

# **Schools Forum**

**6<sup>th</sup> October 2009**

**4.00pm – Briefing by Geoff Boyd**

**4:30pm – Schools Forum Meeting**

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

**Agenda, Minutes and Discussion  
Papers**

## Contents

<b>Agenda.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Members .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Minutes of the last meeting.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 12<sup>th</sup> May .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Barnet Catering Service .....	12
4.2 Contracts Impacting on Schools but not Accessible .....	12
4.3 Insurance .....	13
4.4 Costs of Admissions section.....	13
4.5 Free milk in Schools .....	13
4.6 Conditions survey and measurement of schools .....	15
4.7 DFC Loans to the Local Authority .....	16
<b>5. Items for agreement.....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1 Consultation : Single Early Years funding Formula from April 2010.....	16
<b>6. Items for information .....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1 Report of the Early Years Working Group (EYWG).....	18
6.2 Building Schools for the Future .....	18
6.3 Mid Year adjustments and comparative school funding.....	18
6.4 Post 16 funding – LSC transfer.....	19

## **Agenda**

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

4.30pm Schools Forum meeting

1. Welcome to new members
2. Apologies for absence
3. Minutes of previous meeting: 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009
4. Matters arising
  - 4.1. Barnet Catering Service
  - 4.2. Contracts 'not accessible to schools'
  - 4.3. Insurance
  - 4.4. Cost of admissions section
  - 4.5. Free milk in schools
  - 4.6. Conditions survey and measurement of schools
  - 4.7. DFC Loans to the LA
5. Items for Agreement
  - 5.1. Nursery funding formula from 2010
6. Items for Information
  - 6.1. Report of the Early Years Working Group
  - 6.2. Building Schools for the Future
  - 6.3. Mid Year adjustments and comparative school funding
  - 6.4. Post 16 funding – LSC transfer
7. Any Other Business

### **Dates for future meetings:**

Tue 24 <sup>th</sup> November 2009	4:00pm
Tue 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2010	4.00pm
Tue 18 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	4.00pm
Tue 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	4.00pm

## Members

# Schools Forum Membership

As 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009

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

### GOVERNORS

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

### NON-SCHOOL MEMBERS

Mr	Mick	Quigley	Principal Inspector, Children's Service	Other	Stakeholder – SIPs
Mr	Alan	Homes	NASUWT	Other	Union
Ms	Angela	Murphy	Bishop Douglass	Other	14-19 Partnership
Ms	Sarah	Vipond	Middlesex University Nursery	Other	Private Early Years Providers

### OBSERVERS

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

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Mr	Robert	McCulloch Graham	Director of Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Linda	Parker	Joint Head of Finance – Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Denise	Murray	Joint Head of Finance – Children's Service	Officer	
Mr	Nick	Adams	Schools Finance Services Manager, Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Carol	Beckman	School Funding Manager – Children's Service	Officer	
Ms	Sarosh	Malik	School Resources & Support Officer – Children's Service	Officer	Minutes
Mr	Graham	Durham	Assistant Director of Children's Service	Officer	
Mr	Geoff	Boyd	Consultant	Other	

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting

#### Meeting of the Schools Forum

**Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

***(4.30 pm, Sapphire Room, Emerald Suite at NLBP)***

#### **Attended**

Members:	Alan Homes (NASUWT) Anthea Aberly (Head, Rosh Pinah) Anthony Vourou (Governor, St John's N11) Dee Oelman (Head, St Mary's & St John's) Gilbert Knight (Governor, Oakleigh) Helen Schmitz (Head, Cromer Road) Jayne Franklin (Head, Childs Hill) Jeanette Adak (Head, Monkfrith) John Marincowitz (Head, QE Boys) Johnathan Hewlings (Governor, East Barnet) Kate Webster (Head QE Girls) Ken Huggins (Governor, The Compton) Kevin Hoare (Head, Finchley Catholic) Mick Quigley (Principal Inspector, Children's Service) Stephen Parkin (Governor, St Mary's High)
LA Officers:	Robert McCulloch Graham (Director of Children's Service) Martin Baker (Deputy Director, Children's Service) Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager) Denise Murray (Strategic Finance Manager) Nick Adams (School Services Finance Manager) Linda Parker (Strategic Finance Manager) Val White (Assistant Director, ) Tony Lampert (HR Manager)
Consultant:	Geoff Boyd (Consultant)
Clerk:	Sarrosch Malik (School Resources & Support Officer)
Members:	Angela Murphy (14-19Partnership, Head Bishop Douglas) Gary Tucker (Head, Christ's College Finchley) Hazel Godfrey (Governor, Broadfields) Derrick Brown (Governor, Ashmole) Lynda Walker (Head, Oak Lodge) Elizabeth Pearson (Governor, Livingstone) Jodi Gurney (Head, Hampden Way) Sarah Vipond (Early Years Working Group) Jo Djora (Head, Coppetts Wood) Tim Bowden (Head, Holy Trinity)
Observers:	Cllr Fiona Bulmer Angela Trigg (London Academy) Lucy Salaman (LSC Partnership Manager)

#### **Not Present**

### 1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Bulmer, Lynda Walker, Derrick Brown, Elizabeth Pearson, Gary Tucker, Lucy Salaman, Jo Djora and Sarah Vipond.

## 2. Minutes of previous meeting (12<sup>th</sup> May 2009)

Proposer: KH

Seconder: AH

## 3. Matters Arising

Minute 3.4 –Insurance

Minute 3.7 – Contracts

VW gave an update to the Schools Forum. She said that Barnet Catering are carrying out benchmarking and will report back to a future Schools Forum. VW explained that Barnet Catering is a traded service and schools are able to compare Barnet Catering to other private companies.

