for the 2021/22 budget is attributed to unspent contingency, HR build in an element of contingency for unanticipated mid-year changes so the pot isn't empty.
- Taking account of the carry forward underspend from 21/22 and the need to retain some contingency within the 22/23 budget, the rate for 2022/23 is calculated at £2.27 per pupil for those schools currently participating in the pooled arrangements.

Questions/comments were invited by the Chair and none were forthcoming.

The Chair noted that this recommendation seems a sensible option and is something we have agreed to in the past. Forum were asked if colleagues agreed with the recommendations and were happy to sign off the £2.27 per pupil rate. Forum agreed with the recommendations.

Recommendations:

- (i) Schools Forum are requested to agree to carry forward the forecast 21/22 underspend into 22/23 in order that this can be used to reduce the per pupil cost for participating schools and academies for next financial year. **AGREED**
- (ii) Taking into account the carry forward, it is therefore proposed that Schools Forum agree, on behalf of the maintained school sector to de-delegate £2.27 per pupil for the purposes of teacher trade union facility time in 2022/23. Participating academies are asked to contribute at the same rate. **AGREED**
- (iii) This reduced rate will apply only to those schools that have supported and contributed to the shared facilities time arrangements in the 2021/22 financial year. **NOTED**

## 3. FMS/ESS CAPITA/PARENTPAY (NEW OWNERS/ CONTRACTS/PERIODS)

Jenny Owen presented her paper to Schools Forum to provide a clear summary of the changes to SIMS and FMS contracts and the position of the local authority in January 2022. The advice and information is provided to assist schools to make informed decisions about the key software they will use from April 2022. The report has been coordinated across a number of teams, IT, education, finance, procurement and the education data service. The following was noted:

- The new owners of SIMS and FMS (finance management system) have decided to only offer three year contracts, they were historically one year contracts. This was announced without leaving sufficient time to undertake procurement exercises. The local authority have challenged these changes and there are legal challenges across the country.
- There are considerations for all the schools around procurement, and to avoid falling foul of procurement rules schools need to consult their own procurement policies. It would be a Governing

Body decision to move the functionality, go out to procurement and implement a whole new MIS. Noted that there is expertise in the team as they have already been through the process and know what schools need to ask.

- If a school wants to explore an alternative MIS system to SIMS it is their responsibility to ensure the new system meets the school's requirements and also additional stipulations from the LA. The data flow to council systems is required for the LA to fulfil statutory duties in relation to children. Lots of teams use this data to fulfil SLAs on your behalf. School statutory returns need to be fulfilled from their MIS system. When looking at any software that holds sensitive data, the school has a duty to ensure it provides the level of protection you want to avoid the risk of data breaches.
- Other changes affect the local authority maintained schools. Historically the LA would procure licences on their behalf and the cost of the licence would be split out of de-delegated funding. We can no longer procure in this way and maintained schools will have to purchase their own licenses on a per pupil model. Some schools will be better off and some of the larger schools will be financially impacted.
- ESS will be sending all schools access to a portal so they can see their school's quote for SIMS and FMS licenses.
- There are a couple of considerations for LA maintained schools only. FMS is the finance system used and is delivered by Capita (now ESS). It is sold to maintained schools as a bundle with the SIMS system. It costs more to buy FMS only. All the council financial processes are based on FMS. Although every school has their own choice for what system they use it could cause issues if they are not using this finance system. If any schools are seriously considering changing to a different finance system please raise this with Jenny and Garry B. We don't want to start a new financial year and not be able to fulfil our statutory duties around budgets.
- Jenny noted that they wanted approval from Schools Forum for sharing the report with all Warrington schools. Noted that every school has their own choice but there are implications for decisions made. It was agreed for the report to be shared with all Warrington schools.

Questions/comments were invited by the Chair.

- Ian Moss noted that from a WAPH perspective we will recommend to schools not to get into a procurement process at this late stage. There is a WAPH meeting on Friday and this can be shared and discussed. Jenny noted that she will send the report to Ian and Keith Greenwood.
- Janet Lazarus asked if there might be a possibility for the LA to take control in three years. Jenny noted that the LA could possibly go out to procurement so that other companies could also tender for the contract. Schools would need to agree what they want to buy into and as an LA we don't want to dictate to schools which systems they use. Whatever system is used has to be compatible with the LA. A procurement exercise could be something we could pick up next year to make sure there is plenty of time to consider options. The team is an impartial MIS Support Unit and will look to support systems chosen by schools where there is enough buy-in from schools to make it a viable service.
- Gary C noted that there are other options for management information systems.
- Paula informed forum members that around the region we have pulled a letter together to challenge ESS and a couple of directors met with ESS to talk about their behaviour and how they have conducted themselves.
- Jenny noted there is a group of MATs taking legal action and also other MIS providers taking legal action against ESS. It could be decided that their actions were illegal or wrong and they may revert to offer one year contracts, but at this point it is three years or nothing.

#### **4. EYSFF FEEDBACK (HOURLY RATE RECOMMENDATIONS)**

Lorna Davies (Early Education Funding Manager) introduced herself to forum members. Lorna noted that the single funding formula group meeting was cancelled last week due to absences and has been rearranged for the end of January 2022. Therefore, today will be a verbal update and a report with recommendations will come to Schools Forum in March. There are options to take to the single formula group and the following key points were noted:

- Preferred option is an increase in the funding rate for 3-4 year olds of 13p and for 2 year olds of 17p. This is the fairest option in the budget and part of the sector most affected by Covid. It limits the funds kept back by the council to 2.8% out of 5% allowed to keep back for specific areas of work around SEND support.
- There is a contingency of £100K used against potential EY clawback or other fluctuations that may occur in year. The hourly rate for 3-4 year olds would be £4.52 and £5.25 for 2 year olds.
- We can't predict the outcome of the single funding formula meeting, but previously we have not increased the 2 year old rate at the same level of the 3-4 year old rate and we are trying to bring things more in line.

Questions/comments were invited by the Chair.

