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Background

1 The Council’s constitution provides that any member of an Overview and Scrutiny Forum shall be entitled to raise an item that he/she wishes relevant to the functions of the Forum to be included on the agenda for, and be discussed at, a meeting of the Forum.

2 On 6 February 2009, Councillor Jeff Evans asked that an Overview & Scrutiny Forum examine the costs to the Council of administering Welsh Assembly education grants.

3 At a meeting held on 23 February 2009, the Overview & Scrutiny Chairs agreed that this matter be referred to this Forum. A copy of the appropriate form submitted by Councillor Evans is attached.

4 On the 13 October 2008, this Forum received a presentation on how to undertake an Overview & Scrutiny. In accordance with the framework outlined as part of that presentation, the following structure is suggested to provide a framework for this review.

Stage 1: Scope of Review, terms of reference

The suggested terms of reference are as follows

“To examine the costs to the Council of administering Welsh Assembly education grants and the benefits accruing.”

Stage 2: Prepare Position Statement

Key Issues

Any review should commence with an “audit of current provision.” The attached Request Form identifies the following key issues upon which this review should focus:

- A breakdown of all the Welsh Assembly education grants the authority receives including the value of the grant
- The bidding/application costs
- The administration costs
- The reporting costs
- Audit costs (including the external auditor)

Types of Grant

It is possible to categorise the various types of grants available as follows:

- Those designed to impact directly on pupil performance.
- Those which impact on supporting the learning process (e.g. training)
- Those which impact indirectly on performance, such as clothing, school meals and other “Inclusion” areas

All Wales view

To assist members in considering the current position, attached is a recent paper submitted by the WLGA to the Assembly’s Finance Committee Inquiry into Specific Grants in Education. This sets wider the background to the funding of local authority education services in Wales, but also highlights some of the concerns felt by the WLGA, the Association of Directors of Education in Wales (ADEW) and others. Some of these concerns reflect the issue raised by Councillor Evans.). It is anticipated that the Finance Committee’s report will be published in June 2009.
Grants in Newport

Information about how grants are administered in Newport, including information on how grants are monitored, and a schedule outlining grants accessed by the Council during 2009/10 is also attached.

In addition to the questions highlighted above, other key questions to address as part of this review could include:

- Does the current system of grants address the key risk areas for Newport?
- What quality controls are in place to ensure that the objectives of the grants are met?
- Would there be any benefits of streamlining the current number of education grants in Wales?
- Would there be significant savings in administration costs (or audit costs)
- Would reducing the number of grants allow scope for, for example, switching from annual grants to a three year cycle, leading to improved project management and continuity?
- Would there be potential to increase the number of grants paid direct to schools?
- Could it lead to pressure to establish dedicated teams to administer fewer, yet larger, grants - possibly requiring new dedicated funding rather than absorbing costs within existing staff costs across a variety of posts (as is currently the case in Newport).

Stage 3: Evidence Gathering

Throughout the review, members will receive reports from and question ‘expert witnesses’ and stakeholders relevant to the scope of the review. Potential witnesses could include WLGA and WAG. The Forum may also seek to learn from Best Practice elsewhere.

Stage 4: Report & Recommendations

At the conclusion of the review, recommendations will be developed for reporting to the Executive.

Stage 5: Review & Monitor?

Depending upon the outcomes of the review, a period of monitoring may be required to assess how the outcomes reflect the original purpose of the review.

Options Considered/Available

5 The Forum may wish to endorse the framework set out in this report or propose amendments.

Preferred choice and reasons

6 It is recommended that the framework for this review, as set out in this report. The framework reflects best practice and allows issues to be properly discussed in a logical timescale and order.

7 Members are therefore asked to agree the following scope for the review

- May Stage 1 Scoping Report
- May Stage 2 Position Statement
- June/July Stage 3 Evidence Gathering
- September Stage 4 Findings & Recommendations
- To be agreed Stage 5 Monitoring
Sustainability & Environmental Issues. Equalities & Crime Prevention Impact

8 Effective overview and scrutiny adds value to the work of the Council and helps ensure that the Council meets all of its corporate objectives and makes best use of its resources.

Comments of Monitoring Officer

9 There are no legal implications at this time. The methodology set out in the report for undertaking this review is consistent with the framework previously agreed by OSF. Scoping the review in terms of setting clear objectives and outcomes will be a critical element of its success.

Comments of Chief Financial Officer

10 Currently, the Education Service has circa £21m of external revenue grants, many of which are allocated on an annual basis and can make it difficult for any long term planning.

11 As the report states, there are various costs associated with administering and auditing the grants, some of which are attributable to the Grants areas and others which impact on staff time and resources which are funded from the Councils core revenue budget. Staff also allocated to grants could leave the Council with ongoing employment rights should the grant cease in the future.