SP asked about schools buying in to insurance with Barnet as an in house service. He said that the council's insurers give a lower quotation when contacted directly than through Barnet. He added that the insurance section at Barnet cannot give an explanation for this. JH said that at the last meeting it was said that the Head of Insurance would be attending today's meeting. LP replied that Paul Lawrence had given his apologies for today but will be invited to the next meeting. SP suggested that information could have been sent out rather than have to wait until October. RMG confirmed that the information will be sent out.

DM told the Schools Forum that contract data will be released to the website by the end of this month. She added there is an internal team monitoring the contracts and they have been given the Schools Forum's meeting dates to work around.

JM asked if schools could buy into energy contracts. DM explained that all contracts are accessible to schools apart from the ones at the bottom of the spreadsheet. DM said that only services where schools are the major clients would require the forum to give a view. JH queried what 'giving a view' means in relation to the Schools Forum and requested clarification on the contracts classified within the category contracts impacting on schools but not accessible and DM said clarification will be provided to the next forum.

DM clarified the query around AIG Insurance. She said she checked it and confirmed that the company is AIG UK not AIG Inc which has been downgraded. She also said that the Leader had been briefed.

KH commented on the first class service that has been provided by the insurance section. DM and LP said they would feed back to the department.

AH said the guidance on 1-2-1 tuition suggested that teachers would receive double pay. JF explained that the teachers carry out 1-2-1 tuition outside of contractual school time.

KH asked whether benchmarking information on the costs of admissions was available. LP said she would follow this up.

TL gave a brief summary of the issues surrounding Nursery Nurses having reported back to the primary heads two weeks ago. He said they were close to

agreement with the Trade Unions and further information would be given to primary and nursery heads before the end of term.

#### **4. Items for Agreement**

##### **4.1 Balances as at the end of 2008/09**

NA told the Schools Forum about the national position at the end of March 2009 when school balances were reported to be £2bn. Funding should be used for current pupils and there is a danger of clawback from the local authority if the balances do not go down. The DCSF carried out a survey at the end of 2008/09 of balances which showed a general downward trend.

NA said that there has been a lot of discussion during last year at the Schools Forum about balances and it was agreed that if there was an increase in balances then there would be a review.

NA explained that all schools which have revenue balances in excess of 5% (secondary) or 8% (nursery, primary and special) of their 2008/09 Budget Shares will be asked to explain their balance and potentially be subject to claw back in accordance with the Scheme for Financing Schools and in accordance with the procedure agreed with the Schools Forum. He said the results of this exercise would be reported back to the Schools Forum.

NA went on to explain the possible contributory factors to high revenue balances shown in his paper. He said that whilst schools are asked to use detailed planning to prevent excess surpluses, schools are also expected to plan to avoid deficits.

NA asked the Schools Forum to note the actions being taken including the proposal to consult schools on a change to paragraph 4.1 of the Scheme of Financing Schools. NA said that he would bring the results back to the Schools Forum to make a decision.

AH asked why there had been redundancies if so few schools are in deficit. NA said that redundancies are often linked to children with SEN leaving.

Regarding devolved formula capital DM suggested that the LA could hold the money if the school would otherwise hold it in balances. AA said that DFC funding comes through DCSF and that schools must 'spend it or lose it'. NA told the Schools Forum that VA schools get their DFC from the government so different procedures apply. Clarification was requested regarding the ability of VA schools to loan their DFC to the LA and DM said that she would contact the DCSF and report back to the next meeting.

MB suggested that tighter wording is needed for Point 5 of the actions. DM explained that the words are from the technical guidance notes. JM asked the Schools Forum if they agreed to the wording being changed. JH added that clarification was needed on Point 2 of the actions, asking what the process is. NA explained that the process would be the same as last year. He said that a pro forma was sent asking what is committed and what is unspent. He mentioned that schools have always justified their balances in the past.

JH asked about the Schools Forum's responsibility in this. KH said that the forum is responsible for the 29 schools above the 5%/8% limit. MB suggested

that members could work with NA.

DM said that the Government looks at this issue nationally and doesn't look at commitments. MQ added that it's not just the 29 schools, it could affect all schools if government takes action.

MB suggested schools are reminded about the clawback process. JF explained that schools are already aware and that Schools Forum members have been talking to other Heads and Governors who are discussing the issues. She added that Standards Funds may only be small amounts but they do add up and it would be helpful to have allocations earlier.

JM said that action needed to be decided. NA said two proposals need to be agreed. The first proposal was to consult schools on the wording. A second proposal was made that the Scheme be changed for all revenue balances above 5% (secondary) or 8% (primary, nursery and special) to be clawed back unless a sum which is legitimately deferred and assigned is approved by a sub committee of the Schools Forum. NA said that there is no time to do this this term. KW asked for the points to be included in the School Circular this term so there is time to think about it. RMG agreed.

JM concluded that the two proposals would be sent to schools for consultation. JM asked the Schools Forum to endorse the documents and for the results of consultation of the two proposals to be discussed at the next meeting.

Unanimous agreement.

#### **4.2 Dedicated Schools Grant 2008/09 and 2009/10 – options of use for underspend**

LP presented the paper to the Schools Forum. She said that the figures had been reproduced in this report against the Section 52 lines showing the proposed use of the underspend.

She said Table 2 included the final LSC figures. She told the Schools Forum that the DCSF have announced the final DSG 2009/10 and that the LA were nearly spot on with just an increase of one pupil.

She explained that since the Schools Budget for 2009-10 was discussed at the last meeting of the Schools Forum a number of budget pressures have been identified. These are Pupil Place Planning, Nursery Nurses and Asset Management Plans. The demand for additional school places will be met from the schools contingency budget and the nursery nurses grading arrears should be met by schools from their allocated ISB.

It is recommended that Asset Management should be funded from the 2008-9 rolled forward underspend as surveys could be used for future investment. LP told the Schools Forum that surveys typically cost £3500 per Primary School and £8000 for Secondary Schools, a total of £400k would be needed. The Children's Service would be allocating £100k and the Schools Forum would be asked to agree an allocation of £175.6k.