- Gary C asked who is on the single funding formula group. Lorna noted there are a number of reps from PVI settings and some from schools and they may have to do some work to increase the numbers. Maureen Banner also chaired that group and has now resigned. The first point of action will be to appoint a new chairperson.
- Gary C asked if there are any forum reps on the group. Marcia noted she was part of this group.
- Ian Moss noted it would be sensible to go for 2.8% because of the challenges through Covid and agree we should be prudent. Perhaps we need to improve the provision and reputation of some settings and support some of the settings. After going through the pandemic for the last 2 years, the working party should consider that some of the settings may not have put themselves fully back on track. They may only have seen an improvement with numbers as parents were keeping their children at home. Lorna noted that part of the reason for cautiousness and having a contingency was in case we need to use it to support the sector. We don't want to start the year being generous and at the end the year being unable to meet our obligations to fund places. Ian noted that he would feed this message back to WAPH.
- Marcia informed that it is approximately 4p per hour held back by the LA and it goes towards EY SEND and the SEND outreach team to support settings. There is an increased number of children with SEND in EY. This is something to put forward as part of the discussion about why some of the money is being held back.
- Kelda noted that there hasn't been a lot of support around EY SEND and it needs to be there for those children with needs. Everyone wants more for the hourly rate, and if it's going to the SEND team to support and give advice, if explained in the right way they won't have an issue. There has been concern in the PVI sector over the SEND support people have not received.
- Gary C noted that schools are noticing a difference with the children coming from nursery and the level of need is unprecedented.
- Garry B noted that the single funding formula group meeting will make their own recommendation to Schools Forum and the forum will make a decision about whether to support the recommendation of the working group.

## **5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING (OCTOBER 2021)**

The minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting and there were no matters arising.

## **6. DSG SETTLEMENT AND SCHOOLS FUNDING 2022/23**

Garry Bradbury presented his report to the forum. The following was noted:

- At the last forum meeting members were updated on the basis of the funding settlement. At that time we didn't know what that would be in pounds as it would depend on data from the October census. We raised the issue that the settlement would flex with pupil numbers and there may be issues with some of the other factors of the formula. We didn't know at that time if the overall settlement would be sufficient to deliver NFF.
- We received confirmation of the allocations prior to Christmas and found out we were right to be cautious. Although pupil numbers increased the FSM increased significantly causing pressure on the settlement, but it was sufficient to cover. From the figures received if we implement NFF for the coming

financial year it will leave us with an unallocated amount of £420K. We have to submit to the ESFA what our funding formula is going to be and need a discussion and decision about how we are going to treat the unallocated £420K.

- The report suggests three options to adopt the £420K: (i) Transfer the surplus into the HN block to alleviate the pressures; (ii) Recirculate into the funding formula to exceed the specification of NFF, which would deliver additional funding to some schools but not all (if a school receives protection it might not work out as an overall increase, as they could have less protection and the funding would remain the same); (iii) Could put back in via a lump sum per school, but the downside is that this may cause some issues in future years when the protection kicks in and we have raised baseline in NFF. There would be an issue honouring commitment when funding changes in future years.
- Garry noted that maintained sectors need to make their annual decisions on de-delegations. We have already agreed the trade union facilities time (agenda item 2) and we won't be de-delegating for FMS as this is no longer appropriate and applicable.

In addition to the NFF it has been announced that there will be additional government funding from an individual supplementary grant during the summer term. Appendix shows approximate amounts for individual schools based on current information. The additional £4.5m will be added to school funding but not through the Schools Block. In future years this will be in the DSG raising its annual baseline.

Questions/comments were invited by the Chair.

- Ian Moss noted that at this point he was not willing to propose one of the options and perhaps we should have looked at the HN paper first. If we were in a different place with the review we may be able to make better decision. One option reduces pressure on the HN block and the others support schools. Looking at the lump sum this could make a difference for some schools. Ian noted that he was willing to listen to the arguments and acknowledged that the forum have to make a decision tonight.
- Gwyn Williams suggested we should give the money to the HN block as it does benefit schools. We have consistently said we would try to mirror the NFF and any opportunity to put back into the HN block is a straight forward decision.
- Damian McGuire agreed with Gwyn and noted that options 2 and 3 would benefit less than 50% of schools because of the protection. The HN block helps those who need it most. Damian noted that he contacted Garry B last week with concerns about the growth population and impact on schools in terms of underfunding from in-year admissions. Damian asked if some consideration could be made for some of the surplus to be used for that as well as for the HN block. Gary C noted that a paper earlier in the year talked about the influx of pupils from Hong Kong.

Louise Atkin clarified the point Ian mentioned of the SEND review. The review has been completed and went to the SEND Partnership Board yesterday (10 Jan). This was the earliest time it was ready to present the findings. Some of the recommendations will take place in the Partnership Board. There are considerable proposals which can only take place if funding is pooled. Small pots of funding doesn't meet the needs of most pupils and this is seen in the review data. Gary C noted that he sits on the SEND Partnership Board and the SEND review report was well received. It was aspirational and ambitious.

Ian thanked Louise for that information and clarification and asked what the deficit is on HN. Louise noted that the deficit is predicted to be around half a million by the end of the year and we need to balance the budget by 2023/24. Considerable work has been undertaken, largely due to the forum, to reduce the deficit and we think we will be able to continue to decrease the deficit while taking on other priorities that will meet the needs of pupils. Ian confirmed that he would be happy to support the transfer of the surplus to the HN block after hearing that.

Garry B clarified that the half a million in deficit is after we have repaid in-year (current year) £220K of the accrued cumulative deficit. 2024 is just around the corner and there isn't a lot of time to implement policies to help. The process of using some of the surplus for growth issues (Damian's point above) could be discussed in a subsequent debate and would still require a transfer into the HN block. The money needs to be in a block the local authority has discretion over, so even if not all the money was used for SEND it would still need to be a transfer of all the surplus into the HN block.

Paula noted that colleagues need to be congratulated for the work with HN and considering moving money into HN and not going into schools. Other authorities have to make a decision to top slice. Moving the money to the HN block will go towards supporting our most vulnerable children and she thanked colleagues for considering the report and considering those options. The Chair noted that whatever money is put into HN block would be spent wisely to support children in Warrington.

The Chair asked for a proposal from the three options.

- Chris Hunt proposed option (1) to retain the surplus through a transfer to the HN block.
- This was seconded by Gwyn Williams.

Forum members agreed to the transfer of £418,887 into the high needs block

#### **De-delegations:**

These include contingency, licences, CLEAPS, FSM assessment and maternity. The only issue is the contingency, this was not de-delegated for the last couple of years and it is whether primary maintained want to refresh the pot. Need to consider that we may have a discussion about growth as per Damian's suggestion.

The Chair asked for a proposal.

- Apart from contingency, Chris Hunt proposed that the de-delegations are agreed.
- This was seconded by Zoe Jones.

Noted that contingency may need a separate discussion to debate what size of contingency schools want. There is extra growth from one census to the next. For every £100K in the contingency pot we have talked about a de-delegation of £9 per pupil. The last couple of years we have issued £120K to £140K. If we use the past as a guide to future need we would probably look at £11 per pupil de-delegation. If there is any de-delegation left over at the end of the year it would either be returned to schools or rolled over for future years.

