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**Benchmark Data for Financial Year 2019-20**

**Comparators used to select comparison schools**

The benchmark was created using the following criteria:

* Maintained Primary Schools
* Pupil Numbers within range 431-588 (CTPS 505)
* Type of school – Urban and city
* Percentage of pupils with FSM in range 1.15-7.15 (CTPS 4.1%)
* SEND in range 0-3.8% (CTPS 0.8%)
* EAL in range 10.5-16.5% (CTPS 13.5%)

This gave a total of 15 schools for the comparison data.

A comparison has also been made with similar sized Bracknell Forest primary schools to examine whether any differences in the benchmarking could be due to local costs/authority specific spends/expenditure allocations. This generated 11 schools within the LA for comparison.

**Benchmarking Data**

The Governments schools financial benchmarking website was used and pdf reports downloaded covering total expenditure; staff; premises’ occupation; supplies and service and Income. Please see attached reports showing expenditure as an amount per pupil.

This report looks at any areas identified within these reports where the school either spent at the top or bottom end of the benchmarked data and identifies the reason or actions required.

The reports show the total for an area followed by the sub-divisions within that area as follows:

Total Expenditure

* Staff Total
* Premises Total
* Occupation Total
* Supplies and Services
* Cost of Finance
* Community Expenditure
* Special Facilities Total

Staff Total

* Teaching Staff
* Supply Staff
* Education Support Staff
* Administrative Staff
* Other Staff Costs e.g Triaining

Premises Total

* Premises Staff
* Cleaning and caretaking
* Maintenance and Improvement

Occupation Total

* Energy
* Water and Sewerage
* Rates
* Other Occupation Costs
* Other Insurance Premiums
* Catering Expenditure

Supplies and Services Total

* Administrative Supplies
* Educational Supplies
* Brought in Professional Services

Total Income

* Grant Funding Total – Main Budget, High Needs, EYFS, PP, PE and UIFSM Grants
* Self-Generated Funding Total

**STAFF COSTS**

The total staff costs are in the middle of the group with the supply costs and other staff costs being towards the top of the schools and the education support staff being at the lower end of the costs.

**Teaching Staff and Supply Costs**

The teaching staff costs are in the middle compared to the selected schools with supply staff costs being at the higher end.

Regular supply staff were used to work alongside part time staff in school to teach two classes from April 2019 until July 2019. These costs are therefore included within the supply costs and not within the teacher costs, thereby increasing the supply costs in comparison to the other schools. As this amount is small relative to the total teaching costs (approx. £25 - £30 per pupil) the effect on the overall teaching costs is small and the increased amount is still in-line with the other schools. The supply costs also includes funds de-delegated to BF to allow them to cover maternity leave centrally rather than schools having to find the maternity pay costs as required, it works as a form of insurance. Schools in other authorities may not do this and therefore their supply costs would be lower but their teacher costs could increase if they had any staff on maternity leave. When comparing supply costs with other BF schools our costs are nearer the middle of the range of values with a higher percentage of the schools within the range £100-£250.

It is also possible that other schools cover PPA and other costs in school with contracted staff rather than using supply.

**Education Support Staff**

The schools support staff costs are low compared to the schools in the chosen comparator listing. When comparing our school with only BF schools the support staff costs are still low. This probably reflects the use of support staff to cover classes. Many schools employ higher level teaching assistants to cover classes rather than using supply. During 2019/20 we covered absences and the majority of PPA with supply rather than in-house, therefore our support staff costs are lower. This is an area the school could look at in the future if required in terms of using HLTAs or other support staff rather than supply.

**Other Staff Costs**

The benchmark data shows the schools costs are towards the top end in comparison to other schools although when compared to LA schools our costs are in the middle. Other staff costs include indirect employee expenses, training and staff related insurance. From the benchmarking data we can see that staff related insurance is zero for many of the benchmarked schools indicating that these costs are allocated against a different area for these schools and thereby lowering their other staff costs. We can also see that our training costs are the fourth highest making our total cost higher, however this was planned and included £1270 payment for SENCO course at Reading University and shows the schools commitment to staff development.

**PREMISES TOTAL**

The premises total is in the top half of the schools but similar to the majority of the middle section of schools. Compared to other Bracknell Forest schools the premises total costs is the highest and is due to higher cleaning and caretaking costs and maintenance costs as discussed below.

**Premises Staff and Cleaning and Caretaking Costs.**

Taken alone the premises staff and the cleaning and caretaking costs are difficult to compare as some schools employ their own cleaners and these costs would show under premises staff whereas for our school with a cleaning contractor the costs are all shown under the cleaning costs. Adding the two costs together places our school in the middle of the selection with the range going from 111 to 213. In comparison to BF schools when adding both costs together the schools total costs are still at the top end of the costs but similar in value to the majority of the schools with the range going from 80 to 184. (Our school total is 161) The cleaning contract with Bracknell Forest is due to end this year and they are currently starting the re-tender process.