LP also mentioned the pressure of BSF. She said that there is a requirement to identify £2.9m - £4m. She explained that funding needs to start being identified from now, subject to the bid being satisfactory.

KH said that there was a lack of playing fields and no funding for these. VW explained that sports provision is being looked at as part of BSF.

JM remarked that as the contingency is top sliced from ISB, should it not go back to schools. He also said that if the contingency is too large then less should be topsliced next year.

JM went on to say that accurate surveys are needed, but the LA should be taking the cost on. He added that if the forum contributes towards BSF it could trigger £85m for the council but some schools would never see any of that money.

AH asked if Asset Management would include asbestos. SP explained that an asbestos survey had already been carried out. SP asked who would carry out the surveys. VW said it would be put out to tender. SP recommended approaching RIBA. DO asked if surveys would just be for community schools. LP said it would be all schools.

DM told the Schools Forum that additional funding for Asset Management is needed and the extensive programme cannot be carried out with solely internal funding. MB explained that the unplanned underspend is a one-off and that the contingency is set at an appropriate level.

KW told the Schools Forum that the recommendation is right in principle. She said that there is a lot of sensitivity around BSF. The first wave of schools may be lucky but the other schools will not benefit. RMG said that all schools would benefit eventually.

JM concluded that there is £271k underspend of which £190k came from contingency. He said that there are different interests for the LA and Schools and that both have pressing issues. He asked the Schools Forum if they agree to fund Asset Management and BSF.

Both – 11 Agreed  
BSF only – 1 Agreed  
AM only – 1 Agreed

Agreement was reached to contribute £175,000 to surveys on the basis that all primary schools and some secondary schools outside of the Building Schools for the Future programme will be surveyed this year and a rolling programme introduced thereafter.

SP asked the LA to check with schools if they have had a recent survey.

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

VW presented the paper to the Schools Forum. She told the Schools Forum that the DCSF invited expressions of interest for the Targeted Capital Fund grant for School Kitchens. Following an initial expression of interest, Barnet's detailed bid totalled £2.7m. The DCSF have recently advised that rather than select successful bidders, Ministers have agreed that all authorities that submitted should get half of their bid.

VW explained that the LA have to ask the Schools Forum to agree to the projects. AA asked why there is a kosher kitchen at the Tudor School site. VW said that they serve the Jewish Primary schools.

JM asked the Schools Forum if they agreed to the proposal.

Unanimously Agreed.

Proposer – KH  
Seconder - JH

#### **4.4 Consultation on the Schools Forum Regulations**

CB presented the paper to the Schools Forum. She explained that the DCSF have redrafted Schools Forum regulations and are consulting on a number of changes.

CB said that the DCSF was concerned that academies and private providers should be properly represented. She explained that academies would be able to comment and make decisions about funding for all schools even though academies funding is not made public. CB suggested that a comment to the DCSF should be made on this.

CB asked the forum whether they would be keen to take a view on the sufficiency of nursery provision in the borough. It could be an onerous responsibility but all agreed.

CB explained that some LAs with contrasting geographical localities might wish to have locality representation on the Schools Forum. AH thought this would be a matter for the future.

### **5 Items for Information**

#### **5.1 Report of the Early Years Working Group (1<sup>st</sup> July 2009)**

Deferred until the next meeting.

## **5.4 Building Schools For the Future – Update July 2009**

VW told the Schools Forum that Barnet was among 9 authorities to be invited to a 'Readiness to Deliver Assessment Panel' on 1<sup>st</sup> July at the DCSF. The feedback at this panel was generally positive and our submission was regarded as strong. She said there were still a couple of areas being addressed.

VW explained that there were some concerns among secondary heads and although it can't be properly quantified yet BSF will benefit all schools. VW went on further to explain that the current economic climate and a possible change in administration could jeopardize future BSF programmes so it is important to join the scheme as soon as possible. She said that there would be meeting for headteachers within a fortnight.

KH said that transparency is important. TV asked if there were any plans for primary schools. RMG explained that there is a different funding scheme for primary schools. He added that when investment comes through the money needs to be spent quickly. RMG promised to work on a long term strategy for all schools.

RMG apologised for having to leave the meeting early.

## **5.3 Administration of Free Milk in Schools**

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

VW explained that currently £17k is set aside for milk in schools. She said most schools are in the scheme and that using Cool Milk would save £17k and free up administration time. JF agreed that at present it is time consuming. Members were concerned whether free milk would be stopped on 5<sup>th</sup> birthday or at the end of term. JM asked VW to clarify the situation and talk to primary heads.

VW asked if the LA should go ahead to start Cool Milk in September assuming that she can clarify that a 5year old child stops receiving free milk at the end of the term in which they are 5. If the milk stops following the birthday, VW undertook to do further consultation with schools.

All Agreed.

## **7 Any Other Business**

No.

## **8. Dates of future meetings**

<b>8.1</b>	Tue 6 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2009	4.30 pm (with briefing at 4pm)
	Tue 24 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2009	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
	Tue 2 <sup>nd</sup> Feb 2010	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
	Tue 18 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)
	Tue 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	4.30pm (with briefing at 4pm)