- Chris Hunt noted that it has been the primary sector who has accessed this in the past and is happy to go along with what the primary sector wants.
- Zoe Jones agreed this was the best plan and is happy to agree with the contingency.

It is recommended that Schools Forum members representing mainstream schools:

- (i) Note the contents of the report, including the materiality of the forthcoming Supplementary grant; **NOTED**
- (ii) Agree an appropriate use of the allocation of headroom funding; **AGREED**
- (iii) For maintained sector representatives, agree de-delegations, where appropriate, for the various services discussed in **section 4.5** (of this report). **AGREED AS NOTED ABOVE**

## **7. MEMBERSHIP**

Paula noted that we had finally got to a point where membership was agreed although there was one vacancy for a parent/governor. Garry B has recalculated membership based on the updated census data and for maintained primary there needs to be a reduction in the number of reps from 7 to 6 and for academy there needs to be an increase by one, preferably in the primary phase. Something could be sent out to WAPH and WASCL for a conversation. Garry B noted that this change reflects the Beam conversion that happened since the last time we revisited numbers. The number of school reps remain same, there is just a re-profiling in the primary sector. Paula noted that we will need to identify a chairperson for Schools Forum.

Janet Lazarus noted that Governors Forum were concerned that some governor members coming onto Schools Forum had not been elected by Governors Forum. Schools Forum agreed that Governors Forum could put forward a rep for the parent governor vacancy. Janet asked if the additional academy rep could also be nominated by Governors Forum. Garry B noted that it could be as it doesn't have to be a teaching representative. Janet noted there is a Governors Forum meeting in two weeks and she will put this forward to them, one primary rep from the academy sector and one parent governor from the maintained sector.

Craig Burgess noted that he is currently a rep for the maintained sector as a governor. As the primary maintained sector needs to reduce by one rep, Craig asked how do you choose or ask someone to step down. Paula noted that Janet, Craig and Ian (Chair of WAPH) may want a conversation to discuss. Craig noted that he would be willing to step down as the maintained governor rep and would be happy to be the primary academy rep. Noted that this would need to be taken back to WAPH for a conversation on Friday.

Training for members would be welcome online as well as a buddying up system. Members may want to be proactive but are not sure of their role and when they can and can't vote. Paula noted that we are grateful to Gwyn who had a conversation and session with new members, and noted that we also need to devise an introduction to the forum with some reading material. There could be an information pack for someone considering joining forum that includes the operational guidance. On joining they could be allocated a buddy to talk about how forum works and also have some time with Garry B. It was suggested that there could be a conversation at the next meeting about how to develop a buddy system.

Lucinda Duffy noted that it would be positive to have some training, there are a number people currently on forum want to be more active and understand roles and responsibilities and hope they would be included too, not just new members.

It was noted that the pre-forum meetings with James and Garry are really helpful and are a safe space to ask questions when not in front of the whole forum.

## **8. HIGH NEEDS UPDATE**

Louise Atkin presented her report to the forum. The following key points were noted:

- The deficit is something we have been working on for a number of years, using a number of strategies to reduce it. It is currently £500K and the budget has to be balanced by the end of the financial year 2023/24. We have been spending in excess of the allocated budget year on year since 2012. Most significant is OOB and independent specialist placement. Despite efforts to reduce the OOB numbers it is expected that spend on these placements will continue to rise as a result of increased charges.
- The SEND review has now been completed. It was an ambitious task for a comprehensive view across all SEND services and all ages, it was undertaken in-house to avoid the cost of bringing in consultants. It considers place planning, growth, financial benchmarking and successes in good/outstanding schools to support SEND pupils. High quality teaching and learning was something identified as a success and is to be celebrated.
- The review highlights the reduced number of pupils with SEND, and notes that since the SEND reforms in 2014 there has been a considerable rise in the number of EHCPs maintained by the council. This lengthened time pupils are in receipt of an EHCP has had financial implications.
- The review notes the complexity of need schools are having to meet in mainstream, the high level of medical tasks staff are being asked to undertake and address.
- The review has gone to the SEND Partnership Board and makes a number of recommendations. Some recommendations are from within our resource, our practices and policies. There are a number of strategies and implementations that have a budget by them, quite a significant budget. We want to prioritise those where we can meet most need. The recommendations delivered to the SEND Partnership Board are around which priorities to pursue that will have the greatest impact on our pupils with SEND.

Louise thanked forum members for making the decision earlier in the meeting to move the surplus into the HN block as it will have an impact on a greater number of pupils rather than going into individual budgets. We recognise that some schools are facing deficit budgets and we do not underestimate this decision. Louise informed that she will report back on decisions made by the SEND Partnership Board and the rationale for them.

Questions/comments were invited by the Chair.

- Ian Moss thanked Louise and everyone involved with the review, the report and the proposals. From reading the report he felt massively informed, there was joined up thinking and he said the hard work was a credit to Louise and her team. Ian noted that WAPH are really appreciative and happy to send the £420K over to the HN block. Louise acknowledged the thanks and noted that it was a whole team endeavour and that Marcia was involved with Early Years.
- John Carlin asked about recommendations around existing provisions and whether to grow them. Louise noted that this is looked at year on year. For cognition and learning a view is taken every year to look at the forecast of pupil population coming through and we would have a conversation with you. There is a proposal to grow some DPs for ASD, EY, SEMH KS3 and KS4.
- Gary C noted that the SEND Partnership Board will scrutinise the review report at length and will consider the priorities. Noted that there are recommendations within the review for health funding to support us with money and other commitments to support the most vulnerable in Warrington.

Schools Forum is asked to:

- (a) Note the proposal outlined in paragraph 3 (of the report). **NOTED**
- (b) Support the proposal for any surplus in the DSG Schools Block funding to be committed to SEND priorities identified. **AGREED**
- (c) Have consideration of the impact changes may have on the High Needs Block. There may be a temporary negative impact as funding is reinvested locally. The impact of this should lessen as funding starts to transfer back into the High Needs block as placements in the independent sector are reduced. **NOTED**
- (d) Note that the council will work with all stakeholders; SENDIAS, WarrPAC, parents / carers and with WAPH, WASCL, school leaders and governors to share proposals once they have been approved by the SEND Partnership Board. **NOTED**

9. **AOB** – no items

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

# REPORT



<b>Report to:</b>	Schools Forum	<b>Item:</b>	6
<b>Date:</b>	22/03/2022	<b>For:</b>	Information
<b>Title:</b>	Allocation of funding; High Needs Block		
<b>Author:</b>	Louise Atkin / Kellie Williams	<b>Presenter:</b>	Louise Atkin / Kellie Williams

## 1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to brief Schools Forum on the agreed proposals following the SEND Review, in particular those which require financial investment.

