

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget - Growth Proposal

Service: Education and child social care

Description of Proposal
Supporting targeted life chances, Increase youth offending funding and Pilot project for improving links between schools and employers

Proposed Growth

Proposed Growth in 2013/14 £'000s	Proposed Growth in 2013/14 FTE Staff	Proposed Growth in 2014/15 £'000s	Proposed Growth in 2014/15 FTE Staff
13		13	

	2013/14 £'000s	2014/15 £'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	732
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	267
Third Party Payments	
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	
Gross Expenditure	999
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	(4)
Grant and External Contributions	(460)
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	(464)
Net Expenditure	535

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

<p>Impact of Proposal on public / services</p>	<p>Increase Youth Offending Funding</p> <p>The YOS has previously run a peer mentoring scheme in partnership with Victim Support which trained ex young offenders to work in schools in order to discourage those young people on the brink of suspension from school or displaying pro-criminal attitudes from actually becoming involved in crime. This work ceased in 2010 because the grant aided funding ceased. In order to re-introduce this work, we would need to re-commission Victim Support and train further ex offenders at a cost of £8000.</p> <p>The cost of approximately £8,000 per annum would be more than offset by savings within the wider service. The intention is to provide different options for helping young people who are on the cusp of getting into serious trouble.</p> <p>In addition, a work experience scheme, such as “careers academies UK”, can offer a positive experience for those at risk of simply drifting from education with few Outcomes.</p> <p>For some, opportunities for work experience might make all the difference. For other, a more traditional ‘tougher’ stance may be required. Thus the scheme will work as a pincer movement; a “tough love” approach via the youth offending service and a more encouraging and inspirational approach via special work experience (such as the excellently mentored scheme from “Careers Academies UK”). This would be done with the schools after discussing what cases merit certain actions.</p> <p>The scheme will be a real saving to the Council as intervention while at school is far cheaper than a negative lifestyle later in life.</p> <p>The scheme will only be a cost to the Council for the first two years, as capital costs opposed to building it into base budget. After this it will be offered to schools as a form of tested support they can commission, thus becoming self funding. If it is not a scheme the school wish to fund, then it is not something we should be offering anyway.</p> <p>Strengthening the links between schools, the Council and</p>
---	--

	local employers is a desirable aim in itself. The ability to help even more troubled young people into worthwhile training and/or work is a clear ambition of the Council.
Impact of Proposal on performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

Impact of Proposal on staff	
------------------------------------	--

Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable	
--	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget - Growth Proposal

Service: Education and Children's Social Care

Description of Proposal

Performance related cost savings – Increase proportion of locally recruited foster carers by localising and expending the communications budget.
--

Proposed Growth

Proposed Growth in 2013/14 £'000s	Proposed Growth in 2013/14 FTE Staff	Proposed Growth in 2014/15 £'000s	Proposed Growth in 2014/15 FTE Staff
10			

	2013/14 £'000s	2014/15 £'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	366
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	159
Third Party Payments	1,802
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	17
Gross Expenditure	2,344
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	
Grant and External Contributions	
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	
Net Expenditure	2,344

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

<p>Impact of Proposal on public / services</p>	<p>Increase proportion of locally recruited foster carers</p> <p>Historically, the fostering service held a budget for recruitment and publicity activities in order to attract new foster-carers. This budget was incorporated into the central communications budget with effect from January 1st 2012. This change was implemented "in year", and the whole allocation placed centrally from April 1st 2012. Following previous savings requirements, the budget for Advertising and Publicity at the point of centralisation was £50,500, to cover both Fostering and Adoption activity.</p> <p>The main consequence of centralisation has been to reduce the flexibility of the service to use resources of our choosing based on previous effectiveness, e.g. using the Gazette which has previously generated better response rates. There is also now less flexibility to respond to short notice publicity opportunities.</p> <p>Restoration of an independent budget would be welcomed within the service, although it is recognised that this contradicts the corporate strategy of centralising the Communications budget.</p> <p>Because the budget has now been centralised, there has been no detailed costing produced for the last year, as Communications have sought to consolidate activity and achieve further savings. In addition options for activity have moved on rapidly through the expansion of electronic media, and we have been discussing with Communications Team how to expand in this area, potentially reducing expenditure and activity elsewhere.</p> <p>However the last detailed available forward plan prior to centralisation is outlined below:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Forthcoming campaigns and additional costs</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Estimated Spend</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Therapeutic Open Evening</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£6,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Therapeutic general advertising</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Barking and Dagenham Town Show Guide - Attract their existing carers! Half Page</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£625</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supported Lodgings</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Children's art project (for calendar and Open evening gallery)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adoption Advertising</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Courses/seminars</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Train Advertising</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£8,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Forthcoming campaigns and additional costs	Estimated Spend	Therapeutic Open Evening	£6,000	Therapeutic general advertising	£3,000	Barking and Dagenham Town Show Guide - Attract their existing carers! Half Page	£625	Supported Lodgings	£2,000	Children's art project (for calendar and Open evening gallery)	£500	Adoption Advertising	£1,000	Courses/seminars	£2,000	Train Advertising	£8,500
Forthcoming campaigns and additional costs	Estimated Spend																		
Therapeutic Open Evening	£6,000																		
Therapeutic general advertising	£3,000																		
Barking and Dagenham Town Show Guide - Attract their existing carers! Half Page	£625																		
Supported Lodgings	£2,000																		
Children's art project (for calendar and Open evening gallery)	£500																		
Adoption Advertising	£1,000																		
Courses/seminars	£2,000																		
Train Advertising	£8,500																		