## 4. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 12<sup>th</sup> May

<b>4.1 Barnet Catering Service</b>	
<b>Author</b>	<b>Val White</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>At an earlier meeting members had asked for benchmarking information comparing the Barnet Catering Services with other authorities.</p> <p>Response: Barnet Catering Service offers a service that all schools can buy into. The service is provided to any school regardless of the size or type of school. Schools with small rolls or particular requirements such as special or faith schools tend not to be commercially viable and, as such, are not an attractive market for commercial service providers. Barnet Catering Service does not operate differential charging except for a nominal charge for kosher meals provision.</p> <p>The selling price of school meals is set by the service, based on costs and the income derived from parents. A school does not purchase a service but facilitates the meal provision for parents. There is no financial commitment by the school to underwrite a contract as there often is with a commercial provider.</p> <p>In setting the price of the school meal, Barnet Catering Service benchmarks against other authority areas. Reliable price comparison with other authorities is difficult to achieve as some councils provide undisclosed levels of subsidy.</p> <p>Take-up of school meals is considered to be a more reliable indicator of effective service provision and Barnet scores highly here against similar authorities with similar levels of free school meal provision.</p> <p>Schools are free to choose the service and to market test it against commercial organisations and some have done this. The majority of schools, however continue to use the service on the basis of value for money combined with guaranteed compliance with government legislation and quality standards.</p>	

<b>4.2 Contracts Impacting on Schools but not Accessible</b>	
<b>Author</b>	<b>Denise Murray</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Joint Head of Finance, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>At the last meeting members queried why some contracts on the published list were shown as 'not accessible' to schools.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Call-off contracts enable orders for goods and services to be placed within the contract period, subject to the prices, specification and terms and conditions agreed in the contract. The contracts listed within the section titled 'impacting on schools but not accessible' are corporate contracts which although they impact on schools, schools cannot call-off the existing contracts independently. For instance Insurance - Schools are entitled to make their own arrangements which may include approaching Zurich Municipal (our property and miscellaneous insurer) direct for individual quotations however terms and conditions may be different. AIG (our liability and motor insurer) will not quote for schools individually.</p>	

### 4.3 Insurance

<b>Author</b>	<b>Paul Lawrence</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Head of Insurance</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>

1. The question was raised at the last meeting as to why some schools may obtain a lower quote for insurance if they go direct to insurers rather than through the Council's Insurance Section.

**Response:**

Any insurance provider (including Zurich) may quote lower rates for an individual school or establishment on a stand alone basis. Their rates will be set to reflect their underwriting approach and desire of market share at that particular time. If a school has the ability to market their insurance arrangements each year it is possible they will find a provider who is willing to offer competitive rates to secure the business. Whether these rates are maintained over following years would need to be considered.

Barnet's approach has always been to undertake a full EU tender for its whole insurance portfolio at the expiry of contracts. The period will depend on the advice of external brokers in respect of the state of the market at the time but generally Barnet will enter into long term agreements with the successful insurers for 3 to 5 years. Provided the insurer does not seek to increase the premium during the term we are committed to renew each year. In return for this loyalty insurers will discount the premium. Such arrangements encourage a longer term commitment to work together to reduce risk and claims.

Results of the tender for property and miscellaneous insurances effective 1 October 2008 will be reflected in the current year bills of those schools which buy the cover and will show a reduction from 2008/9 as fire premium rates have decreased. Schools which do not currently make arrangements through the insurance office can ask for a quotation at any time of the year and the quote will be based on existing rates.

2. The question was raised at an earlier meeting regarding the insurance budget that forms part of the centrally retained budget. What is this insurance for and which schools are covered by this insurance?

**Response:**

The insurance cover funded from the centrally retained budget is for claims from third parties against the local authority as set out in Section 3.4.1 of the Financial Guide for Schools. This covers community schools for public liability which includes Officials Indemnity (also may be called Professional Negligence insurance) and tree root trespass to neighbouring property caused by trees on schools grounds. For community schools the LA is responsible for providing main liability insurances and this is not delegated. Schools must follow the advice of the LA and its professional advisors. The governors of VA and Foundation Schools have responsibility for liability insurance and must maintain their own cover.

The premiums for public liability are calculated from a combination of claims experience and the size of the salaries spend as a percentage of the overall council salaries spend. Premiums for professional indemnity are based on salaries alone. These two insurance covers are provided by an external insurance company, the

services of which are subject to a full EU tender every 3 years. Tree root insurance is a self-insured arrangement which represents a much smaller element of the insurance charge and is calculated based on an estimated percentage exposure of all trees within the responsibility of Barnet.

For 2008-9 the actual insurance charge was £424,773. The original budget of £191,000 was initially under-provided but later adjusted to the full value to match the actual costs and following the realignment of insurance budgets the budget of £425,000 in 2009-10 is set at a realistic level.

Further details regarding insurance cover can be found on the Barnet Grid for Learning website:

<http://www.lgfl.net/lgfl/leas/barnet/web/Schools%20Intranet/SchoolsFundingFinance/documents/NewFinancialGuideForSchools/Section%203.4.1%20LBB%20Insurance.doc>

#### **4.4 Costs of Admissions section**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Linda Parker</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Joint Head of Finance, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
At an earlier meeting members had queried the amount charged to the Dedicated Schools Grant for administration of admissions.	
Response: The table overleaf shows the amount different London authorities charge to the Dedicated Schools Grant for Admissions (Section 52, Line 1.5.3). Out of 32 London boroughs Barnet is the 4th= lowest spend per pupil in 2009-10 and 3rd= in 2008-9.	

#### **4.5 Free milk in Schools**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Val White</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
Cool Milk has confirmed that the entitlement to free milk ends on each child's fifth birthday, after which parents are invited to purchase milk. It is Cool Milk's experience that schools tend to manage the withdrawal of milk in a variety of ways to minimise the impact on individual children. In most schools, sufficient milk is delivered to allow all children who want it, to have a cup of milk each day. We will hold a further consultation event for school staff with the aim of implementing the new arrangements from January 2010.	