## 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A comprehensive review of education provision for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND) was initiated in 2021 to understand the drivers behind the increase in demand for EHC Plans and special school places.

- 2.2 The Review highlighted that:

- The overall number of pupils identified with SEND in Warrington schools has reduced mostly as a result of the smaller number of pupils receiving SEN Support (from 3,128 in 2021 to 4,261 in 2014).
- Conversely, there has been a significant rise in the number of EHC Plans maintained by the Council across all age ranges but more notably for pre-school children and young people aged 16 to 25 years. This is in line with the national trend and reflects the growing proportion of pupils presenting with a higher complexity of need.
- A high proportion of pupils' with EHC Plans are educated in mainstream schools and whilst this has dropped year on year since 2019 (from 63.71% to 61.45%), Warrington is still well above the national average of 50.4%.
- One of the key features in Warrington is the role that Designated Provisions play in supporting pupils with SEND to have access to mainstream learning and social

opportunities. 10.8% of pupils' were placed in Resourced Provision and SEN Units (known as Designated Provisions locally) in 2021 compared to 7.7% across England.

- There are fewer Special School places in Warrington compared to the England and North West averages and two of Warrington's three Special Schools are full. This is leading to a high number of special school places being commissioned from the independent and out of borough market, to meet the needs of pupils with Speech Language and Communication Needs and Social Emotional and Mental Health Needs.
- Children and young people are presenting with more complex needs which require additional nursing input to manage tracheostomy care and suctioning, stoma care and feeding through naso-gastric and gastrostomy tubes, as well as therapeutic input.
- Local specialist education provision for pupils with SEND was found to be mostly good and in the best examples seen was tailored well to meet the individual needs of children and young people.

2.3 The Review proposed a series of recommendations to:

- a) Improve local systems for managing the statutory Education, Health and Social Care assessment, planning and review processes for SEND pupils;
- b) Increase capacity and support for SEND pupils in local settings and schools so that more children can access provision in Warrington close to their local community; and
- c) Improve scrutiny and challenge around the allocation of resources for pupils with SEND.

### **3. AGREED PROPOSALS**

3.1 Following on from the report to Schools Forum on the 11 January 2022, Warrington's SEND Partnership Board considered the proposals from the SEND Review, and agreed to implement the following projects:

- Relocate further education offer from Woolston Learning Village; the development of a new post-16/post-19 facility
- Increase commissioned specialist post 16 education placements from 40 to 60
- Standardise top-up funding for SEMH Designated Provision places in Primary in 2022/23 with a view to embedding in the review of the funding formula

- Establish a new 8 place KS1 ASD provision
- Establish a new 8 place KS3 SEMH provision
- Establish a new 8 place KS4 SEMH provision

3.2 These projects are in addition to the 56 place ASD Free School which was actioned in 2019 and is planned to open in September 2023.

3.3 The SEND Review identified considerable pressures on the Educational Psychology Team and on Speech and Language delivery. Plans identify investment to enhance capacity for both of these services.

3.4 Projects are expected to be met using the resources allocated in the 2022/23 High Needs Block budget and indicative spend committed over a three year period is outlined in appendix 1. The retention of a contingency in this budget affords us to anticipate and respond to the growing costs in the market as well as ensuring the deficit on the High Needs Block is cleared by April 2023.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 It is recommended that Schools Forum members:

- a) Note the contents of the report, including the outcomes of the SEND Review, the benefits and the financial impact on the High Needs Block.

## Appendix 1: Agreed Investments; indicative spend

ITEM	TIMELINE	Y1	Y2	Y3
		2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
<b>Proposals in train</b>				
Establish a 56 place ASD Free School	Sep-23		£560,000	£1,232,000
Increase Cognition and Learning Designated Provision place funding in KS3 & KS4 by 4 places	Sep-22	£24,000	£24,000	£24,000
Additional funding for Speech and Language Input into Schools contract	Apr-22	£19,000	£19,000	£19,000
Establish 1 FTE Occupational Therapist post	Apr-22	£55,800	£55,800.00	£55,800.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>£98,800</b>	<b>£658,800</b>	<b>£1,330,800</b>
<b>Proposals agreed</b>				
Relocate further education offer from Woolston Learning Village	Sep-22			
Increase commissioned specialist post 16 education placements from 40 to 60	Sep-23		£699,480	£699,480
Standardise top-up funding for SEMH Designated Provision places in Primary in 2022/23 with a view to embedding in the review of the funding formula	Sep-22	£13,920		
Establish a new 8 place KS1 ASD provision	Sep-22	£63,322.68	£108,552	£108,552
Establish a new 8 place KS3 SEMH provision	Sep-22	£63,322.68	£109,755.38	£109,755.38
Establish a new 8 place KS4 SEMH provision	Sep-23		£63,322.68	£109,755.38
<b>Total</b>		<b>£140,565.36</b>	<b>£981,110.06</b>	<b>£1,027,542.76</b>
<b>Proposals deferred</b>				
Reduce notional budget (Element 2) contribution from £7,500 to £6,000	Sep-23		£258,125	£442,500
Consider the funding formula for Designated Provisions in Primary	Sep-23		£400,000	£400,000
Increase commissioned specialist post-19 education placements from 10 to 20	Sep-22	£150,600	£150,600	£150,600
<b>Total</b>		<b>£150,600.00</b>	<b>£808,725.00</b>	<b>£993,100.00</b>

# REPORT

**Report to:** Schools Forum **Item:** 7  
**Date:** 22nd March 2022 **For:** Information  
**Title:** Dedicated Schools Grant budgets  
2022/23  
**Author:** Garry Bradbury **Presenter:** N/A

## 1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 The purpose of this report is to illustrate how the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement for Warrington for 2022/23 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 11<sup>th</sup> January Schools Forum meeting.

## 2. DSG BLOCK ALLOCATIONS FOR 2022/23

2.1 As reported at the January meeting, DSG settlements were confirmed by ESFA just before Christmas (16<sup>th</sup> December 2021), in order to facilitate submission back to them of the proposed local schools funding formula by 21st January.