**Maintenance and Improvement**

This area includes the maintenance and repair budget and the grounds maintenance budget. The schools maintenance expenditure was in the top section compared to other schools and the highest cost within BF schools, hence the high total premises costs. The high expenditure was planned. The school continues to invest in the upkeep of the school building and grounds and carry out items on the condition survey as required, not all schools invest as much in this area. In 2019-20 as well as general maintenance and repairs the school carried out the following:

* Corridor and Classroom Flooring- £2775
* Redo KS2 hall floor and ball court lines (as per condition survey) - £6050
* New Signs - £820
* Guinea pig and Rabbit Fencing and enclosure - £2289
* Flooring – KS1/2 kitchens, environment, year 4 corridor - £7649
* Gazebo Roof replacement - £1654
* All electrics from 5 year full electrical survey - £3200
* Conversion of small office to therapy room - £2325
* Installation of 10 TMVs (condition survey) - £1200
* Redecoration of year 5 and 6 corridors and doors - £4630
* New wooden built recycle bins - £2880

**OCCUPATION TOTAL**

The occupation total costs are in the middle of the selection and BF schools selection. However the energy, water and sewerage and catering costs are in the top half of the selection.

**Energy**

The energy cost is the third highest against both the comparator schools and the BF schools although the actual cost is similar to half of the schools. The basic costs for all BF schools will be the same as all schools buy into the councils contract to supply energy. This implies that the schools energy usage is higher than other schools. This could be due to the age of the school but it would be useful to look at our current heating settings and ensure they are correct and as required for the schools use. The schools oil boiler in KS2 is also old and the council did mention its age whilst carrying out the last Display Energy Certificate report. This may need to be looked at in the future. The council are currently looking at school boilers and energy use and have replaced some schools boilers recently. The new DEC also indicates that the KS1 building energy rating is lower than average at 110-E when 100-D is average. The KS2 building energy rating is 81-D which would imply the current oil boiler is more efficient than the gas boiler in KS1.

**Water and Sewerage**

The schools water and sewerage costs are at the top end of the range even against BF schools who are all with the same supply. This shows the schools water consumption is higher than the majority of the schools, but not that high that it would imply any leakage. Need to look at water usage and prevent wastage. This will be difficult to assess during Covid but moving forward the school needs to find ways to reduce water consumption.

 **Other Occupation Costs**

The schools spend is the lowest of all the schools. There is a distinct difference between the bottom half of the schools all spending relatively small amounts and the top half when the spend increases significantly. There are obviously some distinct differences between the schools that we have no knowledge about.

Comparing our school against other BF schools our costs are very similar.

**Other Insurance Premiums**

The schools insurance premiums are low. Compared to other schools the cost is in the lower half which shows the premium cost charged through the BF SLA are good value. In terms of comparison with BF schools our lower premium costs will be related to the staff premium insurance, these are kept low by taking a 5 day excess period and only insuring a low number of support staff. Based on eth costs of absent staff to the school the insurance we take out has been good and covered all our expenses over the years so the balance between premiums and insurance level is good.

**Catering Expenditure**

The catering expenditure includes catering staff and supplies. Most schools do not have any catering expenditure as most schools hire catering companies. Our catering expenditure was high in 2019/20 because of the purchase of a new oven. The LA paid for half and the school paid for the other half £4000. The schools normal expenditure is low.

**SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TOTAL**

The total supplies and services cost are in the middle of the selection and very similar in amount to the middle four schools of both the comparator schools and BF schools. Similarly, the administrative supplies are in the middle of the selections and the educational supplies are in the middle of the comparator schools but nearer the top of eth BF schools although consistent in cost with the majority of the schools. The school is towards the top of the bought in professional services but again the actual value is similar to the majority of the schools. Comparison of the supplies and services shows the school is very much in-line with other schools.

**INCOME**

The total income is towards the top of the selected schools but all the incomes are similar in total value, similarly for the grant income. However the school has the lowest school generated income. This is a deliberate policy as the school does not hire out the facilities for profit and to date the after school club has been run by an external organisation so the only school generated income is from the before school club. The school is looking into running an after school club and if further income was required there are obviously areas where the school could generate more income, but it is not currently required.

**SUMMARY**

The schools expenditure compares well to other schools in most areas.

The benchmarking has highlighted the main areas of expenditure that need to be reviewed and monitored are energy and water consumption. Need to examine why consumption is higher than other schools and whether there are any ways to reduce consumption.