**Comparison of Schools Admissions Budget on line 1.5.3 of Section 52 with other London Boroughs**

Budgeted spend per pupil Schools Admissions line 1.5.3		
	2008-9 Budget £	2009-10 Budget £
ENGLAND - Average (mean)	8	8
ENGLAND - Average (median)	8	8
ENGLAND - Minimum	0	0
ENGLAND - Maximum	30	43
London Boroughs Average (median)	12	13
London Boroughs Minimum	3	5
London Boroughs Maximum	30	43
301 Barking and Dagenham	14	16
302 Barnet	7	8
303 Bexley	10	10
304 Brent	9	9
305 Bromley	7	6
202 Camden	7	8
306 Croydon	12	13
307 Ealing	11	14
308 Enfield	12	12
203 Greenwich	15	14
204 Hackney	24	31
205 Hammersmith and Fulham	13	13
309 Haringey	10	19
310 Harrow	19	23
311 Havering	5	7
312 Hillingdon	3	5
313 Hounslow	8	8
206 Islington	19	22
207 Kensington and Chelsea	30	43
314 Kingston upon Thames	12	12
208 Lambeth	7	9
209 Lewisham	14	15
315 Merton	13	13
316 Newham	9	9
317 Redbridge	15	18
318 Richmond upon Thames	13	12
210 Southwark	15	21
319 Sutton	8	9
211 Tower Hamlets	10	10
320 Waltham Forest	13	17
212 Wandsworth	13	14
213 Westminster	14	13

Out of 32 London boroughs Barnet is the 4th= lowest spend per pupil in 2009-10 and 3rd= in 2008-9

**4.6 Conditions survey and measurement of schools**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Keith Rowley</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Head of Capital Team, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>Cabinet Resources Committee, 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2009 approved transfer of £100k to Children's Service for the purpose of School Asset Management surveys. A further £100k is to be provided from Children's Service resources, which together with the £176k DSG contribution brings the total resources available for undertaking condition and measured surveys to £376k. On the basis of funding being made available for this financial year only, quotations are being sought to survey and measure schools with an expectation that the surveys will commence in October 2009.</p> <p>Recent changes in the regulations for the management of asbestos means that certain elements of system style buildings at some schools require the asbestos to be reassessed. The schools affected by the changes in the regulations have been notified and the resurvey of the asbestos elements will be managed as part of the school condition and measured surveys programme.</p>	

#### 4.7 DFC Loans to the Local Authority

<b>Author</b>	<b>Denise Murray</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Joint Head of Finance, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>The DCSF have confirmed that Voluntary Aided (VA) Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) can only be used on VA school capital projects and cannot be loaned to the LA. However, clustering (pooling) is possible between VA schools, usually arranged via the Diocese. This would reduce the need to accumulate annual grants and ensure funds are used to maximum effect.</p>	

## 5. Items for agreement

#### 5.1 Consultation : Single Early Years funding Formula from April 2010

<b>Author</b>	<b>Carol Beckman</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>School Funding Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>

The consultation was circulated to both schools and PVI providers in May requesting responses by 31 August. There were questions on each element of the proposed funding formula. The table below shows the overall volume of responses.

After the consultation closed members of the Early Years Working Group considered the responses and comments received from providers, and the table below shows the final recommendations to the Schools Forum:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Base Rate per pupil	All providers to receive the same base rate per pupil <b>per hour</b> to provide the 12½ hours basic free entitlement, and the same hourly base rate per pupil to be paid to those providers delivering the 2½ hours per week extension for each eligible pupil.
Basic Entitlement per pupil	A basic entitlement allocation to be paid to all providers at a level of £100 per pupil to a maximum limit of £3000 (excluding inflation).
Deprivation Supplement	An allocation based on the IDACI deprivation scores derived from the postcode of children taking up the free entitlement.
Flexibility Supplement	Flexibility funding to be allocated on the basis of three levels (Levels 0, 1 or 2) with Level 1 generating approximately £40 per pupil per annum and the funding rate for Level 2 set at double that of Level 1.
Qualifications Supplement	A qualifications premium to be allocated to settings at £50 per pupil up to a maximum of £1500, in recognition of those settings employing more highly qualified staff (qualifications as defined by CWDC).
Mid-term pupil number adjustments	Providers may claim for funding adjustments for children who leave or join the setting mid-term but it is not compulsory
Payment frequency	Payments to PVIs will be made on a termly basis at



the beginning of the term. (Maintained schools will continue to receive their funding in the same way as now)

## RESPONSE ANALYSIS

	Schools	Returns
<b>Primary &amp; infant schools with nurseries</b>	53	10
<b>Maintained nurseries</b>	4	4
<b>PVI providers</b>	127	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Percentages</b>		<b>15%</b>
<b>Primary schools</b>		18.9%
<b>Maintained nurseries</b>		100.0%
<b>PVI providers</b>		11.0%

A total of 15% of all settings responded – 18.9% of primaries with nurseries, 100% of maintained nurseries, and 11% of PVI Early Years providers. Briefing sessions and workshops with early years providers were carried out prior to the release of the consultation, as we anticipated that non-maintained settings might not be familiar with Barnet's usual consultation process. However, despite a range of approaches to engage providers, promoting and circulating the consultation documents, together with reminders to complete the questionnaire, the response rate from all sectors was disappointingly low.

As a result of comments made at the Early Years funding conference held in November 2008, together with a number of concerns raised at subsequent Learning Network meetings with providers, it was expected there would be significant interest once the consultation paper was issued. The analysis of both the numbers of respondents and the actual responses received shows that the expected concerns raised by providers did not actually materialise when the opportunity to do so was provided.

We recommend that the Schools Forum agrees the funding formula above. Nursery funding will remain under close review over the next two years.