12 There can also be problems with grant timetables, in that in order to complete work within the time constraints this may result in short term decisions being taken to utilise the grant at the expense of other more favourable decisions which could not be delivered within the appropriate timeframe.

13 However, in offsetting the above there are clearly significant benefits that can accrue in terms of Service Delivery from obtaining this level of grants and any review will clearly need to weigh up these benefits against some of the problems identified. The review will also need to consider the longer term benefits that would arise if some of these costs were built into the RSG.

14 Finally, the figures quoted in the report deal primarily with Education Revenue Grants rather than Capital Grants available. There are far fewer capital grants and they are more easily defined. Capital grants form part of the wider package of Assembly grants but including them in this review may make the review too large.

15 Information is however attached in relation to grants administered by the Children and Young People’s Partnership Team and Community Learning

Comments of Head of Human Resources and Policy

16 There are no human resources implications contained in this report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Jeff Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>06.02.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The costs to Newport Council of administering Welsh Assembly education grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do you want Scrutiny to look at this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a plethora of Assembly education grants. There appears to be different requirements associated with each grant. With tighter settlements being received from the Assembly, the administrative costs of these grants needs to be known.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should the review achieve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firstly, greater awareness of the costs can inform more efficient use of scarce resources. Secondly, the information can be used to lobby the Assembly to rationalise and streamline the number of grants (which is taking place in England and Scotland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What matters would you like included in the review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A breakdown of all the Welsh Assembly education grants the authority gets including the value of the grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The bidding/application costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The administration costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The reporting costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Audit costs (including the external auditor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would be the benefits to the Council and Public?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximising the value of grants for children and educational services in the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which Corporate Objective does this link to – and how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking forward the Community Strategy (attractive city; enterprising city; learning city; accessible city; safer city; greener city; healthy city; inclusive city.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Service Improvement Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Access to Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed forms should be sent FAO Miriam Durkin, IS&C, Civic Centre, Newport

**Progress Record** (to be completed by office staff on receipt of form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Service Comments</th>
<th>Comments of Chief Education Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is an ideal topic to be covered both from the point of view of the cost of administrating the grants and from the perspective of the need to simplify the number of grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have lots of materials on this. It is also part and parcel of WLGA’s drive to get WAG to simplify the number of grants and allow their uses to be determined locally by councils. In return for this WLGA intend to negotiate 'outcome agreements' between WAG and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considered by Overview &amp; Scrutiny Chairs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Way Forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Notified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Overview &amp; Scrutiny Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Invited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Notified of Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WLGA Evidence to NAfW Finance Committee

Specific Grants in Education
11th February 2009
Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide a summary of the Welsh Local Government Association’s (WLGA) position on specific grants in education and to highlight the concerns felt by the WLGA, the Association of Directors of Education in Wales (ADEW) and other stakeholders in relation to specific grants. Although the Committee’s review focuses on specific grants within education, this paper sets out the local government position within the wider context of the Children Act 2004. Local authorities plan and deliver services for children and young people, including education, in an integrated way which seeks to deliver the best possible outcomes. It is more appropriate, therefore, to consider grants that are provided for services for children and young people within this broader context rather than the narrower and more traditional education focused approach.

Background

The majority of local government revenue funding is provided by the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) through the Rate Support Grant (RSG). Local government also receives funding through two large unhypothecated grants – the Performance Improvement Grant and the Deprivation Grant – along with a wide range of other specific grants that are in the main service related. Local government funding is supplemented by revenue raised by individual authorities through the Council Tax but this forms a relatively small part of authorities’ total revenue.

Local government’s capital funding is derived from WAG in the same way with a general capital allocation in the form of an unhypothecated capital grant and specific capital grants that are service focused. In addition, authorities receive unhypothecated revenue support for capital borrowing.

The funding of local authority education services and schools is set within this context with the core funding for pre-16 education being provided through the RSG and post-16 training and learning, various national strategies and other policy initiatives being funded through specific grant. It is also worth noting that there are elements within the Performance Improvement Grant and the Deprivation Grant that relate to education and children’s services.

This approach to the funding of education, and local government services as a whole, is based on a longstanding consensus between the WLGA and WAG. There is a fundamental and shared understanding between local and central government in Wales that local government is best placed to decide on how resources are allocated and services are delivered locally, within the context of the strategic direction set by WAG. At its simplest, this philosophical approach can be summed up as WAG setting the strategy nationally and local authorities delivering services locally. This understanding is underpinned by the principle that authorities are free to manage the resources available to them, to respond to local circumstances and to set their own priorities as long as they work within this strategic framework and are sensitive to the needs and expectations of their stakeholders. There is also an underlying
assumption that resources are used as effectively and efficiently as possible and that the norms and conventions of public accounting and governance apply at all times.