	<p>Presence in local press throughout the year £6,000</p> <p>3 month Facebook trial £510</p> <p>Billboards (20 weeks of advertising) £5,000</p> <p>Queen's Theatre Guide - full page, different productions for 1 year £1,000</p> <p>Targeted BME activity £2,000</p> <p>Posters and printing costs £1,000</p> <p>Line rental for 2 phone lines £240</p> <p>Atlas Promo boards x 10 in Thurrock £900</p> <p>Community Road show - 1 week at Lakeside £6,000</p> <p>Incentive vouchers - existing carers recommend a friend £100</p> <p>Stationery £300</p> <p>Essex Radio £5,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;">£51,675</p> <p>We already have a plan for recruitment activity for the service based on the current arrangements which we need to have ready for the inspection. This would be revised in the event of restoration of local controls.</p> <p>For the first two years of the new arrangements, the budget should be increased to £60,000</p>
<p>Impact of Proposal on performance</p>	<p>As part of the debate at Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the challenge must be to set an ambitious but achievable target to increase the number of 'in-borough' carers over the next two years. If that target is not achieved, then funding would have to be withdrawn. Given that what is proposed is therefore a two-year trial, it is proposed that funding is taken from the Council's General Fund reserves rather than being built into the base budget for the service, as this will run for two years to judge its effectiveness.</p> <p>There are significant costs to pay for care outside the borough, if it is not a case where care can take place within our boundaries. In addition, it is best for children and for the financial position of the service to provide care as fast as possible, thus this will help generate fewer long term costs. The department will be requested to produce a business case</p>

	at the end of years 1 and 2 to show the effect that a dedicated and expanded budget has produced i.e. reducing the cost of out of borough care.
--	---

Impact of Proposal on staff	
------------------------------------	--

Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable	
--	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget - Savings Proposal

Service: Education and Children's Social Care

Description of Proposal

Withdrawal of denominational transport subsidies and Replacement of 11-18 school transport with travel passes, with addition of non commercially viable shuttle service
--

Proposed Saving

Proposed Saving in 2013/14 £'000s	Proposed Saving in 2013/14 FTE Staff	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 £'000s	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 FTE Staff
100		250	

	2013/14 £'000s	2014/15 £'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	
Third Party Payments	1,869
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	
Gross Expenditure	
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	
Grant and External Contributions	
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	
Net Expenditure	

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

<p>Impact of Proposal on public / services</p>	<p>Cutting Denomination transport in its entirety will be a cut starting with the 2013 academic year (where possible) and completing in the 2014 academic year. Children with SEN needs, with distance issues outlined in Council policy and children with parents with income support will still be eligible for support. However, we will no longer subsidise the equivalent of private education.</p> <p>This also supports the full role out of the ensign bus scheme as this scheme is the best deal for the taxpayer and it is linked to their commercial viability, instead of our General Fund, with no loss of service, in fact the service is more flexible for students.</p> <p>A part of the saving will be used to tender a means tested shuttle service for areas that are not included in the ensign scheme.</p> <p>This cost of approximately £50k has been netted off the proposed saving for 2014/15.</p> <p>A fairness principal outlines that all changes in provisions will not occur in year at all, and we will start to advertise the changes to all effected from March.</p>
<p>Impact of Proposal on performance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

<p>Impact of Proposal on staff</p>	
---	--

<p>Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable</p>	<p>The Council has an obligation to provide free education transport for eligible children resident in the borough of Thurrock. The legislation outlining the criteria determining “eligible children” is contained in section 508B of The Education Act 1996.</p>
---	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget – Savings and focused spending Proposal