2.2 To recap, the gross DSG Block allocations are as follows:

Schools Block	£155,701,613
High Needs Block	£ 28,291,175
Central Schools Services Block	£ 1,029,741
Early Years Block	£ 13,505,745
<b>TOTAL GROSS DSG</b>	<b>£198,528,274</b>

ESFA will then deduct at source, the allocations for:

- a) Mainstream Academy budgets (£84,869,430)
- b) Schools' National Non-Domestic Rates (£1,296,567)
- c) High Needs Place funding at non-maintained settings (£2,138,000)

2.3 As well as DSG, there will also be a Supplementary Grant element to add to the direct allocations for Schools and High Needs. The Schools grant will be passported directly and wholly to schools, while the High Needs addition will be added to the available resource for SEND. Part of this addition has been used to increase Element 3 top-up rates in special schools and designated provisions.

2.4 Schools Forum has ratified a transfer from Schools Block to the High Needs Block of £417,887. The net position for DSG and Supplementary Grant is therefore as below:

	DSG	Supp Grant	Recoupment	NET	APPLIED	Variance
Schools Block	£155,701,613	£4,528,098	-£86,165,997	£74,063,714	£73,645,827	-£417,887
EY Block	£13,505,745			£13,505,745	£13,505,745	£0
High Needs Block	£28,291,175	£1,097,014	-£2,138,000	£27,250,189	£27,824,997	£574,808
CSSB	£1,029,741			£1,029,741	£872,820	-£156,921
	<b>£198,528,274</b>	<b>£5,625,112</b>	<b>-£88,303,997</b>	<b>£115,849,389</b>	<b>£115,849,389</b>	<b>£0</b>

2.5 The application of the Early Years Block is provisional, based on the recommendation of the Early Years Single Funding Formula working group. Their submission is to be discussed as a separate agenda item this evening, but this report is predicated on the assumption that this will be agreed.

2.6 Usage and application of the High Needs resources (direct Block allocation, Supplementary Grant addition, and Schools Block transfer) includes several elements falling out of the SEND Review, and affords us the benefit of being able to retain a contingency element. This contingency will be key across many areas of SEND:

- Supporting the new ASD Free School
- Supporting development of a new post-19/post-16 facility
- Enhancing capacity in the Educational Psychology team
- Recruiting Occupational Therapy provision
- Enhancing speech and language contract
- Maintaining support following the removal of the School Improvement grant

Senior managers have robust plans for spend and needs to retain a buffer as the independent market continues to elevate costs. Work continues on assessing methodologies and principles regarding special school and designated provision places, and such contingency will assist in facilitating changes when appropriate.

The contingency will also enable the Council to continue its expansion of in-borough provision.

- 2.7 A summary of available funding, both DSG and Supplementary Grant, is shown in **Appendix 1**, alongside the summarised 2022/23 service & activity allocations. **Appendix 2** shows the indicative school allocations for the financial year.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 It is recommended that Schools Forum members note the contents of the report.

<b>AVAILABLE RESOURCES 2022/23</b>	
Schools Block	£155,701,613
High Needs Block	£28,291,175
Central Schools Services Block	£1,029,741
Early Years Block	£13,505,745
Academies Recoupment	-£84,869,430
NNDR Recoupment	-£1,296,567
HN Places Recoupment	-£2,138,000
<b>TOTAL NET DSG 2022/23</b>	<b>£110,224,277</b>
Schools Supplementary Grant	£4,528,098
High Needs Supplementary Grant	£1,097,014
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE</b>	<b>£115,849,389</b>

<b>BUDGETARY ALLOCATIONS 2022/23</b>	
Maintained Primary School Budgets	£51,312,450
Maintained Secondary School Budgets	£17,805,279
Schools Supplementary Grant	£4,528,098
Designated Provision LA Costs	£1,633,194
Designated Provision LA Costs (in-year changes)	£211,238
Special School Base budgets	£7,240,124
Special School Sixth Form Places	£426,400
Original Budget Element 3 Top Ups	£1,584,163
In-year Element 3 Top Ups	£552,000
EOTAS & Home Tuition	£270,000
Hospital & Medical Tuition	£438,095
Inter-Authority Recoupment	£500,000
Sensory Support Team	£257,000
Pre-16 Independent School Fees	£4,000,000
Post-16 SEND Placements	£3,800,000
Home to School Transport SEND	£1,750,000
Speech Therapy	£119,000
Support for Inclusion	£401,000
Pupil Referral Unit	£268,000
Sandy Lane HN Elements	£439,008
Sandy Lane EY Elements	£375,426
Maintained Nursery Classes	£3,576,896
Private, Voluntary, Independent Nurseries	£9,110,941
Early Years Pupil Premium, plus DAF	£160,333
Central Early Years functions	£197,230
Early Years Contingency	£84,919
Schools' Copyright Licensing	£201,380
Servers / CareFirst	£145,000
Health & Safety contribution	£80,000
Non-mainstream schools' FSM contribution	£30,000
Schools Forum Support	£5,000
Repay 21/22 Closing Deficit	£550,000
Occupational Therapy Additional Support	£55,800
ASD School Preparatory Costs	£175,000
Additional Support to Peace Centre	£240,000
DCSO Support	£59,000
Contingency	£3,267,415
<b>ALLOCATIONS 2022/23</b>	<b>£115,849,389</b>

