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**Self-Assessment Dashboard**

The self-assessment dashboard can now be found on the government schools financial benchmarking website, where it was previously a tab as part of the SFVS report.

The dashboard shows the data for 2020-21, taken from the schools CFR report and the schools November 2020 Workforce Census.

See attached document from the website showing the assessment.

All items are either broadly in line with similar schools and some are also in the middle 20% of similar schools. The only area that is not within these criteria is the average teacher cost which shows the school was in the lower 20% of similar schools.

On reviewing the teacher profile for the financial year 2020/21, there were several teachers on maternity leave over this time. The number of teachers in the school during this time was taken from the schools November 2020 School Workforce Census and shows 22.9 FTE. This includes the teachers on maternity leave, however Bracknell forest pay maternity leave costs rather than the school. Other schools in other authorities will be paying their own maternity leave costs, therefore for a direct comparison the teacher costs need to be increased by the cost of the four members of staff on maternity leave during 2020/21. These costs total £61753.

Adding this onto the teaching costs and dividing by the number of teachers gives the schools actual average teacher cost for 2020/21 as £50783. Looking at the dashboard this would put us in the section identified as broadly in line with similar schools.

**Benchmark Data for Financial Year 2020-21**

**Comparators used to select comparison schools**

The benchmark was created using the following criteria:

* Maintained Primary Schools
* Pupil Numbers within range 411-527 (CTPS 497)
* Type of school – Urban and city
* Percentage of pupils with FSM in range 2.3-8.3% (CTPS 5.3%)
* SEND in range 0-3.8% (CTPS 0.8%)
* EAL in range 12.7-18.7% (CTPS 15.7%)

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 12 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 Training

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 lower half compared to the selected schools with supply staff costs being at the higher end and similarly in comparison to other LA schools.

Examining the staffing profile for April 2020 to March 2021 shows that from Sept 2020 there was a reduction in SLT costs with the resignation of one Assistant Head with this position not being replaced in the SLT structure and a second Assistant Head going on maternity leave. The maternity leave costs are paid direct by Bracknell so do not appear in the teacher costs. Other schools will be funding any maternity costs themselves which will increase their cost per pupil. The teacher on maternity leave was the Nursery Lead and it was decided to cover this position by using a teacher in school to oversee the nursery and have an HLTA to do the day to day running of the provision, again reducing teacher costs. The staffing profile grade for the year was low with 3 NQTS on the staff April to August and two staying on into the next school year at grade 2 and three new NQTs starting in Sept 2020.

Additionally, the nursery and FS2 classes were full from Sept 2020 giving a lower teacher costs per pupil which will have impacted the overall costs.

The SLT structure was reviewed in 2020 when the Assistant Head left and again when the second Assistant Head went on maternity leave and was therefore a planned change to reduce the SLT costs, however additional TLR roles have been created to develop staff but this does not impact as much on the overall teaching costs.

**Education Support Staff**

The schools support staff costs are in the middle compared to the schools in the chosen comparator listing and higher in comparison than in previous years. In 2020/21 more use was made of HLTAs and support staff for supply cover, covering long absences such as in Nursery, additional support in FS2 and across the school from Sept 2020 to aid Covid recovery. However in comparison to other LA schools the spend is low which has not been the case in previous years.

**Administrative Staff**

The admin staff costs are towards the bottom of the middle of the compared schools and the value is broadly in-line with the other schools.

**Other Staff Costs**

The benchmark data shows the schools costs are in the middle compared to similar schools and when compared to LA schools. 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. Our training costs for 2020/21 are in-line with the benchmarked schools and LA compared schools and lower than in previous years due to Covid 19, in normal years the school invests more in training

**PREMISES TOTAL**

The premises total is in the middle of the compared schools and LA schools.

**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 with a cleaning contractor the costs are all shown under the cleaning costs. Adding the two costs together gives a smaller range of total costs (£93-£205 for similar schools) with most schools within a similar value to each other, CTPS total cost per pupil £176. Cleaning and premises staff cost are similar in cost to other schools.

 **Maintenance and Improvement**

The spend is showing towards the top of the compared schools both for the similar schools and LA schools and broadly in-line with other schools spends for 2020/21. This area includes the maintenance and repair budget and the grounds maintenance budget. In previous years the school has been at the top of this spend compared to other schools with high investment in upkeep and improving the site. For 2020/21 due to covid restrictions and reduced working rules any new developments and the rolling redecoration were put on hold. The previous investment in the site have allowed this reduction whilst still maintaining a high level of maintenance without impacting the upkeep of the site and allowed essential maintenance and repairs to be carried out. The school carried out the following maintenance projects in addition to any normal upkeep and repair:

* Automated Gate Upgrade - £5111
* Electrical repair work from 5 year electrical survey - £4125
* Nursery Drainage - £3150
* Year 2 Boiler replacement - £3251

**OCCUPATION TOTAL**

The occupation total costs are towards the top of the costings compared to other schools and BF school. With the energy, water and sewerage costs being high and the catering costs compared to LA schools also being at the higher end but of a comparable value.