Service: Education and Children’s Social Care

Description of Proposal
Establishing academy reserves

Proposed Saving

Proposed Saving in 2013/14 £'000s	Proposed Saving in 2013/14 FTE Staff	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 £'000s	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 FTE Staff

	2013/14 £'000s	2014/15 £'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	12,214
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	5,014
Third Party Payments	8,235
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	2,066
Support Services Costs	4,744
Gross Expenditure	32,273
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	
Grant and External Contributions	(13,340)
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	(13,340)
Net Expenditure	18,933

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

Impact of Proposal on public / services	<p>This option will be available to all current and future academy schools. This is to actively support conversion so we can start to release more money by recovering staff and functions based on having maintained schools.</p> <p>The Council remains committed to helping schools improve, and at least £1m should be put into an “Academies improvement reserve” (to replace the current School Improvement budget) from the councils over stocked reserves.</p> <p>The difference in approach from the current arrangements would be that schools would apply for funds from the Reserve rather than this being built into the base budget of the LEA. This would not seek to replace reserves that academies already hold.</p> <p>Academies would provide business cases to what they wish to improve in order to release money. Not only would this ensure that academes can’t hold back money, it will be a new way of building a “commissioner rather than provider” relationship as we would move to a partner of option, opposed to having the powers to intervene.</p> <p>This can be largely decided by the cabinet members and head of service, with committee providing scrutiny.</p> <p>This will enable schools to help themselves before they encounter issues, and will allow us a better and more cooperative relationship to tackle Ofsted reports together in an age where powers to intervene are less.</p>
Impact of Proposal on performance	

Impact of Proposal on staff	
------------------------------------	--

Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable	
--	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget – Savings and focused spending Proposal

Service: Education and Children’s Social Care

Description of Proposal
Move education department to an “all academy model” with all possible dedicated schools grant money being directly devolved to the schools

Proposed Saving

Proposed Saving in 2013/14 £’000s	Proposed Saving in 2013/14 FTE Staff	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 £’000s	Proposed Saving in 2014/15 FTE Staff

	2013/14 £’000s	2014/15 £’000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13 – Relating to Education

	£’000s
Expenditure	
Employees	5,366
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	1,473
Third Party Payments	4,299
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	
Gross Expenditure	11,138
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	(641)
Grant and External Contributions	(8,649)
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	(9,290)
Net Expenditure	1,848

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

<p>Impact of Proposal on public / services</p>	<p>Transfer all possible DSG to academy schools rather than the current practice of top-slicing a sum to be retained by the Local Authority.</p> <p>The government are currently in the process of minimising centrally retained DSG</p> <p>This option will be available to all current and future academy schools. This is to actively support conversion so we can start to release more money by recovering staff and functions based on having maintained schools.</p> <p>For 2013/14 The Dedicated Schools grant has been restructured and split into three separate sub blocks, which are The Schools Block, Early Years Block and High Needs Block.</p> <p>All local Authorities have been tasked with calculating the Schools block in such a way as to ensure that it is distributed in the same way for maintained Schools as for Academies. The amount of centrally retained Schools block DSG has reduced to £1.5m, Previously this was £3.1m, outside of the High needs block. This element covers the costs of Admissions, past redundancy and early retirement commitments, administering Schools Forum, Centrally paid licences (paid by DfE) and a small contribution to Education overhead. Any changes in Schools block DSG, can only be passed to Schools direct budgets and cannot lead to a council saving.</p> <p>For Central Education budgets, there has been a change in the methodology of distributing the revenue support grant, with an element being distributed separately as an Education Services Grant. This grant will be calculated by removing £3.4m of core funding from the councils revenue support grant, and redistributed based on the number of pupils either educated at Local Authority maintained Schools or those educated in Academies. The element that relates to statutory services that the Authority is required to provide to maintained Schools and Academies will be funded at £15 per pupil (approx £365k) whilst those services which stay with the Authority will be allocated at £116 per pupil, this grant will not</p>
---	---