	AWPU	Free School Meal Funding	FSM6 Funding	IDACI Postcode funding	Low Prior Attainment funding	EAL funding	Mobility Funding	Lump Sum	Split Site	Total NFF	Sector Protection	Minimum Funding Guarantee	SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING	Element 3 Top-Up Funding	Designated Provision Funding	Indicative Nursery Funding	TOTAL INDICATIVE BUDGET 2022/23 - EXCLUDES NNDR
Alderman Bolton Primary School	£829,771	£56,133	£74,610	£81,194	£109,299	£14,186	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,286,933	£0	£14,444	£1,301,377	£11,120	£0	£161,936	£1,474,432
Appleton Thorn Primary School	£610,221	£7,547	£11,843	£7,002	£37,222	£6,304	£3,398	£121,740	£0	£805,277	£808	£2,343	£808,428	£5,000	£0	£0	£813,428
Barrow Hall Community Primary School	£2,043,754	£24,057	£30,791	£5,249	£136,613	£15,317	£0	£121,740	£0	£2,377,521	£322,224	£0	£2,699,745	£17,408	£0	£0	£2,717,153
Beamount Community Primary School	£1,159,096	£78,776	£104,217	£100,052	£131,809	£38,685	£1,355	£121,740	£0	£1,735,729	£0	£0	£1,735,729	£21,054	£0	£97,855	£1,854,638
Bewsey Lodge Primary School	£1,020,263	£72,643	£94,742	£79,497	£93,794	£23,057	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,505,737	£0	£146,275	£1,652,012	£22,363	£205,145	£236,918	£2,116,438
Birchwood CE Primary School	£513,360	£43,397	£58,030	£41,972	£78,796	£10,718	£1,355	£121,740	£0	£869,369	£0	£0	£869,369	£1,500	£0	£82,564	£953,433
Bradshaw Community Primary School	£616,678	£16,982	£21,317	£25,482	£42,266	£3,800	£0	£121,740	£0	£848,265	£0	£0	£848,265	£5,482	£0	£0	£853,747
Brook Acre Community Primary School	£674,794	£55,190	£71,649	£75,764	£79,912	£10,593	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,089,642	£0	£84,314	£1,173,956	£0	£0	£108,799	£1,282,755
Broomfields Junior School	£1,117,123	£23,114	£33,160	£27,469	£91,740	£2,268	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,416,614	£59,076	£0	£1,475,690	£40,142	£0	£0	£1,515,832
Bruche Primary School Academy	£690,938	£21,227	£29,607	£15,145	£38,885	£3,334	£0	£121,740	£0	£920,875	£0	£8,935	£929,811	£1,926	£0	£98,986	£1,030,722
Burtonwood Community Primary School	£658,651	£16,982	£21,909	£26,636	£66,498	£1,330	£0	£121,740	£0	£913,746	£0	£0	£913,746	£1,500	£0	£0	£915,246
Callands Community Primary School	£1,213,984	£28,774	£39,081	£40,888	£84,364	£32,957	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,561,788	£41,852	£0	£1,603,640	£9,000	£0	£0	£1,612,640
Chapelord Village Primary School	£1,930,751	£45,756	£60,990	£7,517	£161,087	£23,476	£0	£121,740	£0	£2,351,318	£199,152	£0	£2,550,470	£15,426	£0	£0	£2,565,896
Cherry Tree Primary School	£639,279	£8,019	£10,066	£763	£63,971	£620	£0	£121,740	£0	£844,459	£11	£5,457	£849,927	£18,889	£0	£0	£868,816
Christ Church CE Primary School	£1,029,949	£37,265	£47,963	£38,098	£85,684	£7,951	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,368,651	£0	£0	£1,368,651	£6,196	£0	£62,836	£1,437,683
Cinnamon Brow CE Primary School	£952,461	£48,586	£62,767	£53,995	£82,333	£9,293	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,331,175	£0	£0	£1,331,175	£8,000	£0	£123,947	£1,463,122
Croft Primary School	£681,251	£10,849	£13,619	£6,353	£47,859	£661	£0	£121,740	£0	£882,333	£17,582	£1,560	£901,475	£4,982	£0	£0	£906,457
Culcheth Community Primary School	£661,879	£18,397	£23,686	£7,708	£54,038	£1,916	£0	£121,740	£0	£889,364	£0	£19,090	£908,454	£2,000	£0	£0	£910,454
Dallam Community Primary School	£707,081	£64,624	£82,307	£86,052	£140,270	£15,274	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,217,349	£0	£0	£1,217,349	£35,320	£331,617	£209,960	£1,794,246
Evelyn Street Community Primary School	£994,433	£38,680	£52,700	£58,502	£92,216	£19,041	£483	£121,740	£0	£1,377,796	£0	£206,937	£1,584,733	£13,000	£0	£94,985	£1,692,718
Glazebury CE Primary School	£303,496	£8,019	£10,659	£11,110	£18,540	£666	£2,191	£121,740	£0	£476,421	£0	£36,081	£512,502	£0	£0	£72,993	£585,495
Gorse Covert Primary School	£816,856	£16,038	£21,909	£20,394	£65,916	£8,966	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,071,820	£7,225	£2,834	£1,081,879	£3,482	£0	£0	£1,085,361
Grappenhall Heys Community Primary School	£674,794	£3,302	£4,737	£4,617	£29,969	£5,959	£0	£121,740	£0	£845,118	£46,267	£0	£891,385	£23,229	£0	£83,886	£998,500
Grappenhall St Wilfrid's CE Primary School	£1,336,674	£8,962	£14,211	£12,325	£94,180	£3,316	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,591,409	£174,301	£0	£1,765,710	£28,670	£0	£0	£1,794,380
Great Sankey Primary School	£1,026,720	£15,566	£20,133	£3,342	£60,107	£6,605	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,254,214	£102,056	£0	£1,356,270	£11,482	£0	£126,297	£1,494,049
Latchford CE Primary School	£513,360	£24,057	£30,791	£27,861	£64,081	£15,456	£2,284	£121,740	£0	£799,631	£0	£23,504	£823,135	£16,000	£0	£52,786	£891,921
Locking Stumps Community Primary School	£1,262,414	£56,605	£74,018	£61,774	£127,487	£10,621	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,714,659	£0	£0	£1,714,659	£43,945	£0	£0	£1,758,604
Meadowside CP and Nursery School	£710,310	£62,266	£82,900	£80,411	£147,312	£12,281	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,217,220	£0	£33,618	£1,250,838	£28,400	£205,145	£128,687	£1,613,070
Newchurch Community Primary School	£606,992	£17,453	£21,909	£3,894	£58,633	£0	£0	£121,740	£0	£830,622	£0	£0	£830,622	£13,446	£0	£0	£844,068
Oakwood Avenue Community Primary School	£2,008,239	£117,456	£155,733	£107,669	£246,551	£15,163	£0	£121,740	£0	£2,772,551	£0	£0	£2,772,551	£47,771	£311,343	£233,884	£3,365,550
Oughtrington Community Primary School	£1,346,360	£18,397	£24,870	£5,239	£103,617	£2,635	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,622,857	£155,648	£0	£1,778,505	£3,852	£0	£0	£1,782,357
Our Lady's Catholic Primary School	£506,903	£25,944	£36,121	£33,571	£59,758	£7,096	£0	£121,740	£0	£791,133	£0	£0	£791,133	£10,132	£0	£0	£801,265
Park Road Community Primary School	£671,565	£7,547	£9,474	£1,576	£47,179	£6,553	£0	£121,740	£0	£865,634	£21,486	£0	£887,120	£3,532	£0	£0	£890,652
Penketh Primary School	£681,251	£9,906	£12,435	£3,412	£58,635	£11,899	£3,101	£121,740	£0	£902,380	£0	£0	£902,380	£15,951	£0	£0	£918,331
Penketh South Community Primary School	£652,193	£10,378	£13,619	£6,775	£47,165	£2,574	£0	£121,740	£0	£854,444	£7,086	£10,545	£872,075	£11,172	£0	£88,037	£971,284
Ravenbank Community Primary School	£1,346,360	£16,982	£24,278	£2,349	£92,648	£6,680	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,611,035	£167,470	£0	£1,778,505	£6,926	£0	£0	£1,785,431
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	£587,620	£24,057	£31,976	£38,579	£74,095	£20,766	£0	£121,740	£0	£898,833	£0	£8,369	£907,202	£4,982	£0	£0	£912,184
Sankey Valley St James' CE Primary School	£581,162	£13,208	£17,172	£2,810	£47,109	£13,947	£0	£121,740	£0	£797,149	£0	£138,846	£935,995	£8,496	£0	£119,883	£1,064,374
St Alban's Catholic Primary School	£529,504	£20,284	£26,054	£41,189	£101,694	£30,353	£3,862	£121,740	£0	£874,679	£0	£0	£874,679	£4,319	£0	£45,328	£924,326
St Andrew's CE Primary School	£665,108	£51,416	£68,096	£62,034	£95,881	£1,320	£594	£121,740	£0	£1,066,190	£0	£21,301	£1,087,491	£4,500	£0	£0	£1,091,991
St Augustine's Catholic Primary School	£432,643	£24,529	£31,383	£42,092	£68,841	£18,062	£891	£121,740	£0	£740,182	£0	£18,567	£758,749	£0	£0	£88,245	£846,994
St Benedict's Catholic Primary School	£655,422	£25,944	£34,936	£41,350	£66,712	£16,539	£0	£121,740	£0	£962,643	£0	£495	£963,138	£17,000	£0	£117,579	£1,097,717
St Bridget's Catholic Primary School	£619,907	£41,510	£55,069	£76,120	£105,316	£12,461	£6,944	£121,740	£0	£1,039,068	£0	£0	£1,039,068	£3,686	£0	£0	£1,042,754
St Elphin's (Fairfield) CE Primary School	£1,159,096	£57,077	£74,610	£85,158	£89,021	£30,088	£3,212	£121,740	£0	£1,620,002	£0	£0	£1,620,002	£20,482	£0	£123,542	£1,764,026
St Helen's CE Primary School	£397,128	£9,906	£12,435	£7,387	£30,850	£640	£0	£121,740	£0	£580,085	£0	£12,929	£593,014	£9,568	£0	£0	£602,582
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	£887,887	£11,321	£15,396	£4,988	£48,547	£7,001	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,096,880	£75,995	£0	£1,172,875	£21,127	£0	£0	£1,194,002