## 6. Items for information

### 6.1 Report of the Early Years Working Group (EYWG)

<b>Author</b>	<b>Carol Beckman</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>School Funding Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>The EYWG met on 30<sup>th</sup> September and the two items discussed were progress with Phase 1 (40 nursery settings offering the extension to the free entitlement a year early) and the outcome of the consultation on the Single Early Years Funding Formula. The latter is covered under item 5.1 above.</p> <p>Sheila Abbott reported that Phase 1 is now running and that all settings are being positive and creative. Impact assessments have highlighted the different concerns of the private and maintained sector. For private settings the main issue is the effect on their business, while flexibility is a greater issue at Barnet schools. A very positive session was held with the maintained schools in Phase 1 which was also attended by a representative of the DCSF and concentrated on finding solutions to strategic and operational issues.</p> <p>Private providers asked for clarification on charging top-ups and for additional services. Officers emphasised that the Code of Practice states that the free entitlement must be free at the point of delivery. All settings are entitled to charge for any other services they offer – whether additional hours or extra activities – but these must be offered on a voluntary basis only. Jewish settings are particularly concerned about covering the cost of security but the DCSF is clear that parents can only be asked for a voluntary contribution towards this.</p> <p>It is the view of the private settings that the overall sum of money available to provide the free entitlement is inadequate and that many settings are likely to withdraw if their business is unsustainable.</p>	

### 6.2 Building Schools for the Future

<b>Author</b>	<b>Val White</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Assistant Director, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>This will be a regular item on the agenda in future. A verbal report will be given at the meeting.</p>	

### 6.3 Mid Year adjustments and comparative school funding

<b>Author</b>	<b>Carol Beckman</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>School Funding Manager</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
<p>In order to help schools with their September forecasts, we have issued updated budget shares as well as the usual standards funds updates. The main changes were to Learning Skills Council allocations, funding for newly opened Reception classes, exclusions and adjustments for council tax and NNDR. At the end of October we will issue further revisions and these will include corrections to statement top-ups, SEN contingency and Phase 1 nursery funding.</p> <p>The sheet overleaf shows the current funding per pupil for all schools compared to their final funding for 2008/9. Not all 2009/10 Standards Funds have yet been allocated (Primary and Secondary Strategy, Extended Schools, etc) so the comparison is not quite like for like.</p>	

## 6.4 Post 16 funding – LSC transfer

<b>Author</b>	<b>Mick Quigley</b>
<b>Position</b>	<b>Principal Inspector, Children's Service</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>1 October 2009</b>
A verbal report will be given at the meeting and this will become a standing item on future agendas.	

