

# Departmental Revenue Budget Strategy

2004/05 to 2006/07



# R a i s i n g   S t a n d a r d s   T o g e t h e r

## CONTENTS

	Page
1. Overview / Purpose	3
2. Key Issues driving the Education Revenue Strategy	5
3. Lifelong Learning Reductions Strategy	8
4. Policy Context	10
a) National	
b) City Council	
c) The Education and Lifelong Learning Department	
5. Reserves	14
6. Key Objectives for the Education and Lifelong Learning Department	16
7. Summary of 2003/04 Departmental Budget	18
8. Cash Target 2004/05	28
9. Spending and Resource Forecast	29
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	
Lifelong Learning Reductions – Grant Aid Projects	32
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	
Growth Proposals	33
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>	
Reduction Proposals	66
<b>APPENDIX 4</b>	
Lifelong Learning Reductions Strategy	93
<b>APPENDIX 5</b>	
Race Relations Act - Risk Assessment	107
<b>APPENDIX 6</b>	

**Summary of Consultation with Voluntary Section on Budget Proposals** **108**

**APPENDIX 7**

**Budget Consultation 2004/05** **111**

**Section 1 – Overview / Purpose**

- 1.1 Raising educational standards is the top priority for the Council. This document sets out the three year budget strategy for the Department. It is aimed at ensuring that:
- the resources available to the service are targeted on identified priorities as set out in the Education Strategic Plan – the relevant priorities are set out in Section 6;
  - schools and associated schools block expenditure is protected from reductions, and that all government funding increases continue to be passported;
  - growth pressures in the Schools and LEA blocks are addressed;
  - a case is made for transferring resources within the Education budget from Lifelong Learning to Schools;
  - Member reductions targets are addressed.
- 1.2 The Department wishes to:
- address the very significant financial pressures faced by schools and services supporting schools;
  - prioritise schools and support for schools;
  - re-focus lifelong learning activity;
  - address lifelong learning priorities for early years, youth, adult education, and libraries
  - re-prioritise departmental budget spend from lifelong learning to schools mindful of the above;
  - address corporate cuts priorities.
- 1.3 This strategy enables the Council to continue to prioritise education by agreeing the continuation of the government's funding passport requirement to schools. This will result in significant extra resources for schools and services to schools. A re-direction of resources out of Lifelong Learning enables the Council to respond to the increasing demands for the LEA to support schools and to meet corporate savings targets.
- 1.4 It is the intention that the budget should be:
- transparent and open to scrutiny by Members, the Schools Forum and other interested parties; and
  - consulted on with schools and partners.

- 1.5 The proposals set out address the above strategic issues. Following the budget review process, reductions over three years need to be identified to fund the following:

	£'000
<b>Corporate Savings Target</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>Redirection of services:</b>	
Re-instatement of core budget provision transferred to NRF to enable full take-up of Education funding in 2001/02	750
Continuation of funding for other grants that are terminating	218
Youth service increase to meet government target	1,000
<b>Total Redirection</b>	<b>1,968</b>
<b>Growth for services that support schools:</b>	
Home to school transport	671
Premature retirement costs	600
Other	186
<b>Total Growth for services that support schools</b>	<b>1,457</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,925</b>

- 1.6 The changes introduced in the Secretary of State's announcement on school funding have placed an additional funding pressure on the Schools Block of £308,100. This is because a limit in the amount of growth on central items (mainly SEN, insurance and exclusions) within the schools block has been introduced.
- 1.7 Further work is taking place with the Schools Forum to identify strategies and/or further savings to resolve this funding gap with a view to putting a recommendation to members. The assumption at present is that the shortfall on the schools block will be met by using the ability to apply to the DfES for an exemption to the central items growth limitation. The central items are all spent on behalf of and to support schools, and using the exemption does not affect the Council's commitment to fully passport funds to schools.
- 1.8 If the Schools Forum does not support applying for an exemption to the limitation on central spending, the growth bids contained within this strategy will need to be reviewed and reduced and/or policy changes will need to be implemented to contain the central items spending within the limitation. The deadline for applying for an exemption is 13<sup>th</sup> February 2004.
- 1.9 The current profile gives no capacity to transfer resources to schools over and above passported sums, even though this is a desired objective of this strategy, although there will be some re-direction to LEA Block activities which support schools. There are nonetheless significant additional sums available for schools as the result of government passporting. The implications of this for schools are included in the next section.
- 1.10 Furthermore, there are on-going risks as set out in paragraphs 2.17 to 2.19.

## Section 2 - Key issues driving the Education Revenue Strategy

- 2.1 Raising educational standards is the top priority for the Council. The Council's 3 year revenue strategy recognises this by making it one of the two strategic priorities for additional spending, stating "the Council will commit to increase funding to schools by an amount which matches the increase in its formula grant entitlement for schools; and will ensure the LEA is adequately resourced to support schools".
- 2.2 It is within this context that the Education budget strategy has been developed. It has also taken account of a requirement to identify savings in the LEA Block of expenditure. These savings targets are (cumulative) £900k in 04/05, £1,500k in 05/06 and £1,500k in 06/07.
- 2.3 Account also needs to be taken of a range of growth pressures resulting in part from the nature of the Secretary of State's passporting requirement which means that there is insufficient funding in the Schools Block to meet the government's schools spending target and fund the growth required for services supporting schools.
- 2.4 The Secretary of State's announcement on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003 introduced a requirement for LEAs to provide a guaranteed 4% minimum increase per pupil in school's budgets in 2004/05 and 2005/06.
- 2.5 The cost of fulfilling this requirement cannot be established until the January 2004 pupil numbers are known and detailed modelling of every school's budget has been undertaken. This is likely to take a number of weeks and the final picture will not be available until February/March 2004.
- 2.6 Modelling work carried out so far suggests meeting the cost of inflationary increases, the minimum funding guarantee and agreed policy changes will cost the Schools Block around £4.5m. In addition, a back pay claim for Nursery Nurses and Teaching Assistants will add another £2.3m of costs to the Schools Block. It should be noted though that the back pay costs are one-off in 2004/05 only and so will be added back for growth in 2005/06.
- 2.7 The impact of this is that there will be around £1.3m of passport growth remaining to fund the significant other cost pressures in the Schools Block arising from demand led SEN budgets, insurance costs, exclusions and to provide real growth in school's budgets. The cost pressures are forecast to be around £0.8m, leaving £0.5m for real growth in schools' budgets.
- 2.8 Over the three years of this strategy, the government's passport requirement will mean additional sums are made available to schools, an estimated £3.5m in 2005/06 and £2.8m in 2006/07, in addition to inflation. The one-off back pay costs being added back in 2005/06 will also make resources available for growth in that year.
- 2.9 Furthermore, there will be limited scope for changing the formula to advantage particular types of school, or particular Key Stages. This is a significant restriction on policy choices at a time when certain types of school are facing very specific pressures.

2.10 A number of changes to Standards Funds for 2004/05 were also announced on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003. The main issue for the LEA is that the funds that can be retained by the LEA are cash limited to the same amount as 2003/04. This presents a budgetary pressure as some of these funds support staffing, especially from the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG).

2.11 Members need to be aware that there are also a number of significant budget pressures. These are as follows:

- a) The need to re-instate the core LEA work that was put into the Neighbourhood Renewal fund to enable the LEA to take up £1 million of Standards Fund expenditure in 2001/02.

	£'000
• Lifelong Learning and Community Development	749
• Behaviour Support Key Stage 1 to 4	354

- b) The need to fund other projects once other grant funding ceases
- c) The need to fund upward pressures in schools related expenditure in the LEA block
- Increasing numbers needing transport along with rising costs
  - Increasing requirement to pay teacher redundancies given budget reductions/falling rolls (PRC budget)

2.12 It needs to be stressed that the LEA Block contains a considerable amount of expenditure that is incurred on behalf of schools. (This is explained in more detail in section 4).

2.13 All of this LEA Block expenditure has been scrutinised with lead members following which it was agreed that there is limited scope, at this time, for reductions in this area without damaging the quality of support available to schools, or by not providing statutory services. (The key issues are set out in 4). However, this will be subject to on-going scrutiny through the business planning process, through the Schools Forum and through member scrutiny.

2.14 This necessarily restricted the main area of search for reductions to the Lifelong Learning budget. However, even here the search is limited because a large proportion of the budget is directed towards Key BVPI targets and/or is also grant funded – early years, adult education, and libraries; while the youth service is £1 million short of meeting the government spending target. This means that savings options here are restricted to general community services which includes support to the voluntary sector.

2.15 There is also a need to continue to look at the level of budgetary provision for schools given the impact of this year's passport. Schools have reported widespread difficulties in securing balanced budgets and have reported a heavy use of reserves to sustain levels of expenditure this year. The passport figure for 04/05 is not sufficient to address this as the funds available are insufficient to make up the perceived shortfall,

as noted above. Schools may well be faced with making some very difficult choices in making their budgets balance. It is important to note that the DfES has accepted that there were insufficient resources put into the passport for the current financial year to address the full extent of changes in conditions of service for remodelling the workforce. A survey has been carried out to secure more detailed evidence about the 2003/04 passport.

2.16 The previous Education budget strategy set out the intention to review lifelong learning expenditure with a view to re-directing resources to schools as benchmarking had shown that the relatively high level of lifelong learning expenditure was mirrored in a lower level of schools spending when looking at the authority's Education SSA. Education spend had itself only risen to 101% of SSA last year, following successive years of investment in education which had brought this up from 97.2% at LGR.

2.17 Members need to be aware of the continuing demand led spending risks in a number of areas:

Schools Block:

- Mainstream Statementing
- Independent school placements
- Special school county income
- Exclusions

LEA Block:

- Transport
- Premature retirement and compensation

2.18 There is also always the possibility that grant regimes will come to an end or be reduced – Standards Fund, and the LSC grant for adult education in particular.

2.19 The Department will continue to scrutinise these budgets with the Schools Forum, and through Scrutiny Committee.

2.20 Having identified the growth pressures in the Schools Block and the LEA Block, the Department has produced a set of savings proposals to meet the revised corporate savings targets. This is as follows:

	<b>04/05</b> <b>£'000</b>	<b>05/06</b> <b>£'000</b>	<b>06/07</b> <b>£'000</b>
Revised target	900	1,500	1,500
Current savings	900	1,500	1,500

2.21 As explained above, growth pressures lead to the higher targets sought.

2.22 The Department is undertaking a review of its Lifelong Learning premises to consider opportunities for co-location, rationalisation and re-investment to better enable the service to meet the learning needs of communities. The review started in December 2003 and is programmed to be completed by February 2004. This strategy assumes savings will be achieved but this is subject to the outcome of the review.

### **Section 3 - Lifelong Learning and Community Development Reductions Strategy**

- 3.1 Services have been prioritised within the context of the overall priorities of the department as set out in the Education Strategic Plan:
- Raising standards in schools
  - Early years education
  - The Youth Service
- 3.2 Reduction proposals are put forward that work within and enhance these priorities. They fall into three strands:
- Service remodelling
  - Premises review
  - Grant Aid review
- 3.3 Further detail is set out in Appendix 5.
- 3.4 Service Remodelling:
- Required to create a fit for purpose modern service that can meet departmental priorities.
  - Increases in the Youth Service to meet government targets will be met from the redesignation of former Arts and Leisure young peoples services and the redirection of Council subsidy for Adult Learning.
  - All funding for Adult Learning will be received from LSC
  - Areas of growth resulting from this remodelling will be funded from savings in areas of reduced priority.
- 3.5 Grant Aid Review
- Existing service specifications have been reviewed in the light of the new Departmental priorities
  - Those projects that do not support these priorities will have funding removed in year one.
  - Future funding will need to move from grant aid to commissioning of the service.
  - With the service remodelling, services will be commissioned from the voluntary sector, including projects that have had grant aid removed.
  - This will need to be managed to ensure the continuity of projects that will be required in the future.
  - Structural improvements in the reprioritised voluntary sector will be supported from the reductions in other projects.



### 3.6 Service Breakdown

Service	Current £'000		Proposed £'000	
	Council	External	Council	External
Adult	200	5,500	0	5,500
Children	3,000	2,000	3,000	2,000
Youth	2,200		3,100	
Libraries	4,500		4,350	
Junior Youth	1,700		500	
Community	4,400		250	
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>7,500</b>	<b>11,200</b>	<b>7,500</b>

	Current £000	Reprioritised £'000	Post Commissioning
Grant aid Sector (included in above)	3,600	1,200	To be negotiated

## Section 4 - Policy Context

### a) National

4.1 The Government has continued to make clear the priority status it accords to Education. This is reflected, inter-alia, in the following:

- The 'Education, Education, Education' theme
- Year-on-Year funding increases through SSA and latterly 'passporting' for schools block funding
- Introduction of a split in expenditure between the Schools Block and the LEA Block – see below.

4.2 This has been accompanied by:

- An expectation that schools should be self-managing and self-evaluating entities.

### b) City Council

4.3 The City Council has also prioritised Education. At Unitary Status in 1997/98 Education (schools and community education) were funded at 97.2% of Standard Spending Assessment (SSA). In the first year there was a cut, however, since then there have been year-on-year increases which saw the SSA rise to 101% in 2002/03. This was supported latterly by the 3 year revenue strategy for 2000/01 to 2002/03 which involved the transfer of £1.5 million following reductions in other Departments, and which enabled this target to be met. SSA is no longer in use as a definition and so this particular benchmark no longer exists.

4.4 The Council's draft 3 year revenue strategy has made it clear that there are 3 priorities for additional spending, two of which are the priorities in the Corporate Direction. One of these is :

- (a) raising educational standards – the Council will commit to increase funding to schools by an amount which matches the increase in its formula grant entitlement for schools; and will ensure the LEA is adequately resourced to support schools.

4.5 The Council's Education priorities are reflected in the Corporate Plan which states - "Raise educational standards and skills irreversibly so that all schools are good and individuals are committed to learning throughout life"

### (c) The Education and Lifelong Learning Department

4.6 The Education and Lifelong Learning Department's 2003/04 budget is £173m. Of this, £126m goes directly to the city's 113 schools as delegated budget shares which schools are responsible for managing.

4.7 The remaining £47m is used by the Department to provide services that support schools; pupils with additional needs; and to enable it to operate 61 Lifelong Learning

centres and provide library services for adults and children through 21 library buildings, 3 mobiles, and a home library service.

- 4.8 The Department overspent in 2002/03 by £757,000. This was mainly a result of increasing demands to meet the needs of pupils with Special Educational Needs. The majority of these costs are met by the Department, as opposed to individual schools.
- 4.9 The Department's priorities are set out in the draft Education Strategic Plan. The revenue strategy addresses these priorities to ensure that they can be delivered.

#### The Schools Block and the LEA Block

- 4.10 For 2003/04, the DfES has introduced a new way of looking at budgets. This has seen the introduction of the Schools Block which is broadly expenditure in schools plus expenditure incurred on behalf of schools through a range of services provided by the LEA; and an LEA block.
- 4.11 Nevertheless, the LEA Block also contains services that help support and challenge schools – for example, Standards Inspectors, Educational Psychologists, Education Welfare Officers, school finance, property and governor support, special needs teaching; as well as the school related budgets for premature retirement and compensation (PRC) and transport.
- 4.12 Also, the Policy and Resources Division provides extensive support to schools, funded through the LEA Block, as well as providing support for the Department.