	AWPU	Free School Meal Funding	FSM6 Funding	IDACI Postcode funding	Low Prior Attainment funding	EAL funding	Mobility Funding	Lump Sum	Split Site	Total NFF	Sector Protection	Minimum Funding Guarantee	TOTAL SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING	Element 3 Top-Up Funding	Designated Provision Funding	Indicative Nursery Funding	TOTAL INDICATIVE BUDGET 2022/23 - EXCLUDES NDR
St Lewis Catholic Primary School	£442,329	£6,132	£8,882	£7,828	£28,832	£1,274	£0	£121,740	£0	£617,018	£0	£23,713	£640,731	£10,000	£0	£0	£650,731
St Margaret's CE Primary School	£1,326,987	£64,624	£84,084	£106,937	£175,996	£9,960	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,890,329	£0	£0	£1,890,329	£54,680	£0	£189,200	£2,134,209
St Monica's Catholic Primary School	£587,620	£4,717	£5,921	£8,170	£25,301	£3,753	£0	£121,740	£0	£757,222	£19,008	£12,941	£789,171	£15,855	£0	£0	£805,026
St Oswald's Catholic Primary School	£697,395	£11,793	£14,804	£15,235	£60,402	£19,097	£0	£121,740	£0	£940,466	£0	£0	£940,466	£0	£0	£0	£940,466
St Paul of the Cross Catholic Primary School	£458,473	£18,397	£23,093	£27,389	£46,012	£2,619	£446	£121,740	£0	£698,168	£0	£0	£698,168	£13,445	£0	£11,764	£723,378
St Peter's Catholic Primary School	£703,852	£7,547	£10,066	£10,207	£36,317	£9,863	£0	£121,740	£0	£899,593	£30,177	£0	£929,770	£8,834	£0	£0	£938,604
St Philip (Westbrook) CE School	£1,869,406	£18,397	£24,278	£6,132	£129,272	£31,607	£0	£121,740	£0	£2,200,831	£268,604	£0	£2,469,435	£14,314	£0	£0	£2,483,749
St Stephen's Catholic Primary School	£668,337	£35,378	£45,003	£62,225	£73,189	£15,916	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,021,788	£0	£5,663	£1,027,451	£4,111	£0	£0	£1,031,562
St Thomas' CE Primary School	£678,023	£13,680	£19,541	£8,290	£57,858	£1,985	£0	£121,740	£0	£901,116	£0	£5,359	£906,475	£23,737	£0	£101,586	£1,031,798
St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	£435,872	£4,717	£5,921	£662	£50,566	£2,469	£836	£121,740	£0	£622,784	£0	£0	£622,784	£7,500	£0	£0	£630,284
Statham Community Primary School	£642,507	£20,284	£26,054	£3,513	£52,485	£5,611	£0	£121,740	£0	£872,194	£0	£0	£872,194	£11,679	£0	£0	£883,873
Stockton Heath Primary School	£1,278,557	£24,529	£30,791	£15,446	£103,987	£6,015	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,581,066	£107,874	£0	£1,688,940	£11,500	£0	£0	£1,700,440
Stretton St Matthew's CE Primary School	£678,023	£8,491	£11,251	£1,817	£27,330	£1,963	£0	£121,740	£0	£850,614	£45,036	£0	£895,650	£9,006	£0	£0	£904,656
The Cobbs Infant and Nursery School	£765,197	£24,057	£30,199	£20,474	£68,869	£7,243	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,037,779	£0	£0	£1,037,779	£1,926	£0	£378,967	£1,418,673
Thelwall Community Infant School	£384,213	£5,189	£6,514	£9,705	£34,580	£900	£0	£121,740	£0	£562,840	£0	£20,161	£583,002	£3,463	£0	£0	£586,465
Thelwall Community Junior School	£552,104	£10,378	£14,211	£15,807	£46,358	£567	£0	£121,740	£0	£761,166	£0	£6,797	£767,963	£4,766	£0	£0	£772,729
Twiss Green Community Primary School	£661,879	£8,962	£11,843	£3,563	£44,408	£1,321	£0	£121,740	£0	£853,717	£20,608	£0	£874,325	£9,000	£0	£0	£883,325
Warrington St Ann's CE Primary School	£603,763	£44,812	£60,990	£55,450	£82,377	£24,990	£1,652	£121,740	£0	£995,776	£0	£0	£995,776	£15,500	£0	£162,075	£1,159,351
Warrington St Barnabas CE Primary School	£503,674	£41,039	£52,108	£41,691	£77,086	£20,105	£4,308	£121,740	£0	£861,751	£0	£0	£861,751	£15,567	£0	£184,332	£1,061,649
Westbrook Old Hall Primary School	£1,149,410	£35,850	£49,740	£15,014	£90,169	£13,587	£0	£121,740	£0	£1,475,510	£42,830	£0	£1,518,340	£20,958	£0	£0	£1,539,298
Winwick CE Primary School	£619,907	£8,491	£10,659	£12,325	£47,458	£2,655	£0	£121,740	£0	£823,234	£0	£11,403	£834,637	£13,000	£0	£0	£847,637
Woolston CE Aided Primary School	£707,081	£13,680	£18,356	£6,303	£47,176	£5,256	£0	£121,740	£0	£919,592	£14,443	£0	£934,035	£7,428	£0	£0	£941,463
Woolston Community Primary School	£752,282	£17,453	£22,501	£5,530	£85,194	£13,873	£947	£121,740	£0	£1,019,521	£0	£2,528	£1,022,049	£30,784	£221,078	£0	£1,273,911
<b>PRIMARY SECTOR TOTAL</b>	<b>£56,892,570</b>	<b>£1,863,726</b>	<b>£2,456,789</b>	<b>£2,033,074</b>	<b>£5,259,722</b>	<b>£711,057</b>	<b>£37,859</b>	<b>£8,400,082</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£77,654,879</b>	<b>£1,946,816</b>	<b>£885,009</b>	<b>£80,486,704</b>	<b>£895,511</b>	<b>£1,274,328</b>	<b>£3,587,857</b>	<b>£86,244,399</b>