### Comparative funding analysis for Schools Forum

01/10/2009 14:22

DCSF no	School Name	Jan 08 Funded Pupils	2008/9 Average funding per pupil	Jan 09 Funded Pupils	2009/10 Average funding per pupil	% change from 2008/9 to 2009/10 in per pupil funding	% Change in Funded Pupils	% Change Total Funding	% Change Standards Funds	% Change Budget Share	MFG
<b>Nursery</b>											
1000	Brookhill Nursery School	78	6,245	69.75	6,901	<b>10.50%</b>	-11%	-1%	11%	-2%	YES
1001	Hampden Way Nursery School	38	9,206	38	9,465	<b>2.81%</b>	0%	3%	0%	3%	
1002	Moss Hall Nursery School	78	6,559	71.5	6,805	<b>3.76%</b>	-8%	-5%	5%	-6%	
1003	St Margaret's Nursery School	80	6,353	76	6,641	<b>4.54%</b>	-5%	-1%	7%	-1%	
		274	6,776	255	7,178	<b>5.93%</b>	-7%	-1%	5%	-2%	
<b>Primary</b>											
3520	Akiva School	255	3,460	296	3,768	<b>8.90%</b>	16%	26%	11%	28%	YES
3317	All Saints' CofE Primary School N20	229	3,959	228.5	3,987	<b>0.69%</b>	0%	0%	2%	0%	
3300	All Saints' CofE Primary School Nw2	188	4,523	198	4,420	<b>-2.27%</b>	5%	3%	7%	2%	
2064	Barnet Hill Junior Mixed Infant and Nursery Sch	170.5	6,450	145	3,121	<b>-51.60%</b>	-15%	-59%	-58%	-59%	
2002	Barnfield Primary School	434	4,694	444	4,827	<b>2.82%</b>	2%	5%	8%	5%	YES
2079	Beis Yaakov Primary School	434.5	3,441	450	3,496	<b>1.62%</b>	4%	5%	1%	6%	
2003	Bell Lane Primary School	356	4,660	347	4,694	<b>0.74%</b>	-3%	-2%	-4%	-1%	
3511	Blessed Dominic RC School	196	4,533	196	4,589	<b>1.23%</b>	0%	1%	0%	1%	
3519	Broadfields Primary School	446	5,087	442	5,387	<b>5.90%</b>	-1%	5%	3%	5%	YES
2008	Brookland Infant and Nursery School	294	3,745	296	3,892	<b>3.90%</b>	1%	5%	-3%	5%	
2007	Brookland Junior School	361	3,534	360	3,761	<b>6.40%</b>	0%	6%	1%	7%	
2009	Brunswick Park Primary and Nursery School	212.5	5,036	221.5	5,339	<b>6.01%</b>	4%	11%	9%	11%	
2067	Chalgrove Primary School	165	5,092	175	4,945	<b>-2.90%</b>	6%	3%	2%	3%	YES
2010	Childs Hill School	306	5,653	324	6,106	<b>8.01%</b>	6%	14%	9%	15%	
3302	Christ Church Primary School	221.5	3,717	222	3,810	<b>2.49%</b>	0%	3%	-2%	3%	
2011	Church Hill School	207	4,276	208	4,245	<b>-0.73%</b>	0%	0%	2%	0%	
3522	Claremont Primary School	273	5,248	297.5	5,331	<b>1.57%</b>	9%	11%	7%	11%	YES
2014	Colindale Primary School	431	4,611	437	4,842	<b>5.01%</b>	1%	6%	1%	7%	
2015	Coppetts Wood Primary School	212.5	6,462	227	6,423	<b>-0.60%</b>	7%	6%	7%	6%	
2016	Courtland School	211	4,001	211	4,068	<b>1.68%</b>	0%	2%	-2%	2%	
2017	Cromer Road Primary School	418	3,721	404	3,840	<b>3.19%</b>	-3%	0%	-9%	1%	YES
2073	Danegrove Primary School	617	3,737	603	3,930	<b>5.14%</b>	-2%	3%	-5%	4%	
2019	Deansbrook Infant School	283	4,436	303.5	4,664	<b>5.13%</b>	7%	13%	10%	13%	
2018	Deansbrook Junior School	355	4,138	355	4,264	<b>3.05%</b>	0%	3%	0%	3%	
2021	Dollis Infant School	274	4,477	276.5	4,468	<b>-0.19%</b>	1%	1%	-8%	2%	YES
5200	Dollis Junior School	363	4,227	336	4,635	<b>9.64%</b>	-7%	1%	-7%	3%	
2023	Edgware Infant School	286.5	4,860	304.5	4,802	<b>-1.20%</b>	6%	5%	3%	5%	
2022	Edgware Junior School	299	4,971	300	5,187	<b>4.34%</b>	0%	5%	1%	5%	
2024	Fairway Primary School and Childrens' Centre	209	4,727	235	4,690	<b>-0.80%</b>	12%	12%	2%	13%	YES
2025	Foulds School	308	3,777	311	3,878	<b>2.66%</b>	1%	4%	-6%	5%	
2026	Frith Manor Primary School	663.5	3,554	670.5	3,672	<b>3.33%</b>	1%	4%	-3%	5%	
2028	Garden Suburb Infant School	270	3,782	270	3,877	<b>2.51%</b>	0%	3%	-7%	4%	
2027	Garden Suburb Junior School	346	3,837	353	3,944	<b>2.78%</b>	2%	5%	3%	5%	YES
2029	Goldbeaters Primary School	445.5	4,470	428	4,634	<b>3.67%</b>	-4%	0%	-1%	0%	
2030	Grasvenor Avenue Infant School	49	6,727	61	6,296	<b>-6.41%</b>	24%	17%	13%	17%	
3516	Hasmonean Primary School	239	3,810	229	4,005	<b>5.12%</b>	-4%	1%	-2%	1%	
2031	Hollickwood Primary School	162	5,956	175	5,294	<b>-11.12%</b>	8%	-4%	3%	-5%	YES
2032	Holly Park Primary School	454	4,041	453.5	4,148	<b>2.65%</b>	0%	3%	1%	3%	
3304	Holy Trinity CofE Primary School	221	3,916	225	4,051	<b>3.44%</b>	2%	5%	6%	5%	
3515	Independent Jewish Day School	219	3,804	199	3,971	<b>4.39%</b>	-9%	-5%	-6%	-5%	
2036	Livingstone Primary School	203	7,665	211	7,557	<b>-1.41%</b>	4%	2%	2%	3%	YES
2037	Manorside Primary School	215	5,245	224	5,228	<b>-0.33%</b>	4%	4%	5%	4%	
3523	Martin Primary School	433.5	4,344	435	4,358	<b>0.33%</b>	0%	1%	-7%	2%	
5948	Mathilda Marks-Kennedy Jewish Primary Schoo	216	3,775	205	4,321	<b>14.46%</b>	-5%	9%	3%	9%	
5949	Menorah Foundation School	228	3,809	232	3,943	<b>3.53%</b>	2%	5%	9%	5%	YES
3513	Menorah Primary School	413	3,507	400	3,760	<b>7.19%</b>	-3%	4%	4%	4%	
3305	Monken Hadley CofE Primary School	140	3,847	140	3,935	<b>2.29%</b>	0%	2%	-4%	3%	
2042	Monkfrith Primary School	211	4,254	213	4,129	<b>-2.95%</b>	1%	-2%	-9%	-1%	
2044	Moss Hall Infant School	269	4,010	270	4,380	<b>9.23%</b>	0%	10%	-3%	11%	YES
2043	Moss Hall Junior School	355	3,995	360	4,287	<b>7.31%</b>	1%	9%	6%	9%	
2045	Northside Primary School	223.5	4,974	212	5,445	<b>9.48%</b>	-5%	4%	26%	0%	
5201	Osidge Primary School	419	3,516	421	3,698	<b>5.16%</b>	0%	6%	0%	6%	
3501	Our Lady of Lourdes RC School	226.5	4,093	226.5	4,401	<b>7.52%</b>	0%	8%	1%	8%	YES
2078	Pardes House Primary School	172	3,846	169	4,517	<b>17.46%</b>	-2%	15%	-2%	17%	
2000	Parkfield Primary School	287	4,408	283.5	4,507	<b>2.25%</b>	-1%	1%	-6%	2%	
2071	Queenswell Infant School	296.5	4,632	294.5	4,804	<b>3.71%</b>	-1%	3%	-8%	4%	
2072	Queenswell Junior School	329	4,282	323	4,521	<b>5.58%</b>	-2%	4%	-3%	4%	YES
3512	Rosh Pinah Primary School	456	3,542	441	3,652	<b>3.10%</b>	-3%	0%	2%	0%	