#### The Department

##### i) Overview

- 4.13 Returns to the DfES have regularly shown that the LEA has a low % spent on administration costs compared with family LEAs.
- 4.14 Also, it needs to be noted that, given budget cuts in year one of Unitary Status and the poor settlement with the County, the Department was originally, of necessity, lean. This contributed to the post-Ofsted commentary from OPM which stated that the Department did not have the capacity to deliver the agenda facing it. The Department has been significantly strengthened subsequently so that it is now better placed to address the challenges it continues to face.
- 4.15 Benchmarking shows that the Department is below the median for LEA spend. Also, Corporate Best Value reviews have shown that the Department has an appropriate, or less, level of staffing in the area of support services.
- 4.16 It needs to be noted that £300,000 had to be diverted in 2003/04 from within the LEA Block to enable the library service to continue to operate at a desired level following its transfer from Cultural Services.

ii) Split of Department Expenditure (LEA Block)

4.17 The breakdown of the Department's budget, in the light of the above analysis, shows the LEA Block as follows:-

		<b>£'000</b>
a)	Services to Schools	12,703
b)	Services to Schools and the Department	3,842
c)	Lifelong Learning	10,303
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26,848</b>
d)	Library Service	4,247
e)	School Crossing Patrols	116
	<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>31,211</b>

Schools Block

4.18 Schools continue to face significant financial pressures as they address a formidable national and local school improvement agenda, and to fund national pay awards and new initiatives.

4.19 Also, there are continuing upward pressures in a number of demand-led budgets in the School Block such as statementing of pupils, recoupment, pupil exclusions.

Race Relation (Amendment) Act 2000

4.20 The Council has a general duty under this Act to promote race equality. This means that the Department must have due regard for the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, promote equality of opportunities and promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

4.21 The Education and Lifelong Learning Department manages its functions of delivering, securing and supporting a range of publicly funded education services in the city. The Education Strategic Plan is the high level strategic document that sets out departmental function, purpose and objectives. It pulls together the six statutory plans which are the Adult Learning Plan, the Education Development Plan, the Behaviour Support Plan, the Early Years and Childcare Development Plan, the Library Plan and the Youth Strategy that are submitted to National Government or its agents. Each of these plans aims to ensure the needs of the city's diverse communities are met.

4.22 In developing the Budget Strategy officers carried out an exercise to evaluate the direct contribution of each service, departmental and grant aided, to the achievement of these plans. Those services that were assessed as not directly contributing to the plans were defined as non-core and put forward in the proposals for budget reductions. See Appendix 5.

### Consultation on Budget Proposals

- 4.23 Consultation on the budget proposals contained in this document have occurred with schools, grant aided projects, departmental trade unions, staff and other interested parties. A summary of responses received is outlined in Appendix 6 for grant aided projects and Appendix 7 for other responses. Detailed responses received will be placed in the members' area.

## Section 5 - Reserves

### 5.1 The Department holds the following reserves on behalf of schools:

- **School balances** – this is the net cumulative surplus funds held by schools. Best practice guidance suggests that a prudent level of reserves for schools is between 3% and 5%, which would equal a balance in this reserve of between £3.75m and £6.25m in 2003/04. The balance in this reserve at 1/4/03 was £7.3m, but due to the funding pressures on schools in 2003/04, this is forecast to fall to £3.0m by the end of 2003/04. 8 schools in 2003/04 have set deficit budgets and 4 schools have approved managed budgets. This level of use of reserves by schools is not sustainable into 2004/05. It is noted however that schools have consistently overstated their use of reserves by some considerable margin.

The LEA is amending the Scheme of Delegation for Schools to enable it to claw back excessive reserve balances held by schools. To do this, the LEA must provide schools with 3 year indicative budgets. A model has been prepared to allow schools to predict funding for 3 years, but it will need considerable amendment as a result of the changes in funding for 2004/05 and 2005/06.

The ability to claw back reserves will not come into effect until 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004, and the earliest any claw back could happen would be at the end of 2004/05 financial year. However given the pressure on schools budgets it is unlikely that any claw back will be achieved.

- **Loans to Schools** – this is the outstanding balance due from schools.
- **Schools Capital Reserve** – this is the balance of formula funding devolved to schools which must be spent on capital. Expenditure can be incurred over a three year period and so the balance is likely to reduce over the next two years. However, as the Government is making large amounts of capital funding available, it is not possible to set an appropriate level for this reserve at any one time.

### 5.2 The Department itself holds the following reserves:

- **LMS Contingency Reserve** – This is the balance of LMS formula funding that is not allocated to schools. The balance held in the reserve at present is ring-fenced for SEN purposes and will be used to help create Schools with Additional Resources (SARs).
- **Secondary Review** – this is used to meet expenditure arising from the review of secondary school provision (such as transport and salary protection).
- **Departmental Reserve** – This reserve is used to meet budget pressures within the Department, such as SEN and transport costs. The estimated

balance at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 will represent approximately 0.4% of the non-schools budget.

5.3 The estimated balances in the Department's reserves are shown below:

Reserve	Estimated bal 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004 £'000	Estimated bal 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2005 £'000
School balances	3,000	3,000
Loans to schools	-15	0
Schools Capital Reserve	2,000	2,000
<b>Total School Reserves</b>	<b>4,985</b>	<b>5,000</b>
LMS Contingency Reserve	106	106
Secondary Review	194	90
Departmental Reserve	179	179
<b>Total Department Reserves</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>375</b>

## Section 6 - Key objectives for the Education and Lifelong Learning Department

- 6.1 The following sets out the key issues to guide the prioritisation of the resources available to the service and to ensure they are maximised accordingly. It also sets out the key areas with significant budget implications and which form part of the overall strategy.
- To address the Corporate Plan priority for education.
  - To meet the government's schools passporting requirements and to secure additional funds for schools as appropriate in the context of the Department's revenue strategy
  - To continue to prioritise a high level of funding for our schools and for departmental support for them, (ESP 5).
  - To continue to scrutinise demand-led budgets to ensure the level of resources in schools is maximised.
  - To ensure available schools funds are most effectively targeted through the LMS formula to support the addressing of the Raising Attainment targets in the draft Education Strategic Plan (ESP), and the objective to narrow attainment gaps and tackle underachievement for particular groups of pupils (ESP 14).
  - To review the LMS formula generally to ensure it addresses school issues and funding priorities and specifically in the areas of social deprivation, SEN, turbulence and small schools protection; and to consider the implications specifically for School Workforce reform and the re-grading teaching assistants.
  - To implement three year school budgets and a policy on use of school balances (ESP 5).
  - To address the re-grading of Teaching Assistants and Nursery Nurses.
  - To release the post-secondary review allocation to schools as it is freed up from current commitments in order to maximise funds available in schools.
  - To ensure funding to support the proposals to Transform and modernise provision across the City – secondary (ESP 7 and 8), special (ESP 9) and primary (ESP 11).
  - To secure resources to support the priority (ESP 10) to develop a strategy for West Leicester with a focus on New College, to include external funding.
  - To ensure schools are well placed to address ESP objective 12 to improve teacher supply, recruitment and retention, and remodel the school workforce.
  - To ensure funds are appropriately targeted to enable attendance and behaviour targets to be met (ESP 2).
  - To implement the Common 4+ Admissions Policy (ESP 19)



- With transitional funding arrangements for schools that incur an annual loss of £25,000 or more; and
- With consideration to be given as to how to allocate other funds saved. For example, by providing more advantageous pupil/adult ratios, or by employing additional early years staff.
  
- To review the Local Management of Special Schools (LMSS) formula with a view to ensuring more appropriate funding levels across schools, to include a proposed draw of £231,000 on the ISB to support its implementation
  
- To re-focus the Lifelong Learning and Community Development budget to ensure that the Council meets the national youth service expenditure target and associated ESP 20 funding targets
  
- To maintain the current level of expenditure for Adult and Family Learning (ESP 21), or at a level funded by LSC
  
- To ensure the library service meets its ESP 22 targets.
  
- To secure funding for a network of Children's Centres and further develop a network of extended schools (ESP 23)
  
- Negotiate pooled budgets under section 31 (Health Act) in developing a federation (Children's Trust) of children's services (ESP 18).
  
- To assess and address, as appropriate, the ending of grant regimes, in particular NRF (£1 million), and Standards Fund grants.
  
- To continue to give a high scrutiny profile to all budgets which carry a significant risk element – statementing, independent school placements, recoupment, (Schools Block); and transport and premature retirement and compensation (LEA Block).
  
- To continue to strengthen financial management and control in the Department.
  
- To ensure schools are well supported and challenged as appropriate in making the best use of their resources in the context of self-managing, self-evaluating schools.
  
- To maximise external sources of revenue to supplement Council resources.
  
- To ensure the budget and the budget process is open and transparent, scrutinised and consulted on.

**Section 7 - Summary of Departmental Budget**

a) Overview

Division	2003/04 Budget £
Directorate	575,800
Standards & Effectiveness	8,330,800
Pupil & Student Support	12,614,800
Lifelong Learning & Community Development	16,120,200
Policy & Resources	5,668,100
Departmental pooled budgets	1,373,300
County commitments	952,800
<b>Total Departmental Budget</b>	<b>45,635,800</b>
Delegated schools budgets	125,688,200
Contingencies	1,246,100
<b>Total Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Budget</b>	<b>172,570,100</b>

b) Divisional Budgets - Details

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Standards &amp; Effectiveness Division</b>			
<b>Standards &amp; Effectiveness Service</b>			
Standards & Effectiveness Service	1,831,700	1. To raise standards in schools through the provision of challenge, intervention and support	35.6
Leics. County Cricket Club Study Support Centre	12,000		
Sports & Development Grant	45,400	2. Statutory duties in relation to schools causing concern, the curriculum, assessment strategies, SACRE, newly qualified teachers and the appointment of headteachers.	
Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education	11,000		
Standards Fund	5,803,700		
Support for Schools in Difficulties	150,000	3. Contribution to the implementation and monitoring of the Education Development Plan and key national and local strategies.	
Support for Schools in Special Measures	100,000		
<b>Standards &amp; Effectiveness Service</b>	<b>7,953,800</b>		
<b>Forest Lodge Education Centre</b>			
Forest Lodge	6,400	1. Training and conference facilities provided to the Education Department	
Science & Technology Shop	(2,200)	2. Accommodation for other teams within the Department.	
<b>Forest Lodge Education Centre</b>	<b>4,200</b>		
<b>Multi Cultural Service</b>			
Multicultural Service	111,700	1. Management of the ethnic minority achievement strand of the Standards Fund	6.00
EMAG Admin Service	131,400	2. Monitoring schools' provision for minority ethnic pupils	
Supplementary Schools	38,500	Grants to organisations providing supplementary teaching in mother tongue / cultural heritage education	
Anti-Racist Initiative	8,400	Pump priming fund for individual anti-racist initiatives in schools	
Rent Income	(9,000)	Income budget for use of premises for EAL purposes	
EMAG LTS/Maternity Cover	91,800	Sickness and maternity cover for multicultural services centrally and in schools	
<b>Multi Cultural Service</b>	<b>372,800</b>		
<b>Total Standards &amp; Effectiveness Division</b>	<b>8,330,800</b>		41.6

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Pupil &amp; Student Support Division</b>			
<b>Admissions and Exclusions</b>			
Arts Service	27,400	Arts & drama provision for school aged pupils	16.00
Admissions & Appeals Service	348,500	1. Enabling access to school through school admissions, transfers and transport policies.	
Appeals Panel	25,300	2. Supervision of processes of exclusion and provision of support to parents and children affected.	
<b>Admissions and Exclusions</b>	<b>401,200</b>		
<b>Transport</b>	3,342,300	Transport for qualifying pupils attending mainstream and special schools.	
<b>Special Education Service</b>			
Special Education Service (SES)	482,000	1. Identification and assessment of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) 2. Management of resources for SEN pupils 3. Management of parental appeals and contact point for advice on SEN processes and legislation	15.50
Special Travel Costs	5,400	Travel costs for parents to attend annual reviews or school visits to schools outside the City.	
Independent Schools / OLEA	1,605,800	Provision of education to pupils with SEN statements in independent or non-maintained schools, where their needs cannot be met in the LEA's own schools	
Sanitary Contracts	11,700	Sanitary costs at special schools	
Hill View Annexe	19,800	Provision of independent living skills for SEN pupils about to leave school	
SEN Equipment	87,200	Provision of equipment to pupils with special educational needs to enable them to access the curriculum	
Statementing-Mainstream	618,300	Provision of support for pupils with statements of SEN in mainstream schools who have high level needs	
Statementing-Recoupment	595,200	Provision for pupils with statements of SEN who are educated in other LEAs' mainstream schools, and pupils from other LEAs who are educated in City mainstream schools	
Recoupment Special Schools	(1,067,900)	Provision for pupils with statements of SEN who are educated in other LEAs' special schools, and pupils from other LEAs who are educated in City special schools	
<b>Special Education Service</b>	<b>2,357,500</b>		
<b>Education Psychology Service</b>			
Education Psychology Service	1,128,100	1. To promote and enhance the educational and psychological development of children and young people 2. To provide support to schools, pupils, families, the LEA and partner agencies	27.00
<b>Education Psychology Service</b>	<b>1,128,100</b>		

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Pupil &amp; Student Support Division</b>			
<b>Special Needs Teaching and Student Support Service</b>			
SEN Teaching - Management Support	405,400		161.9
Visual Impairment	418,500		
Specialist Support Teams	573,000	1. To maximise opportunities and achievements of pupils with SEN	
Behaviour Support	340,200	2. Deployment and monitoring of SEN resources, and provision of advice to schools on the use of these resources	
Pre-School	203,000		
Thurnby Lodge	351,500		
Learning Support	525,800		
Student Support Service	33,500		
Exclusions Money Following Pupils	(81,400)		
Service Support Unit	174,200		
Oakham House	92,900	1. Education provision for permanently excluded pupils	
Wigston Lane	187,600	2. Support for students at risk of permanent exclusion	
City East (Coleman Road)	551,500		
Directions/Contingency	638,400		
PRU IT Equipment	67,000		
Mobility Officer	13,600		
U5s Area SENCOS	195,600		
<b>Special Needs Teaching and Student Support Service</b>	<b>4,690,300</b>		
<b>Education Welfare Service</b>			
Education Welfare Service	685,000	Enforcement of school attendance, child employment and entertainment licensing laws	22.80
Border House Travel Costs	10,400	Travel for children in care or in hostels	
<b>Education Welfare Service</b>	<b>695,400</b>		
<b>Total Pupils &amp; Student Support Division</b>	<b>12,614,800</b>		234.2