This agreement at the level of principle is supported by formal agreements, such as the Essex-Jones Agreement and the Protocol on Hypothecated Grants, and structures deriving from the Partnership Council, including the Consultative Forum on Finance (CFF) and various sub-committees such as the Expenditure Sub Group (ESG) and the Distribution Sub Group (DSG). These mechanisms and structures build on and support the shared principle that the RSG should be unhypothecated.

There is also a shared understanding that in some circumstances, funding through specific grant is appropriate. The Grants Protocol has been developed to deal with such circumstances and is based on the understanding that specific grants should be kept to a minimum; that they should have specific and defined objectives; that they should provide as much clarity of funding as possible and that there should be a clear exit strategy.

This Protocol and this approach to funding though specific grant applies to education just as much as to other local government service areas and there is a consensus between the WLGA and WAG on this approach and the philosophy and principles by which it is supported. There is a fundamental concern, however, over how this process works in practice. The reality is very different from the theory.

**Current Policy Context**

There are currently over 100 specific grants that are available to local authorities in Wales to provide services for children and young people. The proliferation in the number of specific grants in recent years, the complexity of the bureaucracy surrounding them and the dynamic policy context make it almost impossible to provide a definitive position. A list of these grants is appended as an annex to this paper. As can be seen from the list, the majority of these grants are provided by the Welsh Assembly Government, but they come from a variety of different departments and not only the Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (DCELLS). Specific grants are also available for children and young people from the WAG departments responsible for transport, health, social services, Welsh language, community safety and local government.

The continuum of learning extends well beyond the traditional school day and the Children Act 2004 means that services for children and young people have to be viewed in this wider context. This approach is supported by the overwhelming body of evidence that shows that achievement and attainment within education is determined by a range of factors within the school but also within families, communities and wider society. The work done by WAG and the WLGA on *Narrowing the Gap* emphasises this point. The variety of opportunities, activities and services available within schools or connected to schools, that range from sports, library services, health services, social services, youth services, play and education for those children who do not attend school must therefore be recognised in this inquiry. The continuum of learning also extends beyond school age into training and adult continuing learning, often provided in a school setting.
The point to stress here is that the source of the grant is not the issue, but the fact that all the grants in this area are processed, administered, monitored and distributed by the same team of people and that they place an enormous bureaucratic and administrative burden on authorities. At a time when funding is scarce, resources are being used to support a growing bureaucracy without adding value. At a time when post-16 funding is cut across Wales by 7.5% and the gap between per pupil funding in England and Wales is growing bigger, this cannot be an effective use of resources.

Local Government Concerns

Local government concern about the growth in specific grants in education extends beyond financial considerations and are summarised below.

- The number of specific grants and the amount of funding distributed through this mechanism undermines the shared acceptance of the principle that local government funding should be unhypothecated.
- Specific grants place an unnecessary and costly bureaucratic burden on schools, local authorities and WAG.
- Specific grants weaken authorities’ capacity to respond to local circumstances and needs.
- The methodological basis upon which grants are provided varies between grants and is often at variance with the RSG formula and shared perceptions of need. For example, the RSG, Cymorth, Flying Start and RAISE grants all have different distribution methodologies.
- Variations in methodologies and in distribution formulae lead to further turbulence when grants go into the RSG creating winners and losers.
- The need to spend in year does not always result in the most efficient and effective use of resources.
- There is no coherent evaluation of the impact of grants in education on outcomes and, in many instances, the impact cannot be measured. The monitoring and evaluation systems currently in place for a number of grants are costly, time consuming and unnecessarily duplicated with the results often not used to inform future or ongoing policy.
- The provision of special grants is not always aligned with strategic policy within DCELLS and between DCELLS and other WAG directorates.
- Policy within DECELLS is not always joined up and there is often overlap between grant funded initiatives.
- The cost of implementing grant schemes varies between authorities.
- The short term focus of grants often leads to longer term problems.
- Grants can often reward bad practice rather than encouraging good practice – topping up or supplementing existing provision.
Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation

It is difficult to estimate the cost of the administration of the 100 or more grants that are accessed by local authorities for children, young people and lifelong learning. It is widely accepted however that approximately 10% of the funding for a grant could be used on administration. It is also evident that authorities are increasingly looking at employing dedicated staff to deal with the proliferation in specific grants. The cost of a single post, including staff on-costs could amount to £45,000. If each local authority decided to take this approach then the costs across Wales could be up to £990,000 per year. This does not include the cost of the growing bureaucracy within DCELLS.

Monitoring and evaluation processes should also add value and be fit for purpose. The Chief Inspector for Education and Training in Wales in his annual report stated, for example, that the monitoring and evaluation for the Community Focused School grant was not effective. Monitoring and evaluation should be proportionate to the amount of grant that is available, the same goes for the submission of applications for grants. Some authorities have inevitably deemed that grants are too small to justify the amount of work required for the application submission and monitoring.