# Comparative funding analysis for Schools Forum

01/10/2009 14:25

DCSF no	School Name	2008/9		2009/10		% change from 2008/9 to 2009/10 in per pupil funding	% Change in Funded Pupils	% Change Total Funding	% Change Standards Funds	% Change Budget Share	MFG
		Jan 08 Funded Pupils	Average funding per pupil	Jan 09 Funded Pupils	Average funding per pupil						
3510	Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Primary School	421	3,334	421	3,522	5.64%	0%	6%	0%	6%	
3502	St Agnes RC School	321	3,885	314	4,002	3.03%	-2%	1%	-5%	1%	
3315	St Andrew's CofE Voluntary Aided Primary Schc	207	3,639	209	3,785	4.01%	1%	5%	-2%	6%	
3504	St Catherine's RC School	334	3,878	339.5	4,039	4.14%	2%	6%	-2%	7%	
3307	St John's CofE Junior Mixed and Infant School	224.5	3,828	228	3,830	0.06%	2%	2%	-1%	2%	
3309	St John's CofE Primary School	226	3,874	229	3,971	2.51%	1%	4%	5%	4%	
3508	St Joseph's RC Infant School	200.5	4,123	206	4,144	0.52%	3%	3%	0%	4%	
3509	St Joseph's RC Junior School	247	3,974	250	4,135	4.04%	1%	5%	3%	6%	
3521	St Mary's and St John's CofE Primary School	439	3,816	433	3,922	2.79%	-1%	1%	-2%	2%	
3311	St Mary's CofE Primary School	448	3,568	442.5	3,615	1.31%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%	
3312	St Mary's CofE Primary School, East Barnet	209	4,035	209	4,120	2.09%	0%	2%	-1%	2%	
3313	St Paul's CofE Primary School N11	221	4,009	219	4,097	2.19%	-1%	1%	3%	1%	
3314	St Paul's CofE Primary School Nw7	207	3,721	208	3,764	1.18%	0%	2%	1%	2%	
3507	St Theresa's RC School	206	3,646	206	3,807	4.41%	0%	4%	4%	4%	
3506	St Vincent's RC School	313	3,594	316	3,871	7.70%	1%	9%	9%	9%	
2052	Summerside Primary School	349.5	5,453	337	5,486	0.60%	-4%	-3%	-2%	-3%	
2070	Sunnyfields Primary School	210.5	4,851	218	4,634	-4.46%	4%	-1%	-2%	-1%	
3500	The Annunciation RC Infant School	197	4,168	190	4,280	2.69%	-4%	-1%	-2%	-1%	
3514	The Annunciation RC Junior School	227	3,771	218	3,931	4.24%	-4%	0%	2%	0%	
2074	The Hyde School	411.5	4,487	416	4,568	1.82%	1%	3%	0%	3%	
2077	The Orion Primary School	440.5	4,737	443.5	4,959	4.67%	1%	5%	4%	6%	
3316	Trent CofE Primary School	210	3,534	209	3,671	3.87%	0%	3%	-6%	4%	
2055	Tudor Primary School	217.5	4,959	210	5,250	5.87%	-3%	2%	-5%	3%	
2057	Underhill Infant School	138	5,111	164	5,222	2.17%	19%	21%	17%	22%	
2056	Underhill Junior School	275	4,380	251	4,418	0.86%	-9%	-8%	-13%	-7%	
2076	Wessex Gardens Primary School	338	4,735	354	4,777	0.87%	5%	6%	7%	5%	YES
2060	Whitings Hill Primary School	205	5,682	199.5	8,964	57.78%	-3%	54%	57%	53%	
3518	Woodcroft Primary School	402	4,819	402	4,858	0.80%	0%	1%	-14%	4%	
2054	Woodridge Primary School	205	3,941	203	4,100	4.02%	-1%	3%	-3%	4%	
		25,229	4,257	7	4,465	3%		4%	0%	4%	
<b>Secondary</b>											
5406	Ashmole School	1094	6,137	1110	6,463	5.32%	1%	7%	8%	7%	
5408	Bishop Douglass School Finchley	664	7,325	623	7,885	7.65%	-6%	1%	5%	0%	YES
4211	Christ's College Finchley	727	6,740	724	6,918	2.65%	0%	2%	7%	2%	YES
4210	Copthall School	899	6,550	897	6,769	3.34%	0%	3%	-3%	4%	
4212	East Barnet School	983	6,467	985	6,754	4.45%	0%	5%	12%	4%	YES
5405	Finchley Catholic High School	850	6,533	838	7,011	7.32%	-1%	6%	9%	5%	YES
4003	Friern Barnet School	773	5,971	779	6,062	1.53%	1%	2%	6%	2%	
5409	Hasmonean High School	752	6,805	758	7,041	3.47%	1%	4%	19%	3%	
5400	Hendon School	1022	7,212	1015	7,701	6.78%	-1%	6%	8%	6%	
5402	MILL Hill County High School	1222	7,499	1222	7,972	6.30%	0%	6%	7%	6%	
4208	Queen Elizabeth's Girls' School	905	6,174	902	6,665	7.95%	0%	8%	14%	7%	YES
5401	Queen Elizabeth's School, Barnet	898	6,191	896	6,587	6.40%	0%	6%	19%	5%	
5407	St James Catholic High School	909	6,179	902	6,464	4.60%	-1%	4%	-7%	5%	
5403	St Mary's CofE High School	720	6,675	657	7,284	9.12%	-9%	0%	5%	-1%	
5404	St Michael's Catholic Grammar School	479	7,846	479	8,419	7.30%	0%	7%	5%	8%	
4215	The Compton School	876	5,661	900	5,778	2.07%	3%	5%	8%	4%	YES
4752	The Henrietta Barnett School	466	7,518	465	7,846	4.37%	0%	4%	3%	4%	
4009	The Ravenscroft School A Technology College	799	7,295	744	7,802	6.95%	-7%	0%	4%	-1%	
4012	Whitefield School	623	8,948	586	9,600	7.29%	-6%	1%	0%	1%	
		15,661	6,752	15,482	7,115	5.38%	-1%	4%	6%	4%	
<b>Special</b>											
7000	Oak Lodge School	160	15,025	160	15,782	5.04%	0%	5%	13%	4%	
7005	Northway School	75	17,101	80	16,888	-1.25%	7%	5%	-18%	8%	YES
7009	Oakleigh School	63	26,163	63	27,029	3.31%	0%	3%	-19%	5%	
7010	Mapledown School	65	23,967	68	25,057	4.55%	5%	9%	17%	9%	
		363	18,988	371	19,631	3.38%	2%	6%	2%	6%	
All Schools		41,527	5,343	16,116	14,315	167.90%	-61%	4%	3%	4%	