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Lifelong Learning &amp; Community Development Division</b>			
SCLM Cluster 1 & 3	39,050	Salary costs of the Senior Community Learning Manager, admin support and the community bursar. Delivery of Adult, Youth, Community Development and Children's Services	40.71
CLM Babington	348,900		
CLM Stocking Farm	315,600		
CLM Tudor	92,000		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 1	64,900		
<b>Cluster Beaumont Leys</b>	<b>860,450</b>		
SCLM Cluster 1 & 3	39,050	As above	23.84
CLM Hamilton	267,600		
CLM Netherhall	26,500		
CLM Northfields	10,300		
West Humberstone	107,300		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 3	117,700		
<b>Cluster Humberstone</b>	<b>568,450</b>		
SCLM Cluster 2 & 6	33,550	As above	35.94
CLM Soar Valley	233,700		
CLM Belgrave	481,800		
Glen Street Rooms	11,200		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 2	642,800		
<b>Cluster Belgrave</b>	<b>1,403,050</b>		
SCLM Cluster 2 & 6	33,550	As above	38.15
CLM Eyres Monsell	236,200		
CLM Saffron	598,000		
CLM Sir Jonathan North	124,200		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 6	210,600		
<b>Cluster South</b>	<b>1,202,550</b>		
SCLM Cluster 4 & 5	48,450	As above	58.06
CLM Moat	478,600		
CLM Highfields	346,600		
CLM St Matthews	283,200		
African Caribbean Centre	141,700		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 4	569,600		
<b>Cluster Highfields</b>	<b>1,868,150</b>		
SCLM Cluster 4 & 5	48,450	As above	18.85
CLM Judgemeanow	175,000		
CLM Crown Hills	261,800		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 5	4,500		
<b>Cluster East</b>	<b>489,750</b>		

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Lifelong Learning &amp; Community Development Division</b>			
SCLM Cluster 7 & 8	44,150	As above	
CLM Riverside	255,800		
CLM Fullhurst	365,500		
CLM Braunstone	524,700		
CLM New College	319,200		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 7	525,300		
<b>Cluster West</b>	<b>2,034,650</b>		60.64
SCLM Cluster 7 & 8	140,850	As above	
REMIT - Main	226,100	Work with the recovering mentally ill	
Leic. Adult Education College	232,200	Delivery of Further Education courses to adults	
Bridge House	147,800		
Vol. Sector Grants Cluster 8	888,800		
<b>Cluster City-Wide</b>	<b>1,635,750</b>		20.78
Youth Services	457,600		
Young Peoples Council	58,300		
<b>Young People's Services</b>	<b>515,900</b>		9.53
Adult Services	(2,141,900)	To provide learning opportunities for adults	
<b>Adult Services</b>	<b>(2,141,900)</b>		7.00
Childrens Services	517,300		
Work Place Nursery	121,000	Provision of a workplace nursery for LEA employees	
Shoppers Play Centre	76,200	Centre providing childcare while parents/carers shop	
Pre-Registration & Adv Wrker	33,300	Advice to childminders before registration	
4 Yr Olds Early Yrs Dev. Grant	490,400	Nursery Education grants paid to private, voluntary, independent & other LEA providers	
Early Years Development - Grant (3yr Olds)	1,545,700		
<b>Children's Services</b>	<b>2,783,900</b>		60.00
Support & Development	345,500	Support & Development Division	10.50
Glass & Glazing (Lifelong Learning)	45,000	Health & Safety improvements at Lifelong Learning centres	
Awards & Grants Service	261,100	Administration of the Education Maintenance Allowance for pupils aged 16-18 in full-time education; plus mandatory awards for university pupils	13.64
Discretionary Award	1,000		
<b>Support and Development</b>	<b>652,600</b>		
Total Libraries & Information Services	4,246,900	Provision of a City-wide service to increase public access to books and the Internet, support educational attainment and literacy standards and promote active citizenship.	
<b>Libraries and Information Service</b>	<b>4,246,900</b>		125.50
<b>Total Lifelong Learning &amp; Community Devel. Div.</b>	<b>16,120,200</b>		253.14

## Section 52 Analysis of Lifelong Learning Division Budgets 2003/04

Cost Centre Description	2003/2004 Base Budget Education £	Classification				Total £
		Education for Under-Fives £	Adult Education £	Youth Service £	Community Services £	
SCLM (Cluster 1)	39,050	4,278	13,392	5,660	15,720	39,050
CLM Babington	348,900	60,000	109,351	51,180	128,369	348,900
CLM (Stocking Farm)	315,600	14,530	110,262	61,370	129,438	315,600
CLM (Tudor)	92,000	0	42,320	0	49,680	92,000
Grant Aid Projects Clusters 1	64,900	0	0	0	64,900	64,900
<b>Cluster Beaumont Leys</b>	<b>860,450</b>	<b>78,808</b>	<b>275,325</b>	<b>118,210</b>	<b>388,107</b>	<b>860,450</b>
SCLM (Cluster 3)	39,050	4,278	13,392	5,660	15,720	39,050
CLM (West Humberstone)	107,300	0	45,991	7,320	53,989	107,300
CLM (Netherhall)	26,500	0	11,005	2,576	12,919	26,500
CLM (Hamilton)	267,600	2,766	104,472	37,720	122,642	267,600
CLM (Northfields)	10,300	98	4,569	270	5,363	10,300
Grant Aid Projects Clusters 3	117,700	0	0	0	117,700	117,700
<b>Cluster Humberstone</b>	<b>568,450</b>	<b>7,142</b>	<b>179,429</b>	<b>53,546</b>	<b>328,333</b>	<b>568,450</b>
SCLM (Cluster 2)	33,550	6,256	4,896	16,650	5,748	33,550
CLM (Belgrave Area)	481,800	10,212	189,211	60,260	222,117	481,800
Glen Street Rooms	11,200	0	5,152	0	6,048	11,200
CLM (Soar Valley)	233,700	0	84,988	48,944	99,768	233,700
Grant Aid Projects Clusters 2	642,800	0	0	0	642,800	642,800
<b>Cluster Belgrave</b>	<b>1,403,050</b>	<b>16,468</b>	<b>284,247</b>	<b>125,854</b>	<b>976,481</b>	<b>1,403,050</b>
SCLM (Cluster 6)	33,550	6,256	4,896	16,650	5,748	33,550
CLM Eyres Monsell	236,200	0	99,989	18,832	117,379	236,200
CLM (Saffron)	598,000	14,172	242,534	56,580	284,714	598,000
CLM Sir Jonathan North	124,200	0	41,302	34,412	48,486	124,200
Grant Aid Projects Clusters 6	210,600	0	0	0	210,600	210,600
<b>Cluster South</b>	<b>1,202,550</b>	<b>20,428</b>	<b>388,722</b>	<b>126,474</b>	<b>666,926</b>	<b>1,202,550</b>
SCLM (Cluster 4)	48,450	2,072	17,548	8,230	20,600	48,450
CLM (Highfields)	346,600	6,672	144,135	26,590	169,203	346,600
CLM (Moat)	478,600	29,210	192,500	30,912	225,978	478,600
CLM (St. Matthews)	283,200	0	124,707	12,098	146,395	283,200
African Caribbean Centre	141,700	0	59,869	11,550	70,281	141,700
Grant Aid Projects Cluster 4	569,600	0	0	0	569,600	569,600
<b>Cluster Highfields</b>	<b>1,868,150</b>	<b>37,954</b>	<b>538,759</b>	<b>89,380</b>	<b>1,202,057</b>	<b>1,868,150</b>
SCLM (Cluster 5)	48,450	2,072	17,548	8,230	20,600	48,450
CLM (Crown Hills)	261,800	0	105,723	31,968	124,109	261,800
CLM Judgemeadow	175,000	0	77,283	6,994	90,723	175,000
Grant Aid Projects Cluster 5	4,500	0	0	0	4,500	4,500
<b>Cluster East</b>	<b>489,750</b>	<b>2,072</b>	<b>200,554</b>	<b>47,192</b>	<b>239,932</b>	<b>489,750</b>
SCLM (Cluster 7)	44,150	1,325	17,872	3,974	20,980	44,150
CLM (Riverside)	255,800	0	101,347	35,480	118,973	255,800
CLM (New College)	319,200	0	135,607	24,402	159,191	319,200
CLM (Braunstone)	524,700	0	198,872	92,370	233,458	524,700
CLM Fullhurst	365,500	0	157,296	23,552	184,652	365,500
Grant Aid Projects 7	525,300	0	0	0	525,300	525,300
<b>Cluster West</b>	<b>2,034,650</b>	<b>1,325</b>	<b>610,994</b>	<b>179,778</b>	<b>1,242,554</b>	<b>2,034,650</b>
SCLM (Cluster 8)	140,850	4,226	57,016	12,677	66,932	140,850
Leicester Adult Ed. College	232,200	0	232,200	0	0	232,200
REMIT	226,100	0	0	0	226,100	226,100
Youth House	147,800	0	61,189	14,780	71,831	147,800
Grant Aid Projects 8	888,800	0	0	0	888,800	888,800
<b>Cluster City Wide</b>	<b>1,635,750</b>	<b>4,226</b>	<b>350,405</b>	<b>27,457</b>	<b>1,253,663</b>	<b>1,635,750</b>



Education & Lifelong Learning Budget Strategy 2004/05 – 2006/07

Cost Centre Description	2003/2004 Base Budget Education £	Classification Education for Under-Fives £	Adult Education £	Youth Service £	Community Services £	Total £
Youth	457,600	0	0	238,372	219,228	457,600
Young People's Council	58,300	0	0	58,300	0	58,300
<b>Young People's Services</b>	<b>515,900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>296,672</b>	<b>219,228</b>	<b>515,900</b>
Adult	(2,141,900)	0	(2,141,900)	0	0	(2,141,900)
<b>Adult Services</b>	<b>(2,141,900)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(2,141,900)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(2,141,900)</b>
Nursery / Play centre	121,000	121,000	0	0	0	121,000
Shoppers Play Centre	76,200	0	0	0	76,200	76,200
Pre-Registration & Advice Worker	33,300	33,300	0	0	0	33,300
Children's Services	517,300	258,650	0	0	258,650	517,300
<b>Children's Services</b>	<b>747,800</b>	<b>412,950</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>334,850</b>	<b>747,800</b>
Support & Development	345,500	51,825	224,575	69,100	0	345,500
Glass & Glazing (LLL)	45,000	0	22,500	22,500	0	45,000
Awards & Grant Service	261,100	0	261,100	0	0	261,100
Discretionary Awards	1,000	0	1,000	0	0	1,000
<b>Support &amp; Development</b>	<b>652,600</b>	<b>51,825</b>	<b>509,175</b>	<b>91,600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>652,600</b>
<b>TOTAL BY CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>9,837,200</b>	<b>633,200</b>	<b>1,195,700</b>	<b>1,156,200</b>	<b>6,852,100</b>	<b>9,837,200</b>
<b>SCHOOLS BLOCK</b>						
Early Years Development - 4 year olds	490,400					490,400
Early Years Development - 3 year olds	1,545,700					1,545,700
	<b>2,036,100</b>					<b>2,036,100</b>
<b>NOT ON SECTION 52</b>						
Libraries Service	<b>4,246,900</b>					<b>4,246,900</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16,120,200</b>	<b>633,200</b>	<b>1,195,700</b>	<b>1,156,200</b>	<b>6,852,100</b>	<b>16,120,200</b>

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Policy &amp; Resources Division</b>			
<b>Finance</b>			
Finance / Bursar Service	538,700	Provide financial services to schools and the Education & Lifelong Learning Department.	20.50
Financial Services	155,200	Provide Group Bursar Service which is traded with schools and has to generate income to cover its costs. Corporate Payroll, cashiers and Customer Accounts services to the Department	
Schools Forum / School Organisation	10,000	Forum for consultation between LEA and City schools	
District Audit Fees	30,100	Charges for audit of external grants	
<b>Finance</b>	<b>734,000</b>		
<b>Planning &amp; Property</b>			
Planning, Property & Procurement	411,200	Property service to the Department (predominantly schools), including School Place Planning and Asset Management Planning	13.00
Vacant Premises	34,600	Management, maintenance & repair of vacant and tenanted properties.	
Free Standing Centres - R & M	36,000	Repairs and maintenance of Lifelong Learning establishments	
Client Service	61,500	Transport/catering/procurement support; maintenance for education playing fields (£19.1k)	
School Milk Scheme	126,800	Provision of free milk to pupils entitled to free school meals	
Sites Development	168,000	Maintenance of playing fields and pavilions, and lettings management	
Criminal Damage contingency	37,800	Contribution to premium payments for schools' optional contents insurance and uninsured losses (excess) for theft	
<b>Planning &amp; Property</b>	<b>875,900</b>		
<b>Policy &amp; Communications Unit</b>			
	263,800	Planning and performance management services; development of best practice in equal opportunities, sustainability, customer care and communications	8.00
<b>Policy and Communications</b>	<b>263,800</b>		
<b>Human Resources</b>			
Human Resources	404,300	HR Service	20.0
Employee General	63,400	Advertising costs for vacancies	
Job Shop / Standby Register / Occupational Health	56,600	Recruitment services and medical (Occupational Health) fees	
Maternity	376,200	Funding for maternity cover in schools	
Social Priority	31,800		
Trade Union Duties	182,100		
Centrally Funded Supply	8,000		
<b>Human Resources</b>	<b>1,122,400</b>		
Information Systems Service	492,100	1. Provide statistical analyses including school/performance information and pupil number forecasting	9.50
		2. Provide ICT and project management support for departmental and schools ICT projects, web and database developments	9.50
		3. EDISS provides a comprehensive ICT/IS support service to schools, Pupil Referral Units and community centres on a traded basis.	
LAN / FMIS / Development Work / Support Centre	575,900	Corporate provision of IT services to the Department	
<b>Information Systems</b>	<b>1,068,000</b>		

Service Area	2003/04 Budget £	Description	Staff FTE
<b>Policy &amp; Resources Division</b>			
<b>Administration &amp; Governor Support Service</b>	538,700	1. Support services to schools, including school governor support and development, risk and business planning, health & safety, corporate governance, challenge and support for schools causing concern, and 1. traded clerking services. 2. Central procurement services for the Department 3. Customer/client services including reception services and free school meals assessments	22.70
School crossing patrols	115,700		
Litigation / Legal / SS & Educ / Commercial & Prop Serv.	228,800	Legal services provided corporately	
Property Recharges	37,100	Car parking costs	
Operational leasing	200		
Public liability insurance	498,100	Corporate insurance costs	
Buildings insurance - fire	185,400		
<b>Governor Services</b>	<b>1,604,000</b>		
<b>Total Policy &amp; Resources Division</b>	<b>5,668,100</b>		103.2

<b>Section 8 - Cash Target 2004/05</b>
--

## Cash Target 2004/05

	<b>Schools Block</b>	<b>LEA Block &amp; other</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
2003/04 Base budget	141,359.2	31,210.9	172,570.1
<b>Virements:</b>			
Telephone Access Project		-33.0	-33.0
Support service transfer (CS&NR)		-6.0	-6.0
Senior Officers pay		7.1	7.1
East West Community Project		-15.5	-15.5
VAL		149.1	149.1
IT Training		15.8	15.8
LCIL		39.6	39.6
Sub-total	141,359.2	31,368.0	172,727.2
<b>Full year effects:</b>			
LEA Block growth		20.5	20.5
<b>Pensions:</b>			
Schools	112.1		112.1
Non-schools		75.1	75.1
Sub-total	141,471.3	31,463.6	172,934.9
<b>Inflation:</b>			
Teachers (3.5%)	2,929.0	113.8	3,042.8
Non-teachers (3.25%)	383.4	664.9	1,048.3
Price (2.1%)	262.8	70.7	333.5
Grant aid		25.5	25.5
Traders		12.2	12.2
<b>CASH TARGET 2004/05</b>	<b>145,046.5</b>	<b>32,350.7</b>	<b>177,397.2</b>
Passport	4,492.7		4,492.7
Savings target		-764.1	-764.1
<b>PLANNING TARGET 2004/05</b>	<b>149,539.2</b>	<b>31,586.6</b>	<b>181,125.8</b>