**Energy**

The energy cost is the fourth highest against the comparator schools and the third highest compared to BF schools although the actual cost is similar to the majority 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 and the age of the boilers. The boiler in the Year 2 terrapin was replaced this year which should help with some costs but is a small amount of the whole school costs. As discussed previously the KS2 oil boiler is old and need to discuss this with Bracknell regarding suitable replacements. However as it is oil fired the costs are currently lower than the KS1 gas boiler. The efficiency of the boiler is more due to age than the fuel it uses. This is an ongoing issue and requires discussion with Bracknell.

In addition the schools policy during Covid has been to open windows and doors and this has been followed throughout the year including during colder weather. Therefore the cost of heating the school will have been higher during this year.

**Water and Sewerage**

The schools water and sewerage costs are at the top end of the range against similar schools and near the top compared against LA schools on the same tariff. This shows the schools water consumption is higher than the majority of the schools, but the value is still comparable to the other schools and not that high that it would imply any leakage. Need to look at water usage and prevent wastage. This has been difficult to assess during Covid and water consumption has gone up due to handwashing and hygiene but moving forward the school needs to look at ways to reduce water consumption. The schools handwashing policy and insistence on this and hygiene during Covid may be a contributing factor to higher water usage, other schools may have relied on hand gel only.

**Catering Expenditure**

The catering expenditure includes catering staff and supplies and catering contract costs. Our catering expenditure was comparable to most other similar size schools with the cost being in the middle of the table. Compared to LA schools the cost is towards the top of the range. When comparing the cost against LA schools the size of the schools are not necessarily comparable and as the majority of the catering cost is for the supply of UIFSM then the cost will be higher for three form entry schools than for two or one form entry. The cost is still however higher than the other three form entry schools in Bracknell but lower than previous years. The cost for the year 2020/21 will be dependent on local agreements between each school and the relevant catering companies to support them during Covid 19 when there was heavily reduced take up of meals. For April to August all schools in the LA catering contract paid their usual amount for UIFSM that would normally be taken during this time, so schools and the catering company were not out of pocket, this was agreed for all schools in the contract. From Sept College Town had opted out of LA catering contract along with many more BF schools more schools so there were more individual arrangements between schools and their catering companies. At College Town it was agreed to fund the actual cost of the service from Sept 2020 until April 2021 to be funded from the UIFSM grant rather than on a price per meal sold which meant the catering company were not out of pocket and the cost to the school was within the UIFSM grant. Other schools did not agree the same payment strategy with their catering companies and reduced their catering costs.

**SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TOTAL**

The total supplies and services cost are towards the top of the comparison and LA schools although similar in value to the majority of the schools. The administrative supply costs are in line with the comparison schools and lower than the LA schools. With Covid more administrative tasks were changed to online reducing the cost of supplies and with only key worker children in school from April to May 2020 and Jan to March 2021 any internal admin costs were also reduced. However the educational supplies were the highest compared to LA schools and in the top half compared to the similar schools.

**Educational Supplies**

Looking at the schools spend on educational supplies in 2020/21 the higher spend was planned and can be explained by additional spend due to Covid and planned spend on IT equipment. The following additional resources were purchased in 2020/21:

* Laptops/Desktops - £15655
* 5 Interactive whiteboards - £11525
* Additional tables to create extra class to reduce numbers in class for Covid - £1115
* CGP books to support home learning - £5255
* Yoyos, racket ball game, delivered to each child during lockdown - £1264

**INCOME**

The total income is in the middle of both the compared similar schools and LA schools. However the grant funding although in the middle of the funding level for LA schools is at the top when compared to other similar schools, implying that the grant funding for the LA was higher than other areas. The schools self generated funding is low compared to other schools. This is a deliberate policy as the school does not hire out the facilities for profit. The school has started an after school club from Sept 2021 which will increase the self-generated income however its intention is to break even in the first instance. It it was required there are areas where the school could generate more income, but it is not currently required, eg hiring the halls for outside activities, hire of ball court and changing facilities especially once canopy is erected as there will be all year round use.

**Highest Progress Schools Benchmarking**

The benchmarking website now contains an area to benchmark the schools expenditure against similar sized/profile schools with higher progress attainment.

The data shows that the schools expenditure on premises, occupation and supplies and services are all in line with the expenditure of the other schools however the staffing costs are the lowest of all the schools, although the value is similar to the bottom half of the schools.

As discussed above the impact of maternity leave on staffing costs is not seen within BF schools costs as the authority pay for these directly however the staff remain as an employee therefore the cost per staff is lower than other schools who fund their own maternity costs. The cost per staff member is also varies significantly depending on the level of maternity in any given year.

Also as discussed above the SLT costs were reduced in the school year 2020/21 and restructured so long term these costs will be lower. No additional changes were made in 2020/21 due to Covid, however as part of the staffing restructure moving forward in 2021/22 additional middle leader roles have been added with higher costings, Upper pay scales, additional TLRs to support the SLT structure and develop staff and ensure staff available to step up into roles as required. This will have increased the staffing costs from 2021/22. The staffing structure is continually reviewed and developed as 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 as previously. As gas prices increase in 2022/23 and therefore electricity and water prices this will become a higher priority to save energy and reduce costs.

There is also a need to continue to review and monitor the staffing structure on an annual basis and as required

**ACTIONS**

1. To investigate boiler options with BF
2. Look at consumption of electricity, areas to save. Already replacing lights with more energy efficient lights as required.
3. Water- monitor usage, ensure no leaks and look at areas where savings can be made.
4. Review staff structure regularly