

## Appendix vii – J2b saving proposal

1. Savings proposal	
Proposal title:	Schools Related Services
Reference:	J2b
LFP work strand:	School Effectiveness
Directorate:	Children & Young People
Head of Service:	Alan Docksey
Service/Team area:	Standards and Achievement, Education Psychology, Attendance and Welfare, Estates Management, Pupil Support
Cabinet portfolio:	Children & Young People
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Children & Young People

2. Decision Route			
Saving proposed:	Key Decision Yes/No	Public Consultation Yes/No	Staff Consultation Yes/No
<b>b) Attendance and Welfare: (£150k)</b> The proposal is to focus council spend on meeting statutory duties and increase the range of services that schools can receive if they pay.	Yes	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal
<b>Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:</b>
<p>The services and activities being reviewed all provide support to schools in support of their responsibilities.</p> <p>The Local Authority already charges for services provided to schools with an annual income of £3.3m (2015/16).</p>
<b>Saving proposal</b>
<p>b) This proposal is to increase the proportion of <b>Attendance and Welfare services</b> traded with schools and reduce the cost of the core service. The increased income is estimated at <b>£150k</b>. While the attendance of vulnerable pupils would continue to be the subject of attendance casework centrally, schools would be charged for routine casework currently undertaken as part of the core service. Under this proposal, the AWS would better reflect the statutory duties of the LA and there would be greater clarity about the responsibilities that schools must deliver either by doing the casework themselves or paying for the LA to undertake it. Primary schools will in the main be affected by this proposal as secondary schools already have the in-school resources to absorb the impact of this change.</p> <p>The current council funded budget of £498k represents a cost of £19 per pupil which benchmarks against average English spending of £12 per pupil. The budget has in last two years been reduced to move towards national and local comparators and this further saving would achieve the English average benchmark.</p>

## Appendix vii – J2b saving proposal

### 4. Impact and risks of proposal

#### Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

##### General

School budgets and the dedicated schools grant have come under increasing pressure over the last few years. For 2015/16, funding allocated to schools in respect of children with special educational needs has been reduced by £2.1m to help balance the central DSG budget. The Schools Forum agreed to this change, recognising that schools had already been funded for some of these costs within their delegated budgets.

Recent publicity, nationally, has highlighted that real terms funding of schools budgets will reduce over the life of this parliament by at least 7% in real terms if the funding level per pupil stays cash frozen. Some forecasts suggest up to 12% (an analysis by the Institute of Fiscal Studies).

A 7% reduction would reduce schools' spending power across Lewisham by £17m. There are other budgetary pressures on the Dedicated Schools Grant that will need to be funded. The national rates revaluation which will take place in 2017 is expected to increase the rates bills falling to the DSG. Some of this pressure will however be eased by the continued increase in pupil numbers.

In respect of the individual proposals:

b) There is a risk that if schools do not buy in to this, that children who have some vulnerabilities and who are not in school may be missed. However the LA's 'missing from education' procedures should mitigate this. If the service is not successful in securing buy back from schools, there is a risk that up to 3 FTE staff may need to be made redundant.

#### Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions:

##### General

It is likely that there will come a point when schools feel the increased charges through SLAs will result in them having to purchase fewer services, a reduced level of support or reducing expenditure on other services in support of pupils' education. This will make the traded services much more sensitive to price increases than has been the case in the past.

In order to mitigate the likelihood of the increased levels of income failing to be achieved there will be consultation with schools forum on the proposals with the opportunity to influence the final shape of the proposals for the services to be charged for and the value of charges. Other mitigation for each specific proposal is set out below:

b) There is a need to ensure that schools have robust systems in place to identify vulnerable children and refer to the appropriate agencies.

### 5. Financial information

Controllable budget:	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000
General Fund	5,844	(3,670)	2,174
Saving proposed:	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000

## Appendix vii – J2b saving proposal

5. Financial information			
b) Attendance and Welfare	150		150
Total	150	0	150
% of Net GF Budget	7%	0%	7%
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA
	Yes	Yes	No
If impact on DSG or HRA describe:	The DSG provides additional support to these services.		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities		
Main priority	Second priority	<b>Corporate priorities</b> 1. Community leadership and empowerment 2. Young people's achievement and involvement 3. Clean, green and liveable 4. Safety, security and a visible presence 5. Strengthening the local economy 6. Decent homes for all 7. Protection of children 8. Caring for adults and the older people 9. Active, healthy citizens 10. Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity
<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	
Impact on main priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	Impact on second priority – Positive / Neutral / Negative	
<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Positive</b>	
Level of impact on main priority – High / Medium / Low	Level of impact on second priority – High / Medium / Low	
<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical impact by ward:	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
	No Specific Impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact			
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A			
Ethnicity:		Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:		Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:		Sexual orientation:	
Disability:		Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:		Overall:	N/A
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:			
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No			No

9. Human Resources impact	
Will this saving proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No	Other than

## Appendix vii – J2b saving proposal

### 9. Human Resources impact

deletion of  
vacant  
posts - No

### 10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Section 443 of the Education Act 1996 requires local authorities to make arrangements to enable them to establish (as far as possible) the identity of children in their area who are not receiving a suitable education. Section 444 imposes a statutory responsibility of local authorities to ensure that parents fulfil their legal duty that children of compulsory school age receive suitable, efficient full-time education either by regularly attending school or otherwise. Section 446 of the Education Act 1996 requires that proceedings for offences under sections 443 or 444 can only be instituted by a local authority.

The local authority is statutorily required to ensure that its education and training functions are exercised with a view to promoting high standards, fulfilment of potential and fair access to opportunity for education and training. The proposals have to be consistent with the local authorities ability to meet its statutory responsibilities.

### 11. Summary timetable

Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:

Month	Activity
August 2015	Proposals prepared ( <b>this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation</b> )
September 2015	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C on 30 September
October 2015	Consultations with Schools Forum 1 October 2015
November 2015	Consultations ongoing and ( <b>full decision</b> ) reports returned to Scrutiny for review
December 2015	Consultations returned to Scrutiny for review leading to M&C for decision on 9 December
January 2016	Transition work ongoing
February 2016	Transition work ongoing and budget set 24 February
March 2016	Savings implemented
April 2016	