<b>Section 9 - Spending and Resource Forecast</b>
---

### Spending and Resources Forecast

Ref		2004/05		2005/06		2006/07	
		£'000		£'000		£'000	
		Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other
	Cash Target	145,046.5	32,350.7	145,046.5	32,350.7	145,046.5	32,350.7
	Add: Total service enhancements	312.0	33.0	329.0	78.0	329.0	78.0
	Add: Total Decisions already taken	60.0	1,045.0	0.0	1,045.0	0.0	1,045.0
	Add: Total Other	4,428.8	1,422.3	8,110.6	1,872.0	11,603.5	2,279.7
	<b>SUB-TOTAL - GROWTH</b>	<b>4,800.8</b>	<b>2,500.3</b>	<b>8,439.6</b>	<b>2,995.0</b>	<b>11,932.5</b>	<b>3,402.7</b>
	Less: Total Service Reductions	0.0	-1,575.9	0.0	-2,571.5	0.0	-2,894.2
	Less: Total Decisions already made	0.0	-1,100.0	0.0	-1,100.0	0.0	-1,100.0
	Less: Efficiency/Restructuring savings	0.0	-558.5	0.0	-1,027.5	0.0	-1,212.5
	Less: Other	0.0	-30.0	0.0	-60.0	0.0	-60.0
	<b>SUB-TOTAL – REDUCTIONS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-3,264.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-4,759.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-5,266.7</b>
	<b>TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>149,847.3</b>	<b>31,586.6</b>	<b>153,486.1</b>	<b>30,586.7</b>	<b>156,979.0</b>	<b>30,486.7</b>
	PLANNING TOTAL (2004/05 prices)	149,539.2	31,586.6	153,073.7	30,586.7	155,864.8	30,486.7
	Difference	308.1	0.0	412.4	0.0	1,114.2	0.0

## Revenue Budget - Growth

Ref		2004/05 £'000		2005/06 £'000		2006/07 £'000	
		Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other
	<b>Service enhancements:</b>						
G1	Hearing Impaired Teacher	12.0	10.0	12.0	10.0	12.0	10.0
G2	Educ Welfare Service (post & Salaries)		23.0		28.0		28.0
G3	Educational Psychologist		0.0		40.0		40.0
G4	3 x NNEB (pre school referrals)	53.0		53.0		53.0	
G5	Distance Learning	233.0		233.0		233.0	
G6	2 Admin caseworkers (Admissions/Exclusions)	0.0		17.0		17.0	
G7	0.5 fte Admin Assistant (SNTS)	14.0		14.0		14.0	
	<b>Total service enhancements</b>	<b>312.0</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>329.0</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>329.0</b>	<b>78.0</b>
	<b>Add Decisions already taken:</b>						
G8	Youth Service £100/head increase		1,000.0		1,000.0		1,000.0
G9	Library Services for Education		10.0		10.0		10.0
G10	Re-open Fosse NC for group access		35.0		35.0		35.0
G11	New school set up costs	60.0		0.0		0.0	
	<b>Total Decisions already taken</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>1,045.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1,045.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1,045.0</b>
	<b>Add Other:</b>						
	<i>Continuation of grant funded activity:</i>						
G12	NRF - LL&CD		250.0		500.0		750.0
G13	NRF – Excluded Pupils	0.0		190.0		354.0	
G14	Parent Partnership		8.0		8.0		8.0
G15	Std Fund – Travellers		70.0		70.0		70.0
G16	Std Fund – match funding		16.0		16.0		16.0
G17	Std Fund – Foundation Stage		90.0		90.0		90.0
G18	Additional Study Support cover	25.0		25.0		25.0	
G19	NOF – Study Support (Libraries)		34.0		34.0		34.0
	<i>Demand led budgets:</i>						
G20	SEN Transport		620.0		620.0		620.0
G21	Mainstream Transport		51.0		51.0		51.0
G22	PRU Transport	30.0		30.0		30.0	
G23	Mainstream Statements	120.0		132.0		145.0	
G24	Mainstream Recoupment	65.0		72.0		79.0	
G25	County Schools Recoupment	20.0		22.0		24.0	
G26	Independent school placements	50.0		55.0		60.0	
G27	Premature Retirement Costs (PRC)		200.0		400.0		600.0
	<i>Corporate charges increases:</i>						
G28	Corporate IT Service charges		20.0		20.0		20.0
G29	Insurance charges	100.0		200.0		300.0	
	<i>Schools:</i>						
G30	Passport growth (4% guarantee)	3,692.8		7,135.6		10,414.5	
G31	Consortia built schools insurance	95.0		95.0		95.0	
G32	LMSS moderation	231.0		154.0		77.0	
	Service re-investment		63.3		63.0		20.7
	<b>Total Other</b>	<b>4,428.8</b>	<b>1,422.3</b>	<b>8,110.6</b>	<b>1,872.0</b>	<b>11,603.5</b>	<b>2,279.7</b>
	<b>SUB-TOTAL - GROWTH</b>	<b>4,800.8</b>	<b>2,500.3</b>	<b>8,439.6</b>	<b>2,995.0</b>	<b>11,932.5</b>	<b>3,402.7</b>

## Revenue Budget - Reductions

Ref		2004/05		2005/06		2006/07	
		£'000		£'000		£'000	
		Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other	Schools Block	LEA Block & Other
	<b>Service Reductions:</b>						
R1	Delete 1 fte Technician		-26.0		-26.0		-26.0
R2	Reduce 2 fte Community Project Officer		-52.0		-52.0		-52.0
R3	Reduce 2 fte Community Project Officer		-26.0		-26.0		-26.0
R4	Day closure of St Matthews Sports Ctre		-15.0		-15.0		-15.0
R5	Reduce Book Fund		-61.0		-61.0		-61.0
R6	Reduce Play sessional staffing		-25.0		-25.0		-25.0
R7	Delete Sport Grant		-12.0		-12.0		-12.0
R8	Grant Aided Projects		-1,132.8		-1,880.9		-2,153.6
R9	Delete general activities fund		-31.0		-31.0		-31.0
R10	Workplace Nursery – removal of subsidy		-88.6		-118.1		-118.1
R11	Shoppers Playcentre		-27.5		-36.5		-36.5
R12	Delete Policy Assistant post		-22.0		-22.0		-22.0
R34	SED income generation		-35.0		-35.0		-35.0
R35	Vacant properties management		-22.0		-22.0		-22.0
R36	Education Finance Review		0.0		-25.0		-25.0
R37	Pupil & Student Support Review		0.0		-150.0		-200.0
R38	Policy Officer		0.0		-34.0		-34.0
	<b>Total Service Reductions</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,575.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-2,571.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-2,894.2</b>
	<b>Less Decisions already taken:</b>						
R13	Youth Service £100/head increase		-1,000.0		-1,000.0		-1,000.0
R14	Reduce Senior Management by 2 posts		-100.0		-100.0		-100.0
	<b>Total Decisions already taken</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,100.0</b>
	<b>Less Efficiency/Restructuring Savings:</b>						
R15	Delete 1 fte AV Manager		-30.0		-30.0		-30.0
R16	Delete Voluntary Sector Grants Officer		-29.0		-29.0		-29.0
R17	Convert Communications post to Sc 6		-6.0		-6.0		-6.0
R18	Reduce 5 fte Community Learning Mgr		-189.0		-189.0		-189.0
R19	Delete Grant Aid Assistant		-16.0		-16.0		-16.0
R20	Delete Divisional Accountant		-25.0		-25.0		-25.0
R21	Delete REMQ Implementation post		-5.0		-8.0		-8.0
R22	Reduce Care in the Community Fund		-5.0		-5.0		-5.0
R23	Reduce training budget		-5.0		-5.0		-5.0
R24	Premises Review		-112.5		-503.5		-638.5
R25	Technical support restructure		-10.0		-10.0		-10.0
R26	Free school meals support		-16.0		-16.0		-16.0
R28	SEN Transport		-34.0		-109.0		-159.0
R29	Furniture & equipment		-39.0		-39.0		-39.0
R30	Buildings maintenance		-10.0		-10.0		-10.0
R31	Stationery		-10.0		-10.0		-10.0
R32	Printing		-10.0		-10.0		-10.0
R33	Governor recruitment support		-7.0		-7.0		-7.0
	<b>Total Efficiency/Restructuring Savings</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-558.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,027.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-1,212.5</b>
	<b>Less Other:</b>						
R27	Management costs from Review		-30.0		-60.0		-60.0
	<b>Total Other</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-30.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-60.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-60.0</b>
	<b>SUB-TOTAL - REDUCTIONS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-3,264.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-4,759.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>-5,266.7</b>

**APPENDIX 1**

**Grant Aid Contract – Core Service specification**

<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
African Caribbean Citizens Forum	40,000
Bal Nagri	4,100
Belgrave Playgroup	9,300
Belgrave Playhouse	126,600
Centre for Integrated Living	39,600
Council for Volunteer Youth Service	12,481
Glenn Street Playgroup	10,100
Leicester Council of Faiths	20,800
Leicester Race Equality Council	39,800
Mellor playgroup	5,100
New Parks Playgroup	3,000
Open Door	18,700
Preschool Learning Alliance	38,300
Toddler Activity Group	2,800
Voluntary Action Leicester (incl Volunteer Centre)	264,600
Young People First - CORE	4,000
<b>Total Core Service Specification</b>	<b>639,281</b>



## Grant Aid Contract – Non Core Service specification

Project	£
Ajani	92,900
Allexton Youth and Community Centre	7,500
Baghini Women's Centre	110,700
Bangladesh Youth and Cultural Shomiti	47,900
Belgrave Baheno	129,500
Braunstone Adventure Playground *	84,900
Chinese Community Centre	50,000
East West Community Project	20,000
Ek Awaaj *	73,200
Gilmorton Estate Junior Youth Club	4,700
Girlguiding – Leicestershire *	5,100
Goldhill Adventure Playground *	74,800
Gorse Hill City Farm **	55,000
Heatherbrook Play Association	11,300
Highfields Adventure Playground *	77,700
Irish Centre	10,000
Lame Duck Project	4,300
Leicester United Caribbean Association **	65,900
Leicestershire Clubs for Young People *	7,600
Leicestershire Scouts *	6,500
Medway Bangladeshi Education Project	60,600
Minor Capital Works	4,000
Moira Street Play Area	4,500
Mowmacre Young Peoples Play and Development Association *	53,600
New Parks Adventure Playground *	88,800
Northfields and District Play Association *	109,600
Pakistan Youth and Community Association	18,100
Rathbone Society	38,600
Saffron Resource Centre	59,800
Shama Women's Centre	126,600
Shree Sanatan Community Project	75,500
Shree Sanatan Mandir	11,100
Sikh Community Centre	50,200
St Albans Community Centre	41,100
St Andrews Play Association *	71,200
St Gabriels Community Centre	43,400
St Matthews Childrens Action Group *	64,600
St Peters	16,500
Support to Management Committees	14,000
Thurnby Lodge Adult and Youth Association	4,700
Turning Point Women's Centre	103,800
Vietnamese Community Association	22,500
Waverly Tenants	4,500
WEA *	58,300
Wesley Hall Community Project	118,700
Woodgate Adventure Playground *	94,800
Woodgate Residents Association	31,700
YMCA *	23,300
Service re-investment	-200,000
<b>Total Non Core Service Specification</b>	<b>2,153,600</b>

\* It is proposed that these projects be offered a 5 month extension (to 31/8/04) to their contract to enable the possibility of commissioning services to be explored without the risk of a break in service delivery.

\*\* It is proposed that these projects be offered a 12 month extension (to 31/3/05) to allow them to explore the opportunities for securing other sources of external income.

**APPENDIX 2**

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	SNTS – Hearing Impairment Team			<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G1</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
Provision of one full time equivalent teacher to increase the capacity of the Hearing Impairment team in order to meet the increasing referrals to the Service..					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Service Improvement					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
The number of regular visits needed to meet the needs of children with severe and profound hearing losses has risen from 72 per week in the last academic year to 98 per week in the year 2003-4. (The team works on a basis of 4 visits per day). This increase of 27 visits per week equates to the caseload of 1.5 teachers.					
The Service provided in Leicester City differs from most of statistical and geographical neighbours in that, as a result of current staffing and support practices, almost all the children with impaired hearing in the LEA attend their local community school.					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
Increasing pressure on the Hearing Impairment team resulting in a reduction in the level of support available for severe and profoundly deaf pupils in Leicester City mainstream schools. If the support available to deaf children in mainstream schools diminishes because of increased numbers, there will be pressure from parents to look to independent, out of city special school provision which would in turn, drive up the independent schools budget..					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implementation/date of proposed implementation:</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> September 2004					
<b>Current Budget</b>	£3,111,000				
Cost Centre number:	343262	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		22.0	22.0	22.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		89.4	89.4	89.4	
Extra post(s) (FTE)		1.0	1.0	1.0	
Signature: ..... Name: Janis Warren					
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03					

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	Education Welfare Service	Proposal No:	G2
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
One additional full-time EWO (scale6/SO), thereby raising the EWO establishment from 18 to 19fte.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Service Improvement			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
DfES has identified LEA as having unauthorised absence rates at twice the national average. The LEA has a statutory duty to enforce school attendance and this is fulfilled by the EWS. The DfES have appointed consultants to work with the LEA to address this high level of U/A and a target has been set to reduce this from 1.54% in 2003 to 1.07% in 2004. This is an exceptionally challenging target and there is not sufficient capacity to address this effectively. Feedback from schools and initial observations by the DfES consultants report current systems and practice are sound. Despite the increased national focus on tackling pupil absence over recent years, the EWS has managed to take on significant additional workloads and pressures without any increase in resources. Whilst attendance levels have gone up almost year on year in both the primary and secondary school sectors since LGR, attendance rates in Leicester are 1% and 1.3% respectively below the national average.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
The service will not be able to address the additional demands being placed upon it and will not be able to work towards securing the necessary improvements which are being required.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1/6/04			
<b>Current Budget £685,000</b>			
Cost Centre number: 343150	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	23.0	28.0	28.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	23.6	23.6	23.6
Extra post(s) (FTE)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Signature: ..... Name: J.Broadhead, PrincipalEWO			
Date: 31/10/03			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>Psychology Service</b>	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G3</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
<p>1 x Educational Psychologist.                  To increase the capacity of the Psychology Service to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respond to the concerns of secondary schools</li> </ul> <p>Meet LEA responsibilities for children with complex and enduring behaviour difficulties</p>			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Service Improvement			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
<p>The bid fulfils the additional responsibilities for LEA support services as identified by the EIC behaviour strand. The service has contributed to discussion between the LEA and the Excellence in Cities Partnership, concerning the development of future arrangements to reduce exclusion and meet the needs of pupils exhibiting behaviour difficulties. To meet demands from head teachers to enhance specialist services for behaviour. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To create Service capacity to attend and advise in-school inclusion panel meetings in secondary schools.</li> <li>To carry an additional caseload of children with complex behaviour difficulties, as identified at the cluster reference group meetings.</li> <li>To attend relevant central cluster and reference group meetings.</li> <li>To undertake specialist assessments within LEA provision for children with complex and enduring needs.</li> <li>To advise and contribute to multi-agency planning for these students.</li> </ol>			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bid promotes the corporate priority of social inclusion and will enhance cross-disciplinary working.</li> <li>It ensures the Psychology Service can meet expectations set by the Education Department's Business Support Plan, Behaviour Improvement Plan and Educational Development Plan.</li> </ol>			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
<b>Date of earliest implementation:</b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2005			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number: 343220	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	0.0	40.0	40.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE) Total Staff	27.0	27.0	27.0
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0	1.0	1.0
Name: Paul Phillips - Principal Educational Psychologist..... Date: 12/12/2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	SNTS – Parkfield/Pre-School Team			Proposal No:	<b>G4</b>	
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>						
To enhance the current Pre-School peripatetic team by 3 x Nursery Nurses (NNEB). This is to meet the increasing referrals to the service for intensive work with 0-5year olds with complex special educational needs. Support takes place in a variety of educational settings including the home.						
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>						
Service Improvement						
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>						
The number of Pre-school referrals has increased from 45 in 1997 to 63 in 2003. There has been no pro rata increase in Pre-School staffing during this period with the team remaining at 4.9 FTE. National initiatives for example 'Getting it Right From the Start' require LEAs to evidence making effective early intervention for pupils with high level needs.						
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>						
This would enable the SNTS Pre-School Team to meet the special educational needs of pupils referred by health agencies. It will enable compliance with Pre-School statutory (SEN) requirements.						
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>						
None						
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>						
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004						
<b>Current Budget</b>	£3,111.000					
Cost Centre number:	343264					
		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>		
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		53.0	53.0	53.0		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
Current service staffing (FTE)		89.4	89.4	89.4		
Extra post(s) (FTE)		3.0	3.0	3.0		
Signature: ..... Name: Janis Warren						
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03						