	AWPU	Free School Meal Funding	FSM6 Funding	IDACI Postcode funding	Low Prior Attainment funding	EAL funding	Mobility Funding	Lump Sum	Split Site	Total NFF	Sector Protection	Minimum Funding Guarantee	TOTAL SCHOOLS BLOCK FUNDING	Element 3 Top-Up Funding	Designated Provision Funding	Indicative Nursery Funding	TOTAL INDICATIVE BUDGET 2022/23 - EXCLUDES NDR
Beamont Collegiate Academy	£4,277,948	£154,721	£329,025	£410,047	£357,385	£23,033	£0	£121,740	£0	£5,673,900	£0	£0	£5,673,900	£62,693	£0	£0	£5,736,593
Birchwood Community High School	£3,805,070	£99,059	£206,617	£223,749	£304,087	£32,287	£0	£121,740	£0	£4,792,608	£0	£0	£4,792,608	£17,310	£0	£0	£4,809,918
Bridgewater High School	£7,415,322	£70,285	£151,056	£115,698	£359,491	£40,028	£0	£121,740	£297,000	£8,570,620	£290,125	£2,036	£8,862,781	£68,661	£388,707	£0	£9,320,149
Cardinal Newman Catholic High School	£3,851,967	£83,021	£179,705	£237,057	£301,345	£24,569	£0	£121,740	£0	£4,799,404	£0	£0	£4,799,404	£33,760	£0	£0	£4,833,164
Culcheth High School	£5,662,333	£71,228	£153,661	£106,660	£286,380	£0	£0	£121,740	£0	£6,402,002	£145,123	£0	£6,547,125	£35,400	£0	£0	£6,582,525
Great Sankey High School	£8,739,152	£63,209	£154,529	£61,939	£439,193	£78,442	£0	£121,740	£0	£9,658,204	£452,546	£0	£10,110,750	£32,119	£0	£0	£10,142,869
King's Leadership Academy Warrington	£3,461,033	£37,265	£89,418	£53,960	£185,662	£7,688	£0	£121,740	£0	£3,956,767	£65,433	£0	£4,022,200	£15,893	£0	£0	£4,038,093
Lymm High School	£7,383,383	£59,435	£131,957	£80,095	£343,108	£12,300	£0	£121,740	£0	£8,132,019	£398,581	£0	£8,530,600	£71,074	£0	£0	£8,601,674
Padgate Academy	£2,467,222	£99,531	£222,244	£223,719	£277,547	£25,478	£0	£121,740	£0	£3,437,481	£0	£0	£3,437,481	£43,964	£138,378	£0	£3,619,823
Penketh High School	£3,995,334	£92,455	£207,485	£154,880	£286,351	£74,417	£0	£121,740	£0	£4,932,662	£0	£0	£4,932,662	£49,626	£184,504	£0	£5,166,793
Sir Thomas Boteler CE High School	£3,228,713	£101,889	£224,848	£226,980	£324,713	£52,596	£3,017	£121,740	£0	£4,284,497	£0	£0	£4,284,497	£74,274	£184,504	£0	£4,543,275
St Gregory's Catholic High School	£5,511,740	£73,587	£175,364	£155,572	£386,904	£33,841	£0	£121,740	£0	£6,458,748	£0	£0	£6,458,748	£67,246	£248,772	£0	£6,774,767
UTC Warrington	£697,756	£19,340	£44,275	£37,750	£69,486	£0	£0	£121,740	£0	£990,348	£0	£57,350	£1,047,698	£4,500	£0	£0	£1,052,198
<b>SECONDARY SECTOR TOTAL</b>	<b>£60,496,972</b>	<b>£1,025,026</b>	<b>£2,270,186</b>	<b>£2,088,105</b>	<b>£3,921,652</b>	<b>£404,679</b>	<b>£3,017</b>	<b>£1,582,624</b>	<b>£297,000</b>	<b>£72,089,260</b>	<b>£1,351,809</b>	<b>£59,386</b>	<b>£73,500,455</b>	<b>£576,520</b>	<b>£1,144,866</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£75,221,841</b>
<b>SCHOOLS' TOTAL</b>	<b>£117,389,542</b>	<b>£2,888,752</b>	<b>£4,726,975</b>	<b>£4,121,179</b>	<b>£9,181,374</b>	<b>£1,115,736</b>	<b>£40,875</b>	<b>£9,982,706</b>	<b>£297,000</b>	<b>£149,744,139</b>	<b>£3,298,625</b>	<b>£944,395</b>	<b>£153,987,159</b>	<b>£1,472,031</b>	<b>£2,419,194</b>	<b>£3,587,857</b>	<b>£161,466,241</b>