	<p>be paid for pupils in Academies.</p> <p>Therefore if we move to an all Academy model, it would be a real terms saving in officer time and posts no longer needed, but the true saving would be of the greater financial benefit to schools because the existing DSG would be better spent directly by the schools, and it would allow for greater economies of scale scope because different schools are free to enter into new arrangements that make sense to them i.e. the learning community commissioning directly for the needs of Tilbury and Chadwell.</p>
<p>Impact of Proposal on performance</p>	<p>To be clear, the proposal is to ensure that the schools receive the maximum amount of DSG as possible, with none being 'top-sliced' by the LEA. The only exception would be when schools decide to commission from the Council, even so this would be the school paying us via DSG.</p> <p>If schools choose to continue to commission services from the LEA that must be their choice and the Council must be ready to reduce those services that schools are not prepared to purchase. It is envisaged that the transition to a fully commissioned approach may take a couple of years, but would be fully in place for financial year 2015/16 at the absolute latest. For example, educational psychologists paid for by the Council using DSG, would be expressed to the schools to commission for themselves. It will free a greater level of monetary support as it would not require the same level of input from the Council. Of course this does not hold the same for the duties where there is an explicit need for the authority to carry it out, or indeed in areas where school chose to commission the authority.</p>

<p>Impact of Proposal on staff</p>	
<p>Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable</p>	

<p>Equalities Impact</p>	
---------------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget - Growth Proposal

Service: Education and Children's Social Care

Description of Proposal
Consultation and investigation on the cost of child social care

Proposed Growth

Proposed Growth in 2013/14	Proposed Growth in 2013/14	Proposed Growth in 2014/15	Proposed Growth in 2014/15
£'000s	FTE Staff	£'000s	FTE Staff
5			

	2013/14	2014/15
	£'000s	£'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	
Third Party Payments	4,234
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	
Gross Expenditure	4,234
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	
Grant and External Contributions	(120)
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	(120)
Net Expenditure	4,114

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

Impact of Proposal on public / services	<p>The cost of child social care is huge and complex, it does not always produce clear expenditure, and thus it is subject to mistake or inefficiency. We cannot accept a growth bid £3million without a plan of ensuring that such growth bids are not a constant occurrence.</p> <p>An investigation will pay for the following from an independent professional – a review of our case placements for value for money, to ensure we do accurately proportion costs between us and partners, and the cost of the structural body of the Council administering the case and such.</p>
Impact of Proposal on performance	<p>No impact, the investigation can help us achieve huge savings, far greater in proportion than the cost</p>

Impact of Proposal on staff	
------------------------------------	--

Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable	
--	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--

2013/14 – 2014/15 Budget – Savings and focused spending proposal

Service: Education and Children’s Social Care

Description of Proposal
Zero Base Budget Restructure for the redistribution of discretionary education spend from savings in the structural size of the LEA.

Proposed Growth

Proposed Growth in 2013/14	Proposed Growth in 2013/14	Proposed Growth in 2014/15	Proposed Growth in 2014/15
£'000s	FTE Staff	£'000s	FTE Staff
30			

	2013/14	2014/15
	£'000s	£'000s
People		
Property	-	-
Third Party	-	-
Infrastructure/Kit	-	-

Base Budget 2012/13

	£'000s
Expenditure	
Employees	
Other Direct Running Costs (Premises, Transport and Supplies)	
Third Party Payments	
Transfer Payments	
Capital Financing Costs	
Support Services Costs	
Gross Expenditure	
Income	
Sales, Fees and Charges	
Grant and External Contributions	
Support Services Income	
Gross Income	
Net Expenditure	

Recent Changes to Base Budget

	£'000s
Growth approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0
Savings approved in the 2012/13 Base Budget	0

<p>Impact of Proposal on public / services</p>	<p>Currently the staff budget for education sits at about £12m; this is £3m more than 2007. This is concerning considering the fact that since 2010, we have far more academies (all but 2 of our secondary schools) who require less direct input from the Council.</p> <p>With the expansion of academies and free schools in Thurrock, it is hard to justify such a large department. In addition, with the third worst ratings for children with access to a “good” or better school, It is clear that the front line is in the class room, not in the Civic office.</p> <p>We will start to move money from the structural size of the Council to the class rooms.</p> <p>We will look to start to move to a baseline department where only statutory functions are a given, the rest being on a commission basis or where members actively chose to opt in schemes such as NEET work.</p> <p>This can be done by an external consultant who will help us Zero base budget the department with the aim of producing a firm “statutory” only structure, so we can see how much discretionary expenditure there is and start to move it to schools and groups on a commissioner basis.</p> <p>In addition, a comment was made at O&S that we spend 10 months going over performance, and only 2 going over the budget. Finance have confirmed that they can split the budget into manageable and logical chunks to go onto the work plan so committee gets to scrutinise the entirety of the budget within a year. This could lead to better scrutiny than ever and invaluable new ideas coming forward in preparation for budget.</p>
<p>Impact of Proposal on performance</p>	

<p>Impact of Proposal on staff</p>	
---	--

Practical requirements regarding implementation and timetable	
--	--

Equalities Impact	
--------------------------	--