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Student Support KS3/4 – Key Way Centre			<b>Proposal No: G5</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>				
<p>The KS4 Pupil Referral Unit reached its capacity of 60 excluded pupils and is full. At present there are an additional 40 excluded KS4 pupils. This proposal will enable the establishment of a Distance Learning Programme (DLP) for these pupils. This programme will offer a range of alternative education options which will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Virtual Classroom/On-line Learning</li> <li>• Youth Service Group Work Programmes</li> <li>• Home Study</li> <li>• Work Experience Placements (via City Cluster)</li> <li>• College of Further Education Placements (via City Cluster)</li> <li>• Part time provision in PRUs</li> <li>• Twilight Tutorials (Held in PRUs)</li> <li>• Voluntary and private organisation lead programmes e.g. St Matthews Contact Project.</li> </ul>				
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>				
Service Improvement				
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>				
To seek permanent authority for the establishment of Distance Learning and Virtual Classroom facilities for excluded pupils at Key Way Centre which is now over capacity by 40 pupils. The DLP will provide education programmes for the additional 40 excluded pupils. This will enable the LEA to meet its statutory responsibilities towards excluded pupils in a more costly and effective manner rather than opening a further Pupil Referral Unit which would cost in excess of £1.2 million to establish.				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
The proposal presents flexibility and a broader range of educational options for pupils and it can be adjusted to meet need and to support who are at risk of exclusion from school if exclusion levels fluctuate. Without this provision, the Service would be unable to meet statutory requirements.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
None				
<b>Date of earliest implementation/date of proposed implementation:</b>				
01 April 2004				
<b>Current Budget</b>	£1,678.00			
Cost Centre number: 343167		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		233.0	233.0	233.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		55.9	55.9	55.9
Extra post(s) (FTE)		5.0	5.0	5.0
Signature: ..... Name: Janis Warren				
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03				

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Admissions and exclusions			<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G6</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
2 additional 0.5 admissions caseworkers (one permanent and one temporary renewable)					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Other					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
This growth is needed to deal with additional responsibilities of the LEA for co-ordinating admissions to schools which are outside LEA control for admissions. It will give capacity to introduce systems to handle an expected extra 1000 requests for school places for each transfer group as required by the Education Act 2002 and to deal with the extra ongoing casework. There will be prescribed data sharing exercises with the other admission authorities to achieve the co-ordination required before offers are made to parents.					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
If this is not provided the existing team would be under unreasonable pressure to take on the extra work causing recruitment and retention problems. A key staff member has already resigned due to the pressure of work. We would seriously risk not only failing to meet the new requirements to provide all parents in Leicester City with their school application results but we would also hinder the County Council from meeting their equivalent requirement relating to their residents.					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
April 2004					
<b>Current Budget</b> £348,500					
Cost Centre number: 343170	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>		
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	0.0	17.0	17.0		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
Current service staffing (FTE)	14	14	14		
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0	1.0	1.0		
Signature: ..... Name: ...Janet Shaw.....					
Date: ...28 <sup>th</sup> October 2003.....					

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	SNTS – New Parks House		Proposal No:	<b>G7</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>				
Enhancement of administrative, clerical and database support to teaching staff at New Parks House by one full time equivalent admin assistant to support the increase in staffing.				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Service enhancement				
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>				
Since January 2000, the Admin Assistant support to NPH teaching staff (then 55 FTE) has remained constant at 3.6 FTE giving an admin/teacher ratio of 1:15.				
During the past 3 years, teaching staffing has risen to 66 FTE with a consequent admin/teacher ration of 1:18. The Service is required to produce reports contributing to the statutory assessment process. Pressure on the admin team is making it difficult to meet statutory deadlines which in turn has a direct impact upon the CPA and BVPP targets. The situation has also led to difficulties in maintaining accurate pupil records with a clear impact on pupils' recorded progress. This has also prevented the Service moving forward towards a collective sharing of database information with other agencies/partners.				
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>				
Without this increase in staffing, CPA and BPVI targets will not be met.				
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>				
none				
<b><u>Date of earliest implementation/date of proposed implementation:</u></b>				
1 <sup>st</sup> April 04				
<b>Current Budget</b>	£3,111,000			
Cost Centre number:	343266	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		14.0	14.0	14.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		89.4	89.4	89.4
Extra post(s) (FTE)		1.0	1.0	1.0
Signature: ..... Name: Janis Warren.				
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03				



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA		Youth service		Proposal No:	G8
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
Realign funding for the statutory Youth Service, in line with Government recommendations, to meet Ofsted inspection.					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Decisions Already Taken					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
The Youth Service is subject to Ofsted inspection. This will expect funding in line with Government recommendations, anything less than this risks failure at inspection and/or public criticism from Ofsted.					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
All the divisions work with young people will become subject to the Youth Work Curriculum raising quality, outputs and outcomes.					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004					
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Cost Centre number:		£000s	£000s	£000s	
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		1000.0	1000.0	1000.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		45	45	45	
Extra post(s) (FTE)		30 (redirected)	30	30	
Signature: ..... Name: Keith Murdoch.....					
Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2003.....					

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA    Libraries		Proposal No: <b>G9</b>	
<b>Details of Proposal:</b> Additional funding is required to pay for the reinstatement of the Joint Arrangement for Library Services for Education (LSE).			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>  Decisions Already Taken			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>  A Cabinet decision was taken to end the Joint Arrangement for LSE in January 2002. Subsequently, a decision was taken to reinstate the Joint Arrangement from September 2003.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>  			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>  None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>  1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	10.0	10.0	10.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)			
Extra post(s) (FTE)			
Signature: ..... Name: .....Pat Flynn.....			
Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA		Re-open Fosse NC	Proposal No:	G10
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>				
Re-open Fosse Neighbourhood Centre				
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>				
Decisions Already				
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>				
Increased community access in the Tudor Road area				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
See above				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
None				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004				
<b>Current Budget £0.00</b>				
Cost Centre number: 341904 (part)	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	35.0	35.0	35.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	0	0	0	
Extra post(s) (FTE)	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Signature: ..... Name: ...Keith Murdoch.....				
Date: .....16 <sup>th</sup> December 2003.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA		New School		Proposal No:	G11
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
A new school (St Mary's) is opening in January 2005. The Headteacher and some teaching staff will be appointed before the school opens to assist with setting up.					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Decisions Already Taken					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
The school will not receive section 52 funding until it actually opens in January 2005. This funding is necessary to ensure the school can be made ready for opening.					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
Without this funding the school will not be in a position to open in January 2005.					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2005					
<b>Current Budget £</b>					
Cost Centre number:		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount of Growth (cumulative)		60.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		N/a	N/a	N/a	
Extra post(s) (FTE)		N/a	N/a	N/a	
Signature: ..... Name: ...David Wilkin.....					
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....					

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA    NRF		Proposal No: <b>G12</b>	
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
Mainstreaming of NRF funding.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (grant funded)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
£0.75m of the division's services for the community, particularly children, are supported by NRF. This funding will be withdrawn, on a tapered basis, by 2006/07.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Closure of play, early years and community services in priority areas if the funding is not replaced.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	250.0	500.0	750.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: ...John Crookes.....			
Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Student Support KS3/4 PRUs	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G13</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
To continue to maintain the level of provision and capacity within the Primary and Secondary Pupil Referral Units. At present this funding is provided by NRF but will cease from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 04			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (continuation of grant-maintained activity)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
The LEA has a statutory duty to provide 25 hours education per week to permanently excluded pupils. Without this funding the LEA will be unable to make the required provision.			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
The Service would be able to provide the required 25hrs education per week to permanently excluded pupils. This will also impact upon key BVPIs.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 04			
<b>Current Budget</b> £1,678,100			
Cost Centre number: 343155	<b>2004/05</b> £000s	<b>2005/06</b> £000s	<b>2006/07</b> £000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	0.0	190.0	354.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	55.9	55.9	55.9
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0.0	7.0	13.0
Signature: ..... Name: Janis Warren			
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Special Education Service		<b>Proposal No:</b> G14	
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
Additional £8,000 required for Parent Partnership Scheme.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Grant funded)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
Additional £8,000 required for Parent Partnership Scheme.			
2003-04 Budget for Parent Partnership was £70,000. We were able to give VAL a reduced grant due to their previous years' underspends and recruitment issues that meant they were not fully staffed. For 2004-05 they will require the full amount.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
The provision of a Parent Partnership Scheme is a statutory requirement. The service needs to be adequately funded to support parents, otherwise the Special Education Service would face additional pressures due to parents needing help and advice during the statutory assessment process. The SES could not cope with this with its existing staffing.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004			
<b>Current Budget £482,000</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number: 343230	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	8.0	8.0	8.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	16.5	17.0	17.0
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0.5		
Signature: ..... Name: Vicky Wibberley			
Date: 16/12/2003			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	Standards and Effectiveness Division	Proposal No:	G15
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
Currently the Standards Fund pays for support for travellers and displaced persons. Until 2003 the Department received a discrete Standards Fund to cover this work. The fund has now become part of the vulnerable Children's Fund. The Vulnerable Children's Fund has to encompass the work of the new Children's Trust, resulting in a potential loss of £70,000 to support traveller and displaced persons' education			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Grant funded).			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
The support to travellers and displaced persons is a statutory requirement under the Race Relations Amendment Act, 2000.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Because it is a legal requirement to provide the support the loss of grant has to be covered by other means.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004.			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	70.0	70.0	70.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	4.0	4.0	4.0
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Signature: ..... Name: .....Jim Muncey.....			
Date: .....16/12/03.....			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>Standards Funds</b>	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G16</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
The LEA is required to match fund Standards Fund received from the Government. The amount required each year varies.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (grant funded)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
Without this funding the LEA would lose Standards Fund income and this would have a negative impact on standards in schools and the LEA's capacity.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Without this funding the LEA would lose Standards Fund income and this would have a negative impact on standards in schools and the LEA's capacity.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	16.0	16.0	16.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: ...Ann Barwell.....			
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Standards and Effectiveness Division	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G17</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>Currently there are three temporary advisory teacher posts, funded through the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership (EYDCP) Foundation Stage Training Grant. The posts deliver a major part of Priority 1 in the EDP. They also contribute to the statutory process for the delivery of the Foundation Stage Profile and the EYDCP targets, which form the most recent 2003-2004 Best Value Indicators (BV192a; BV192b). To date we have been unable to meet these targets due to limited staffing.</p> <p>The growth bid is for £70,000 staffing plus £20,000 to replace the LEA matched funding lost when EYDCP took over the previous Standards Fund. This funding is required to meet the LEA's statutory responsibilities for the training and moderation activities associated with the Foundation Stage Profile.</p>			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (Grant funded).			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>The growth bid would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enable the LEA to meet its statutory responsibilities for the Foundation Stage Profile.</li> <li>▪ Enable the LEA's and EYDCP's target and BVI's to be met.</li> <li>▪ Make a significant contribution to EDP 1, Priority 1.</li> <li>▪ Significantly raise the quality of education in Nursery education settings and schools across the City.</li> <li>▪ Support a wide range of training and inset events for foundation stage teachers in LEA schools which is extremely limited at present, thus helping to raise standards.</li> <li>▪ Provide qualified teacher involvement to Children's Centre and Sure Start programmes across the City.</li> <li>▪ Potentially contribute to the generation of further income.</li> </ul>			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
<p>Without the growth bid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current staff will leave once their present contracts finish in March 2004 and their expertise will be lost to the LEA.</li> <li>▪ Progress towards the BVI's and Targets will be reduced from our present low position.</li> <li>▪ The LEA will be unable to deliver a major part of Priority 1 of the EDP.</li> <li>▪ There will be a negative impact on standards in schools, the private and the voluntary sectors.</li> <li>▪ The statutory duty for the Foundation Stage profile will not be discharged. With the change of the admission policy in 2004, this support is crucial to embed good practice across the City as the changes take place.</li> </ul>			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None.			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
April 2004.			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	90.0	90.0	90.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	3.0	3.0	3.0
Extra post(s) (FTE)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Signature: ..... Name: .....Jim Muncey.....			
Date: .....16/12/03.....			

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	Standards and Effectiveness Division	Proposal No:	G18
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
The work of the Study Support coordinator for the last three financial years has been funded by a combination of grant funding. Funding streams end at the start of the new financial year. Other funding will enable projects to continue but they require co-ordination.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Grant funded).			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
National and local research has shown the value of programmes of Out of Hours Learning and Leicester has many very worthwhile programmes running in both Primary and Secondary schools and monitored by the Study Support Coordinator. Leicester is one of the few cities in the country with three Playing for Success Centres, which are overseen by the Study Support Coordinator.			
The Coordinator also manages Standards Fund 206b, monitoring the work of Leicester's secondary schools in relation to study support and planning the spend of the centrally-held element of the Fund. Through this fund the Coordinator supports the work of the Endeavour Learning Centre (based at the National Space Centre) and delivers an Out of Hours Learning opportunity for Key Stage 3 students based at the Knighton Fields Arts in Education Centre. This work encourages the development of creativity and Performing Arts skills. The Coordinator has strong links with the City Learning Centres and is coordinating Out of Hours Learning opportunities for Key Stage 4 students in media.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Out of Hours Learning has been shown to have an effect upon attainment, attendance, attitude and aspiration; closely linked to priority areas of raising standards and promoting social inclusion. The loss of the Study Support Coordinator role would have a drastic effect upon Leicester's ability to capitalise on the potential of Out of Hours Learning both to motivate and re-motivate Leicester students from key Stage 1 to key Stage 4.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004.			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Extra post(s) (FTE)			
Signature: ..... Name: .....Jim Muncey.....			
Date: .....16/12/03.....			

Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	NOF study support	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G19</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
Replace New Opportunities Funding (NOF) for study support and homework help in Libraries.			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (grant funded)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
NOF ended in July 2003. The Library Service has redirected budget to pay for the service from September 2003 to March 2004, but cannot fund it from April 2004.			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
Study support and homework help supports raising educational attainment and has been successful in attracting children across the city. The replacement for NOF would enable this important service to continue.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	34.0	34.0	34.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: .....Pat Flynn.....			
Date: .....1 <sup>st</sup> October 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> SEN Transport	<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G20</b>		
<b>Details of Proposal:</b> The LEA is required to provide free transport for qualifying pupils who have transport as a need on their Statement , or if they live more than 2 miles (under 8 years) or 3 miles (over 8 years) from the nearest school with an available place. By its nature, SEN transport is expensive and the average cost is £20 per pupil per day. This budget covers pupils who attend special schools.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>  Other (Demand led budgets)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b> The number of pupils qualifying for free transport has increased from 820 in June 2001 to 979 in June 2003. The charges levied by Commercial Services are scrutinised and have been challenged in 2003/04, however the level of increase in volume of pupils cannot be contained within the existing budget.			
<b>Service Implications:</b> The LEA has a statutory duty to provide this transport.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £3,025,400</b>  Cost Centre number: 343113	<b>2004/05</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2006/07</b> <b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	620.0	620.0	620.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: ...Janet Shaw..... Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Mainstream Transport			<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G21</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
The LEA is required to provide free transport for qualifying pupils who have transport as a need on their Statement , or if they live more than 2 miles (under 8 years) or 3 miles (over 8 years) from the nearest school with an available place. This budget covers pupils who attend mainstream schools.					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Other (Demand led budgets)					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
The combined effects of schools closures following the Secondary Review and the influx of refugee children have resulted in a reduction of spare places in Secondary schools. As a result, pupils whose applications are unsuccessful have to be offered places at schools outside their immediate area, and this means the number of children who meet the criteria for free transport has increased.					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
The LEA has a statutory duty to provide this transport.					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004					
<b>Current Budget £316,900</b>					
Cost Centre number: 343112	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>		
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	51.0	51.0	51.0		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
Current service staffing (FTE)	0	0	0		
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0	0	0		
Signature: ..... Name: Janet Shaw.....					
Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....					

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> SNTS KS1/2 – Service Prus	<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G22</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>To fund the current shortfall in the cost of transporting excluded KS1/2 pupils to the Pupil Referral Units at the Phoenix Centre (Thurnby Lodge) and the ARC (Holy Cross Primary School). Transport is by escorted mini bus which meets all requirements of the current Education Transport Policy and is a key element in the success of the provision for excluded primary pupils.</p>			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (Demand-led)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>The statutory requirement for 25hrs provision for all excluded pupils together with the significant rise in transport costs, has resulted in a deficit of £30 000 in the Service budget for the transport of pupils to the Thurnby Lodge and Holy Cross Primary School PRUs.</p> <p>The quality of transport provided is appropriate and effective and has resulted in a significantly high level of attendance and subsequent achievement by excluded KS1/2 pupils.</p>			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
<p>This is essential to meeting the needs of excluded pupils at KS1/2 level within the overall context of the Service Transport policy. Without this funding, pupil attendance levels and academic achievements would fall affecting significantly CPA and BVPI targets.</p>			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 04			
<b>Current Budget</b> £3,111,000			
Cost Centre number: 343164	<b>2004/05</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2006/07</b> <b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	30.0	30.0	30.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	Nil	Nil	Nil
Signature: .....    Name: Janis Warren			
Date: 28 <sup>th</sup> October 03			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Statementing - Mainstream	<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G23</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
Growth required due to increasing demand on budget			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (Demand Led)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>The predicted overspend with current pupils is £105,000. However, additional pupils are likely to be supported in the new academic year.</p> <p>The overspend and requirement for growth is a result of the LEA's inclusion policy. Greater numbers of pupils are now being supported in mainstream schools who would otherwise be in special schools. The cost of supporting these pupils in mainstream schools is greater than the cost of special school placements.</p> <p>Pupil numbers will continue to rise due to inclusion of pupils into mainstream schools. The success of the Parkfield Inclusion Team in particular has had an effect on the numbers of younger pupils being supported centrally.</p> <p>Growth for this budget could be partly found from the Special School Contingency Budget, as this is where the savings from reducing special school places feed in to.</p> <p>Strategies to reverse the trend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attendance by LEA officers at Annual Review meetings of all centrally funded pupils. None of the SEN support services have capacity to carry out these tasks and would need to be redirected from other priorities</li> <li>- SEN management reference group continue to use MIN guidance rigidly for requests for centrally funded resources</li> </ul>			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
Without the growth the service will be unable to fulfil its statutory duties.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
01/04/2004			
<b>Current Budget £618,300</b>			
Cost Centre number: 343251	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	120.0	132.0	145.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extra post(s) (FTE)			
Signature: ..... Name: Vicky Wibberley			
Date: 16/12/2003			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Statementing – Recoupment		<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G24</b>	
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
Growth required due to increasing demand on budget.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Demand led).			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
2003-04 Projected overspend with current pupils is £93,000. This is due to a continuing fall in the numbers of county pupils attending city mainstream schools, with a rise in the numbers of city pupils attending county schools. Parental preference is the main factor in this trend.			
There is a potential for savings of up to £30,000 if we reduce the support to our pupils in county schools to the same level as that provided by the county. This should also result in a greater incentive for parents to express a preference for city schools, which may lead to greater savings.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Without the growth the service will be unable to fulfil its statutory duties.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004			
<b>Current Budget £595,200</b>			
Cost Centre number: 343250	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	65.0	72.0	79.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extra post(s) (FTE)			
Signature: ..... Name: Vicky Wibberley			
Date: 16/12/2003			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Recoupment - Special			<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G25</b>
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>					
Growth required due to increased demand on the budget.					
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>					
Other (Demand led).					
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>					
<p>Growth requested: £20,000                  2003-04 projected overspend with current pupils is £15,000.                  The number of county pupils attending city special schools continues to fall. There are two reasons for this:                  - County parents tend to prefer county special schools. The funding provided to these schools by the county LEA means that pupils can receive higher levels of individual support than in similar city schools. This also means that parents of city pupils prefer their children to go to county schools.                  - The policy of inclusion means that the county are using their own mainstream schools rather than our special schools.</p>					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
Without the growth the service will be unable to fulfil its statutory duties.					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
01/04/2004					
<b>Current Budget £-1,067,900</b>					
Cost Centre number: 343252	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>		
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	20.0	22.0	24.0		
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Extra post(s) (FTE)					
Signature: ..... Name: Vicky Wibberley					
Date: 16/12/2003					

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Growth Proposal 2004/05

SERVICE AREA	Independent Schools	Proposal No:	G26
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
Growth required due to increased demand on the budget.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Demand led)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
<p>The projected overspend for 2003-04 with current pupil numbers is £22,000. However, there are potentially several additional pupils who may need funding from this budget before the end of the year. Pupil numbers have varied between 37 and 40 since 1997. However, a variation of 3 pupils means a difference in expenditure of £120,000 to £180,000 in any one year. Estimates are based on pupil numbers remaining stable.</p> <p>Pupil numbers vary throughout the year due to movements in and out.</p> <p>The budget is increasingly being used to provide support to pupils who have been excluded from other special schools, and for whom no other viable place can be found. For 2003-04 the cost of these packages is expected to exceed £130,000. The SEN Regional Partnership is working to coordinate the efforts of LEAs to bring pressure on schools to limit fee increases, hence the reducing increases in 2005-06 and 2006-07.</p> <p>The increase in 2002-03 and 2003-04 are partly due to increased school fees; these increases ranged from 3% to 20%.</p> <p>The fees charged by independent schools are continuing to increase in excess of inflation.</p> <p>The education officer- SEN is a member of a national group which is responsible for implementing and monitoring a national contract for independent/ non-maintained schools. Part of the remit of this group is to investigate fee increases and make recommendations back to individual LEAs and the DfES.</p>			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Without the growth the service will be unable to fulfill its statutory duties.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004			
<b>Current Budget £1,605,800</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number: 343233	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	50.0	55.0	60.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extra post(s) (FTE)			
Signature: ..... Name: Vicky Wibberley			
Date: 16/12/2003			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	<b>PRC</b>	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>G27</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>The PRC budget pays for early retirement and redundancy payments for school based staff. Additional funding is needed because the fund is now fully committed.</p>			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (Demand led)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
<p>There will be continued demands on this budget given the current funding position in schools where many schools are reliant on reserves this year may well not be sustainable unless staff leave. Also, any decision to progress a primary or special school review would lead to a demand on PRC.</p>			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
<p>If this funding is not available it would be necessary to either make schools pay for these costs themselves, or to terminate such payments. This would require a renegotiation of conditions of service with the unions.</p>			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1/4/04			
<b>Current Budget £ 614,100</b>			
Cost Centre number: 343071	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	200.0	400.0	600.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
<p>Signature: ..... Name: .....Gill Stacey.....</p> <p>Date: 1<sup>st</sup> November 2003.....</p>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Information Services	<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G28</b>		
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
A change in the charging model will result in increased re-charges. Increased number of supported units in Lifelong Learning Division. Increased charges due to increased server space used.			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other (Corporate Charges)			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
The controllable recharges budget is certain to be subject to an increase. The level of growth is likely to be around 2.1%.			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
This is a central recharge. If growth was not supported, other departments would be affected and we would not receive a full IT service.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £ 736,900</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number: 343546	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	20.0	20.0	20.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	0	0	0
Signature: ..... Name: ...Jen Clarke.....			
Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Insurance	<b>Proposal No:</b> G29		
<b>Details of Proposal:</b> The insurance fund of the authority is currently being reviewed. A 15% increase in the cost of insurance premiums has been predicted as a result of this review.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b> Other (Corporate Charges increases)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b> The Department is responsible for meeting the cost of insurance and therefore any increases in premiums.			
<b>Service Implications:</b> The Department must ensure it has sufficient insurance.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £ 683,500</b> Cost Centre number: 343094 & 343095	<b>2004/05</b> £000s	<b>2005/06</b> £000s	<b>2006/07</b> £000s
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	100.0	200.0	300.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: .....Adrian Paterson..... Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Schools Budgets		<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G30</b>	
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
The City Council are required to passport growth in schools funding to schools budgets. The changes introduced for 2004/05 effectively set a minimum amount of growth from the passport which schools must receive.			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (Passport)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
The Secretary of State has reserve powers to set schools budgets if the LEA fails to meet the necessary passporting requirements.			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Achievement of the Council's key strategic objective of raising standards in schools is addressed by this growth.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1/4/04			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	3,692.8	7,135.6	10,414.5
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: ...David Wilkin.....			
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Schools – Insurance	<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G31</b>		
<b>Details of Proposal:</b>			
<p>New arrangements are being proposed by the Council’s insurers for 28 consortia built schools (essentially 1960’s jerry built). The insurers expect the City Council to co-insure the buidings, which means they are only willing to pay for a proportion of any damage, leaving the Council to meet the balance.</p>			
<b>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</b>			
Other (corporate charges)			
<b>Justification for Proposal:</b>			
<p>The cost of co-insuring must be provided for as the alternate is to risk a liability that could be very large. For example, if a school were destroyed be fire a liability of £2m could result.</p>			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
This cost has to be met to ensure appropriate cover.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1/4/04			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	95.0	95.0	95.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
<p>Signature: ..... Name: ...David Wilkin.....</p> <p>Date: ...1<sup>st</sup> November 2003.....</p>			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Growth Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Special Schools		<b>Proposal No:</b> <b>G32</b>	
<b><u>Details of Proposal:</u></b>			
To fund the moderation for special schools should a proposal to change the funding for special schools to a needs led formula be agreed. This will result in significant changes to school's funding. To limit the impact, 3 year reducing moderation has been proposed.			
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>			
Other			
<b><u>Justification for Proposal:</u></b>			
The moderation is needed to prevent the impact of a fundamental change in funding making schools not viable in 2004/05.			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
The figures shown are worst case scenario and final costs will be known in January 2004 when the pupil count figures has been analysed.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number:	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount of Growth (cumulative)	231.0	154.0	77.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Extra post(s) (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: ..... Name: ...David Wilkin.....			
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003.....			

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Libraries	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R1</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Delete Post: Peoples Network Technician.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Could affect the quality of services to the public due to delays in fixing Public Access PCs, which are out of order			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004.			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number: 341003			
Amount to be Saved	26.0	26.0	26.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	1	1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)	1	1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Patricia Flynn</u>	
Date: <u>29/10/2003</u> .			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R2</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To reduce Community Project Officers by 2 Posts.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
This will lead to a reduction in monitoring and support of Grant aided projects. It will also increase the workload of staff who pick up this work.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2003.			
<b>Current Budget £140,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: Various		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		52.0	52.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		4	4
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		2	2
Current Vacancies (FTE)		1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)		3	3
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R3</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Subject to R8 delete two Community Project Officer posts.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service Reduction,			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
With a reduced grant aided section time is a reduced need for CPO's but if R8 does not happen this has a very high risk with regards to monitoring of projects.			
Only 50% of the saving is realised as the balance will be required for the administration of contracts.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £52,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: Various		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		26.0	26.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		2	2
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		2	2
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning and Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R4</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b> Close St Matthews Sports Hall for Daytime use.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b> Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b> Relocation of services to other sports facilities, existing and being developed.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £15,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: 341143		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		15.0	15.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1	1
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/03.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Libraries		<b>Proposal No:</b> R5	
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Reduced bookfund by £61,000.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General reduction in the number of books bought.</li> <li>would mean cutting a significant number of periodicals and journals from the reference library which would reduced current information sources and specialist sources of information. Likely to cerate complaints and loss of users. Could impact on customer satisfaction levels (CPA PI) and have a negative impact on ability to meet library standards.</li> </ol>			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004.			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount to be Saved	61.0	61.0	61.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Current Vacancies (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Individuals at risk (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: _____		Name: _Pat Flynn_____	
Date: __1 <sup>st</sup> November 2003_____			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Play Sessional Staff		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R6</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
The reduction in central play sessional staffing				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Service Reduction				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
The reduction in central projects supporting play organisations in the city. However, this is a historic resource the relevance of which has declined over time and this support can now be provided in alternative ways.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
None				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004				
<b>Current Budget</b> £ 25,000	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Cost Centre number 341701(part)	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	
Amount to be Saved	25.0	25.0	25.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	1	1	1	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	1	1	1	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: .....Keith Murdoch.				
Date: .....16/12/04.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Youth Services		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R7</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Delete the Youth Sports Grant			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Grants to individual young sports people will be removed. However, these are not a core element of the youth service and do not contribute to targets.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget</b> £ 12,000	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number 341501	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	12.0	12.0	12.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	0	0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0
Signature:..... Name: .....Keith Murdcoh.....			
Date: .....16 <sup>th</sup> December 2003.....			



## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Lifelong Learning & Community Development	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R8</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
The ceasing or tapered reduction of funding for those grant aid projects that are designated non core service specification under the new departmental priorities set out in the Education Strategic Plan.			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>			
Service Reduction			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
The reduction in non core education and lifelong learning services to communities. However, commissioning agreements may be entered into with voluntary projects were they can deliver core services with enhanced value to the community. Some capital receipts and revenue funding can be reinvested			
Where this commissioning is being negotiated it is projected that funding for projects will cease on 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2004 from which date the commissioning agreement will come into effect.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None.			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
Start 01/04/2004 End 01/04/2006.			
<b>Current Budget £3.5 m approx</b>	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number: Various			
Amount to be Saved	1,132.8	1,880.9	2,153.6
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	0	0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0
Signature: _____	Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>		
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R9</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b> Delete General Activities Fund.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b> Service Reduction			
<b>Service Implications:</b> Loss of small grants to Community Organisations.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £31,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		31.0	31.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: 31/10/2003.			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Early Years Service		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R10</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Removal of any Council subsidy for the Workplace Nursery, and redesigning the service so that it can continue to operate but on a self-financing basis.				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Service Reduction				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
The service will continue to operate, but as a self-financing unit.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
None				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
1 <sup>st</sup> July 2004				
<b>Current Budget</b> £118200				
Cost Centre number 341711	<b>2004/05</b> £000s	<b>2005/06</b> £000s	<b>2006/07</b> £000s	
Amount to be Saved	88.6	118.1	118.1	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: .....Keith Murdoch.....				
Date: .....16 <sup>th</sup> December 2003.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Early Years Service		<b>Proposal No:</b>	R11
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
The closure of the Shoppers Playcentre and the transfer of the training service to other, community based, settings.			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>			
Service Reduction			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
The loss of quality city centre based childcare.			
50% of the current budget funds a training programme which supports the qualification of early Years staff which are utilised by the whole service. This training opportunity will be retained and transferred to community based Early Years services.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> July 2004			
<b>Current Budget</b> £ 73,400	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number 341712	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	27.5	36.5	36.5
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	1.5	1.5	1.5
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1.5	1.5	1.5
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)	1.5	1.5	1.5
Signature:..... Name: Keith Murdoch.....			
Date: .....16 <sup>th</sup> December 2004.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Policy & Communications Unit		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R12</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Reduction of one Policy Assistant				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Service Reduction				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
Loss of this post would limit the ability of the Department to reach the corporate target of achieving level 3 of the Equality Standard for Local Government by July 2004. This also is a key objective in the ESP.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
<b>Current Budget £</b>				
Cost Centre number 343063	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount to be Saved	22.0	22.0	22.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>				
	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	1	1	1	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: Jay Hardman.....				
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> December 2003.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Lifelong Learning & Community Development	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R13</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To redesignate and direct resources from Arts and Leisure Young peoples services and the Councils Subsidy of Adult Learning to the Youth Service.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Decisions Already Taken			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
This will bring services to Young People into the youth Work Curriculum improving quality, outputs and outcomes. The Adult Learning Services should be fully supported by LSC and, in line with government recommendations should not be subsidised by the Council.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
Start 01/04/2004 End 31/03/2007.			
<b>Current Budget £10000000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: Various		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		1,000.0	1,000.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)			
Current Vacancies (FTE)			
Individuals at risk (FTE)			
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R14</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To reduce SMT, third tier Managers, by two Posts.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Decisions already taken			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
See Divisional Organisation Review documentation.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/12/2003.			
<b>Current Budget £ 450,000 approx</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number : Various		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		100.0	100.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		9	9
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		2	2
Current Vacancies (FTE)		1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)		8	8
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31 / 10 / 2003</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Libraries		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R15</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Service management restructure at PO level saving one post of Audio – Visual Services Manager.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Reduced Level of specialist input into A / V materials but this can be provided more efficiently and effectively in an alternative way.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: Currently Part of 341020		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		30.0	30.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
			<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1	1
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Patricia Flynn</u>	
Date: <u>29/10/2003.</u>			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R16</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
To delete the post of voluntary sector Grants Officer and merge the duties with the Service Manager - Awards and Grants.			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
The loss of Specialist input to The Divisions Strategic relationship with The Voluntary Sector.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None.			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £ 550,000 (part of)</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: 341901		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		29.0	29.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		2	2
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1	1
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31 / 10 / 2003</u>			

## Education &amp; Lifelong Learning Department

## Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Lifelong Learning & Community Development	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R17</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To convert the post of Communications and Consultation Officer (PO2) To Communications Coordinator (Sc 6)			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Under DOR the consultation role identified in phase 1 of the Youth and Community Review will be carried out in a different way. There will be the loss of Strategic input to Divisional Communication.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £550,000 (part of)</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number: 340901	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	6.0	6.0	6.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	1	1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)	1	1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0
Signature: _____	Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>		
Date: <u>31/10/2003</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R18</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To reduce the number of CLM's by 5			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
This will lead to a reduction in Management Support to Front Line Services and to the quantity of Line Management Support to staff.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number	£000s	£000s	£000s
Amount to be Saved	189.0	189.0	189.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	20	20	20
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	5	5	5
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)	20	20	20
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003</u> .			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R19</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Subject to R8 delete the Grant Aid Assistant and merge duties with Awards and Grants staff.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
With a much reduced Grant and Sector there is no need for a dedicated post for this work but there will be a loss of specialist knowledge ones. If R8 does not happen its risk to Financial scrutiny of projects.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £550,000 (part of)</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: 341901		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		16.0	16.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
			<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1	1
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Lifelong Learning & Community Development	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R20</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
To delete the post of Divisional Accountant.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Reduction in the Accountancy and Finance Support to the division.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
<b>Current Budget £550,000 part of)</b>	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number: 341901			
Amount to be Saved	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	1	1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)	1	1	1
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R21</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
The temporary REMQ implementation post end in September 2004. So costs are not required.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
None – Other than recourses cannot be redirect to services.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
September 2004			
<b>Current Budget £8,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: 341901		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		5.0	8.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
			<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning – Adult		<b>Proposal No:</b> R22	
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b> Reduce care in the community by £5000			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b> Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b> None			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £41,5000</b> Cost Centre number: 341601	<b>2004/05</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2006/07</b> <b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Current Vacancies (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Individuals at risk (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: _____		Name: <u>T. A. Ward</u>	
Date: <u>29/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning – Adult		<b>Proposal No:</b> R23	
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b> Reduce Training Budget by £5000			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b> Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b> Will need to take money for consultation (FE funding stream) to meet shortfall.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b> N/A			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b> 01/04/2004.			
<b>Current Budget £73,8000</b> Cost Centre number: 341601 (A820)	<b>2004/05</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2006/07</b> <b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Current Vacancies (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Individuals at risk (FTE)	N/a	N/a	N/a
Signature: _____		Name: <u>T.A. Ward</u>	
Date: <u>29/10/2003.</u>			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b>	Lifelong Learning & Community Development	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R24</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
The review of Premises within Lifelong Learning and Community Development			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency/Restructuring			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Free standing facilities are located on a historical basis, often near to other Divisional, Departmental and Corporate facilities. In addition new initiatives, such as extended schools, need to be considered by the department. The review will therefore look to develop a pattern of settings that meet the modern agenda releasing capital receipts and revenue for reinvestment as well as contributing to the cuts target.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
Start 01/04/2004 End 01/04/2006.			
<b>Current Budget £2.0 m approx</b>			
Cost Centre number: Various	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	112.5	503.5	638.5
<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)	50	50	50
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	6	26	28.5
Current Vacancies (FTE)	variable	variable	variable
Individuals at risk (FTE)	50	50	50
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Information Services		<b>Proposal No:</b>	R25
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Re-structure the ICT technical Support Service				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Efficiency/Restructuring				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
No impact as technical support requirements have been significantly reduced due to improved central support and strengthening in other areas of the team				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
<b>Current Budget £</b>				
Cost Centre number	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount to be Saved	10.0	10.0	10.0	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>				
	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	10	10	10	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: Jen Clarke.....				
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> December 2003.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Free school meals	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R26</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Restructuring of free school meals assessment service			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Efficiency			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
At present the Free School Meals Assessment Service has a dedicated establishment of 2.0 FTE officers. One of these posts is currently vacant and it is envisaged that this assessment work could be undertaken within a refocused client services team			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number	343090		
	Amount to be Saved	16.0	16.0
			16.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		2	2
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature:..... Name: ...Trevor Pringle.....			
Date: ...1 <sup>st</sup> December 2003.....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA:</b> Lifelong Learning & Community Development		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R27</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Divisional Organisations Review to be completed by September 2004. So management costs not required.			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Other			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
None – Other than inability to redirect Resources to services.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None.			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
<b>Current Budget £60,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number: 341903		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved		30.0	60.0
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		1	1
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		1	1
Current Vacancies (FTE)		1	1
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature: _____		Name: <u>Keith Murdoch</u>	
Date: <u>31/10/2003.</u>			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Special transport	<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R28</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
<p>To change the Transport eligibility criteria.                  At LGR the City inherited a policy of providing transport to all pupils with statements. Although this has since changed, roughly 850 children with statements still receive transport out of a total of 2,000 children with statements overall. Many of these pupils have no significant physical disabilities. This is somewhat at odds with the philosophy of inclusion where, if educational input is successful, then children become increasingly independent. If the criteria for allowing transport were applied to ALL pupils regardless of statement (but with consideration of those who had clear medical/physical difficulties) this number could be reduced by at least 100 (for example, by discontinuing transport for all secondary-age pupils with MLD attending a school under the statutory distance except those with exceptional other difficulties)</p>			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>			
Policy Options			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
<p>This would be very unpopular particularly in the case of families where having to accompany their children to school or make their own arrangements would cause hardship.                  If the change were introduced at the start of 2004/5 for all children some would have transport withdrawn. New starters who previously might have had transport would not get it.                  This would also put greater pressure on existing staff who have to deal with complaints from parents expecting that they should get transport and therefore the service may require some temporary augmentation for the first year of operation.                  Savings in the first year would be only 2/3rds of the annual estimate because the new policy could not start until the second term of the financial year.</p>			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
Fewer vehicles on the road at peak times.			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
2004/5 academic year			
<b>Current Budget £</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Amount to be Saved	34.0	109.0	159.0
<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	No change	No change	No change
Current Vacancies (FTE)			
Individuals at risk (FTE)			
Signature:..... Name: .....			
Date: .....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R29</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Reduced expenditure on furniture throughout the Department			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service efficiency			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Curtailment of planned replacement programme.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number:	343101		
	Amount to be Saved	39.0	39.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature:..... Name: .....			
Date: .....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Planning & Property		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R30</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>				
Reduce buildings maintenance at Education premises.				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>				
Service efficiency				
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>				
Re-phase works required over a longer period				
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>				
None				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>				
April 2004				
<b>Current Budget £</b>				
Cost Centre number: 343106	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount to be Saved	10.0	10.0	10.0	
<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)	0	0	0	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	0	0	0	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	0	0	0	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: .....				
Date: .....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R31</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Reduction of expenditure on consumables throughout the Department			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service efficiency			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number:	343100		
	Amount to be Saved	10.0	10.0
	<b>Staffing Implications</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature:..... Name: .....			
Date: .....			



Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R32</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>			
Reduction of print related expenditure throughout the Department			
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>			
Service efficiency			
<b>Service Implications:</b>			
Greater use to be made of electronic media and intranet/ internet technologies, less printed publications for schools etc.			
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>			
None			
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>			
April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>
Cost Centre number:	343096		
	Amount to be Saved	10.0	10.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0
Signature:..... Name: .....			
Date: .....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R33</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>			
Reduction in governor recruitment/ translation materials budget			
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>			
Service Reduction			
<b><u>Service Implications:</u></b>			
Reduced ability to recruit, support and retain ethnic minority governors and increased exposure to adverse OFSTED inspection judgements.			
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>			
None			
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>			
April 2004			
<b>Current Budget £ 10,000</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
Cost Centre number:	343091	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
	Amount to be Saved	7.0	7.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
		<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		N/A	N/A
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		N/A	N/A
Current Vacancies (FTE)		N/A	N/A
Individuals at risk (FTE)		N/A	N/A
Signature:..... Name: .....			
Date: .....			

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Standards & Effectiveness		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R34</b>
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>				
To set an income target of £35,000 for the Division.				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</u></b>				
Service Reduction				
<b><u>Service Implications :</u></b>				
Where income has been generated in the Division it has been used by the Department to manage the overall budget. Time spent generating income means less time for school improvement work in the City. There is a direct, positive relationship between pupil performance and support from the Division. The income results from engagement in Ofsted inspections across the country, and selling services. Ofsted inspections will generate less income because of the smaller profit now possible as the result of the LEA having to change contractors because the original contractor has ceased to trade.				
<b><u>Environmental Implications:</u></b>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</u></b>				
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
	Amount to be Saved	35.0	35.0	35.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0	0
Signature:..... Name: .....				
Date: .....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Planning and Property		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R35</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Transfer responsibility for vacant and tenanted property to an existing Development Officer.				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Service Reduction				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
<p>This is essential work that would have to be carried out 'in-house' by development officers. The team has been re-scoped and staffed to address a significantly increased capital programme - £1m at Unitary status to £20m in 2003/04, plus a substantial sum of devolved school funding.</p> <p>This requires considerable advice and support to schools and programme management. This support to schools would have to be reduced with the risk of not securing joined up funding between the LEA and schools.</p>				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
None				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
April 04				
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
	Amount to be Saved	22.0	22.0	22.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		0	0	0
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		0	0	0
Current Vacancies (FTE)		0	0	0
Individuals at risk (FTE)		0	0	0
Signature:..... Name: J A Garratt				
Date: .....1.12.03.....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Finance			<b>Proposal No:</b>	R36
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>					
Review Education Finance to achieve a more efficient service and make staff cost savings.					
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>					
Service Reduction					
<b>Service Implications:</b>					
<p>The financial support to schools would be severely reduced. The impact would be a 25% reduction in the level of support for schools at a time when there are significant changes to school funding and so the demand for support is increasing. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools facing financial difficulties due to under funding by the Government in 2003/04, falling rolls across the city and use of reserves in 2003/04;</li> <li>LMS Funding Formula review needed to address issues around small schools;</li> <li>Support for school amalgamations, transforming schools agenda and the Schools Forum.</li> </ul> <p>A review of the way schools are supported by Finance is being undertaken in consultation with schools. This will lead to a modernised and more efficient service. To achieve cultural and organisational change of this order and without causing unnecessary impact on schools will take some time and as a result savings from it may be possible in 2005/06 as opposed to 2004/05.</p>					
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>					
None					
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2004					
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Cost Centre number					
	Amount to be Saved	0.0	25.0	25.0	
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		21.5	21.5	21.5	
Post(s) deleted (FTE)					
Current Vacancies (FTE)		1	1	1	
Individuals at risk (FTE)		20.5	20.5	20.5	
Signature:..... Name: David Wilkin.....					
Date: .....					

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Pupil & Student Support		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R37</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Phased review of staffing levels in the Pupil & Student Support Division.				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Efficiency				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
Subject to the review.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
<b>Current Budget £</b>		<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Cost Centre number		<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
	Amount to be Saved	0.0	150.0	200.0
	<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)				
Current Vacancies (FTE)				
Individuals at risk (FTE)				
Signature:..... Name: .....				
Date: .....				

Education & Lifelong Learning Department

Reduction Proposal 2004/05

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>	Policy & Communications Unit		<b>Proposal No:</b>	<b>R38</b>
<b>Details of Proposed Reduction:</b>				
Reduction of one Policy Officer				
<b>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate):</b>				
Service Reduction				
<b>Service Implications:</b>				
This post supports the formulation and development of policies and projects in inclusive education and the broader area of social inclusion.				
Loss of this post, only recently secured through a growth bid, would be undesirable given the Council's commitment to establishing a federation of children's services (Children's Trust) and the cost of implementing proposals arising from the Green Paper: Every Child Matters (see Cabinet report of 24/11/03). There would also be no capacity for the Department to respond to this key development.				
<b>Environmental Implications:</b>				
<b>Date of earliest implication/date of proposed implication:</b>				
<b>Current Budget £</b>				
Cost Centre number 343063	<b>2004/05 £000s</b>	<b>2005/06 £000s</b>	<b>2006/07 £000s</b>	
Amount to be Saved	0.0	34.0	34.0	
<b><u>Staffing Implications</u></b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)	1	1	1	
Current Vacancies (FTE)	1	1	1	
Individuals at risk (FTE)	0	0	0	
Signature:..... Name: .....				
Date: .....				

## **Lifelong Learning Reductions Strategy**

1.1 The Education Strategic Plan prioritises Divisional Targets as set out in the Strategic Community Learning Plan. These are as follows:

1. Raising standards in schools
2. Early years education
3. The Youth Service

1.2 Officers in the Division have identified four strands to the budget strategy

1. Service and infrastructure remodelling, with reference to the Divisional Organisational Review.
2. Review of the Grant Aided Sector
3. Review of premises
4. Service reductions in priority areas

## **2. Service and infrastructure remodelling**

### Detail

2.1 A new management structure and operational framework for the Division has been identified through the Divisional Organisational Review focusing upon Adult, Early Years, Youth and Community Services. The Review examined the management, operation and historic commitments of the division with the objective of redirecting resources to priority front line services.

2.2 This redirection has now been allocated to the savings target and is identified as proposals in the detailed list.

### Implications

2.3 Whilst the proposed reductions reflect the needs of the service to modernise and be fit for purpose as identified in the Divisional Organisational Review the decision not to release the identified resources for front line priority services will undermine the ability of the Division, through reorganisation, to enhance the quality and quantity of service, and meet priority targets.

## **3. Review of the Grant Aid Sector**

### Detail

3.1 The Education Department has undertaken an exercise to identify core services in relation to grant aided projects in line with the corporate budget strategy. In the Lifelong Learning & Community Development Division those are identified in the Education Strategic Plan as Adult Learning, Early Years and Youth Service. Projects were identified as core if they directly contribute to the targets of those services. Some projects may not do this but where they could contribute in the future contracts will be extended for 5 months to explore the possibility of commissioning in line with the



preference to provide services through the voluntary sector where there is a benefit in doing so.

- 3.2 With the introduction of the refined Departmental priorities in the Education Strategic Plan the categorisation of Grant Aid Projects was revisited. This process identified those Projects that supported Departmental priorities and targets as Core service specification and those that did not as Non-core service specification, a full list is attached in Appendix 1. This latter group was identified as being liable to funding reductions.
- 3.3 In addition the way that the Division is monitored nationally, particularly in the Youth Service, means that outputs and outcomes secured through Grant Aid cannot be included in our returns. The Division will therefore need to move from Grant Aid to the commissioning of services.
- 3.4 It is proposed that funding to all Non core service specification Projects is withdrawn on a tapered basis on either 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 or 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004.
- 3.5 However, it needs to be noted that through the building up of the front line structures in the third stage of the Divisional Organisational Review the voluntary sector may be identified as the most appropriate way of providing certain services from within remaining service budgets. In this case commissioning agreements will need to be drawn up with some of these projects and the timetabling identified above will need to be carefully managed to ensure that a project that is needed for the commissioning of services is not put at risk by this tapering.
- 3.6 There will also be a need to alter the existing Grant Aid Contracts of Core service specification projects in line with the need to commission service and reflect the changed voluntary sector environment.
- 3.7 In addition the requirement for dedicated officers to monitor and administer the grant aid relationship is removed.

#### Implications

- 3.8 It should be noted that although the withdrawal of funding would be completed by the beginning of the second year of this strategy the redirection of the savings to the reductions target is staged over the three years. This will enable enhancement of the capital stock, which is often old, rundown and less than ideal for current requirements, of core service specification projects and those projects that are commissioned to deliver services for the Division

#### **4. Premises Review**

##### Detail

- 4.1 Much of the Division's capital stock is old, unsuitable for its modern purpose and in the wrong local location.

- 4.2 The introduction of the government's Extended Schools Initiative has altered the service provision landscape for Lifelong Learning and Community Development Services.
- 4.3 The addition of the Libraries Service to the Division has opened up opportunities for the co-location of services especially for the Adult Learning Service.
- 4.4 The Division is therefore reviewing the premises that services operate from with the view to introducing a Local Learning Network based on key centres and satellites, taking advantage of extended schools where possible.
- 4.5 Key Centres will be the focus for a particular service in an area and will be the location for the curriculum lead in the area. Whilst a centre may be key for more than one service this is not a requirement. For example, a particular building could be the Key Centre for the Adult Learning Service, a satellite for the Early Years Service and have no youth or community services delivered at that location.
- 4.6 In addition, City Centre New Adult Learning/Library provision.

## Race Relations Act - Risk Assessment

Ref	Reduction	Core or Non-core service	High / medium / low risk of adverse impact on racial groups?
R1	Delete 1 fte Technician	Non –core	N/a
R2	Reduce 2 fte Community Project Officer	Non –core	N/a
R3	Reduce 2 fte Community Project Officer	Non –core	N/a
R4	Day closure of St Matthews Sports Ctre	Non –core	N/a
R5	Reduce Book Fund	Non –core	N/a
R6	Reduce Play sessional staffing	Non –core	N/a
R7	Delete Sport Grant	Non –core	N/a
R8	Grant Aided Projects	Non –core	N/a
R9	Delete general activities fund	Non –core	N/a
R10	Workplace Nursery – removal of subsidy	Non –core	N/a
R11	Shoppers Playcentre	Non –core	N/a
R12	Delete Policy Assistant post	Non –core	N/a
R34	SED income generation	Non –core	N/a
R35	Vacant properties management	Core	Low
R36	Education Finance Review	Core	Low
R37	Pupil & Student Support Review	Core	Low
R38	Policy Officer	Non –core	N/a
R13	Youth Service £100/head increase	Non –core	N/a
R14	Reduce Senior Management by 2 posts	Non –core	N/a
R15	Delete 1 fte AV Manager	Non –core	N/a
R16	Delete Voluntary Sector Grants Officer	Non –core	N/a
R17	Convert Communications post to Sc 6	Non –core	N/a
R18	Reduce 5 fte Community Learning Mgr	Non –core	N/a
R19	Delete Grant Aid Assistant	Non –core	N/a
R20	Delete Divisional Accountant	Non –core	N/a
R21	Delete REMQ Implementation post	Non –core	N/a
R22	Reduce Care in the Community Fund	Non –core	N/a
R23	Reduce training budget	Non –core	N/a
R24	Premises Review	Non –core	N/a
R25	Technical support restructure	Non –core	N/a
R26	Free school meals support	Non-Core	N/a
R28	SEN Transport	Core	Low
R29	Furniture & equipment	Non –core	N/a
R30	Buildings maintenance	Non –core	N/a
R31	Stationery	Non –core	N/a
R32	Printing	Non –core	N/a
R33	Governor recruitment support	Non –core	N/a
R27	Management costs from Review	Non –core	N/a

## Education and Lifelong Learning DRS Summary of Consultation with Voluntary Section on Budget Proposals

Following the publication of the draft Budget Strategy on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2004 Grant Aid Projects were given the opportunity to respond to by 3<sup>rd</sup> February. The proposals were based upon an identification of whether the specification included within each project's Grant Aid Contract provided core services for the Department, i.e. whether the outputs of the project were included in the targets set out in the Adult Learning Plan, Early Years and Childcare Development Plan, the Education Development Plan, the Library Plan or the Youth Strategy. There was also consideration of whether there were any other material considerations that outweighed the fact that the specification did not provide core services. The feedback falls into 2 broad areas as follows: -

- **Projects making a case that they do provide core services**

In the main this is set against the Adult Learning Plan, the Early Years and Childcare Development Plan and/or the Youth Strategy

### Adult Learning Plan

Groups have identified that they do support Adult Learning however this is often provided by an agency other than the LEA, i.e. Leicester College, and the infrastructure costs should be met by this agency rather than a Council subsidy through the Grant Aid Contract. In addition groups claim that they are providing complementary or supporting services to adults but this again does not form part of the Adult Learning Plan of the LEA and so is not considered core service.

### Youth

Groups have identified that they work with young people however this is not part of the service identified within the Youth Strategy and the quality is not driven through a purchase of service agreement that would enable it to be included. It should be noted that where groups exclusively or mainly work with young people a 5 month extension to funding has been proposed to provide the opportunity to explore developing a purchase of service agreement that would allow the project to contribute to the Youth Strategy and hence continue to receive some funding. For projects where youth activities are only part of the funding this is not proposed because any subsequent purchase of service would be a small proportion of the overall funding and not secure the future viability of the project.

Adventure Playgrounds, defined in the widest sense, have pointed out that they carry out very similar work to the youth service but with an age range that is not covered by the Departments' Plans. The current review of the Lifelong Learning and Community Development Division recognises this and a Junior Youth Service has therefore been created to link Early Years and Youth Services. In the same way as dedicated youth projects a five month extension to the Grant Aid Contract has been proposed to explore developing a purchase of service agreement that would allow some of these projects to contribute to the Youth Strategy and hence enable them to continue to receive some funding.

## Early Years

Projects have again identified that they work with children in support, and sometimes within the targets, of the Early Years and Childcare Development Plan and that grant aid supports the infrastructure for this. As with the generalist projects delivering youth activities any continuation of this element of the grant aid would not generally secure the long-term viability of the project. However officers from the Lifelong Learning and Community Development Division will work with projects to facilitate the relocation of such services and, where appropriate, the funding of infrastructure from within existing Early Years budgets that may enable them to remain at their current location.

The one exception is the Belgrave Playgroup where the examination of their response has expanded on the detail contained in the grant Aid Contract and the proposal to remove their funding has been withdrawn.

- **That there are other material considerations that outweigh the fact that services are not core.**

These fall into two main categories: -

### **The securing of services from external sources**

Whilst many projects have secured other resources to run services in the main these are not core to the Department, as set out above, and so Grant Aid should not be used to provide the infrastructure and indeed in many cases the Council has not agreed to the use of Grant Aid as match funding. In addition these services are on the whole not Project specific i.e. the funding agency would look to continue supporting the work in that area in a different way and through a different agency.

The one exception to this is the Belgrave Baheno and their development of the Peepul Centre. They have requested a three-year extension to funding to enable the transition to the new service. This significant, £15m, regeneration initiative is Project Specific and could be lost if the funding for Belgrave Baheno is withdrawn.

### **The Contribution to Community Cohesion.**

It is recognised that the voluntary and community sectors have played a valuable role in developing community cohesion in the city through the services they provide to particular sections of the community.

However, the specific services provided by the projects are not core to delivering community cohesion within the context of the overall resources available to the Council and that focusing declining resources elsewhere will have a greater impact in the long term on community cohesion in the city.

Recent research and consultation has also shown that different approaches to community cohesion are required which will be developed and outlined through the new community cohesion strategy which enhances inclusion rather than supports different communities living parallel lives.

Should as a result of the consultation Members take a different view on the definition of core service they have an opportunity to address this in the final budget.

At this time in addition to the formal letter in response to the Corporate Directors letter of the 6<sup>th</sup> January 2004 the following letters, petition letters and petitions have been received in support of the grant aid projects and seeking reinstatement of the cut.

NAME OF ORGANISATION	LETTERS	PETITION LETTERS	PETITION SIGNATURES
Allextion	0	0	0
Bangladesh Youth & Cultural Shomiti	0	0	270
Belgrave Baheno	1	0	0
Bhagini	0	0	0
Braunstone Adventure Playground	16	0	0
Ek Awaaj	1	0	0
Gilmorton Junior Youth Club	0	0	0
Girlguiding	0	0	0
Highfields Adventure Playground	16	0	0
Lame Duck	0	0	0
New Parks Adventure Playground	29	0	200
New Parks Playgroup	0	0	0
Northfields Adventure Playground	72	0	0
Pakistan Youth & Community Association	2	66	520
Shama Womens Centre	600	0	1850
Shree Sanatan Community Centre	0	0	0
Shree Sanatan Mandir	15	0	75
Sikh Community Centre	0	0	0
St Albans	0	0	330
St Andrews Play Association	12	0	0
St Gabriels	1	0	870
St Matthews CAG	19	0	0
St Peters	0	0	215
Vietnamese Community Centre	0	0	0
Wakerley	0	0	0
WEA	0	0	0
Wesley Hall	283	0	1120
Woodgate Adventure Playground	35	0	0

## Education & Lifelong Learning Department Budget Consultation 2004/05

Summary of consultation response	Officer response
<p><b>Schools Consultation</b> 15 out of 113 schools responded to the budget consultation. In total, schools supported all the growth and reductions proposals.</p> <p><b>Schools Forum</b> The Forum are meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February to consider the schools consultation responses.</p> <p><b>Admin &amp; Governor Services Team and Michael Jeeves, Team Leader, Traffic Impact.</b> Concern expressed about the proposal to delegate School Crossings Patrol Management to schools (R33), especially in the area of lost economies of scale, cost efficiency of advertising and implementing the Safer Routes to School agenda.</p> <p><b>Policy &amp; Communications Unit</b> Acknowledgement for the need for reductions, but concern that reviews need to be more focused and should limit the impact for staff not affected by the review.</p> <p><b>Education Welfare Service</b> General concern expressed at reductions to the voluntary sector.</p> <p><b>Lifelong Learning &amp; Community Development Division</b> Would the number of Community Project Officers be varied if changes were made to the voluntary sector proposals?</p> <p><b>Workplace Nursery</b> A number of responses were received from City Council employees who use the nursery for child care provision. The principal point made related to the council commitment to equality of opportunity of employment and the provision of child care as a factor of recruitment and retention of staff.</p>	<p>Detailed consideration of the results will be carried out by Schools Forum on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2004.</p> <p>To be provided after 12<sup>th</sup> February 2004.</p> <p>This reduction proposal has been withdrawn from the Departmental Revenue Strategy as further analysis has shown that implementation would lead to a less efficient service. The Department's reductions target will still be achieved by reducing the contingency within the strategy for redundancy and unforeseen costs.</p> <p>No specific points raised. No changes to the Departmental Revenue Strategy are recommended.</p> <p>No specific points raised. No changes to the Departmental Revenue Strategy are recommended.</p> <p>This would have to be reviewed if changes are made to the current budget proposals.</p> <p>A revised business plan, changes to the organisational structure and maximisation of the flexibility within taxation rules have been used to produce a self-financing function. This does not affect achieving the savings reduction in the Departmental Revenue Strategy.</p>