It can also be difficult to judge the effectiveness of some small grants. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation highlighted the difficulty of assessing the impact of short term, limited interventions in its recent work on the impact of deprivation on educational attainment. The grant associated with the RAISE (Raising Individual Standards in Education) initiative highlights many of these problems. RAISE funding was targeted on schools with over 20% free school meals and over 50 pupils in order to tackle disadvantage and underachievement. It proved to be very contentious from the outset. The programme was initially for 2 years (DCELLS has since funded an extra year) with £14.5 million available in each year. In order to access this funding each local authority had to first notify the 648 schools involved that they were eligible for funding. Authorities then had to develop plans in conjunction with their schools, outlining their proposed use of the funding and identifying the impact, and submit them to WAG for approval. Schools and local authorities had to agree the proposed use of funding, to complete reams of supporting documentation, and were then required to check this work against existing good practise and share any developing good practise. Schools and local authorities had 2 months to complete this work and then a further two weeks in order to submit proposals to WAG. In addition, the proposals were revisited at a later point with a view to the submission of additional detail.

In addition, a national programme board was established, RAISE was monitored and evaluated by the schools and local authorities themselves, and by Estyn as well as being routinely inspected by Estyn and then evaluated by 2 separate external consultants. The result of all this work has been a recognition that it is too early to say whether RAISE funding is having a significant impact on attainment in deprived areas and that it is hard to determine whether it is RAISE or other similar interventions have an impact on improvement and raising standards.
The Way Forward

The WLGA and ADEW believe that there is a problem here that needs to be addressed. The current arrangement is unsustainable and is a poor use of resources at a time when public funds are under increasing pressure.

Local government recognises the Education Minister’s view that funding is one of the “levers available to deliver policy objectives and high performance” but believes that there are more effective, more efficient and more sustainable alternatives. The deficiencies identified in this paper in relation to the current approach to specific grants far outweigh any perceived benefits. The principles set out at the start of this paper with regard to the unhypothecation of the RSG and the Grants Protocol must be adhered to in practice.

The WLGA and WAG share the objective of “securing both efficient and effective delivery of policy objectives” to produce better outcomes for children and young people. The WLGA also shares the Minister’s vision of providing high quality education opportunities for all, that enable individuals to fulfil their potential and contribute meaningfully to sustainable communities and society as a whole.

The Association believes that this is brought about through partnership and shared outcomes within a focused, defined and complementary regulatory and legislative framework. The regulatory framework is key and must be aligned to the wider policy context. The aspiration for local government is greater autonomy over how funding is used locally, the reward for WAG is improved delivery of policy objectives and performance coupled with the shared goal of improved outcomes for children and young people.

For these reasons, the WLGA has been seeking to simplify the current funding model, both within education and local government as a whole. The focus of this discussion has been the development of a Concordat between local government and WAG aimed at reducing the number of specific grants and associated bureaucracy in return for agreement on the delivery of outcomes by local government within its service areas. Within education, this has led to productive discussion between DCELLS and the WLGA in relation to the School Effectiveness Framework with the real possibility of developing a pilot on outcome agreements within education. At the same time, the Grants Protocol and the Essex-Jones agreement are being reviewed by WAG and the WLGA.
List of Grant Funding Available to Local Authorities for Services to Children and Young People

Schools not *specifically* education
Welsh Healthy Schools Network
Healthy Schools Food and Fitness
Safer Communities Fund for the implementation of the All Wales Youth Offending Strategy (through the Community Safety Partnerships which Local Authorities sit on)
Food and Fitness – training for school caterers
Communities First

Children and Young People - General
Autism Funding (to implement national autism strategy)
Short Breaks funding
Disabled Funding for Play
Performance Improvement Grants - all of them have an element for children and young people

**FE/ Post 16**
FE Recurrent Funding
Post 16 provision in schools
Adult Community Learning Funding
Post 16 special schools out of county
SEN in 6<sup>th</sup> forms
Financial Contingency Funds
Welsh Bacc Delivery
Basic Skills for (FE)
Specialist Placements (FE)
Bilingual Champions (FE)
Capital (FE)
Key Skills Grant

Education
Assistance for Teaching Heads
Better Schools Fund
Community Focused Schools
Cymorth
Childcare Grant
Education in Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship
Energy Grant
Flying Start (Revenue grant)
Foundation Phase
Foundation Phase pilots and early starts
Foundation Phase training additional grant
Foundation Phase training and support officers
Foundation Phase Setting Support Teachers
14 – 19 Learning Pathways (revenue)
GTCW
Headship Training
Minority Ethnic Achievement Grant
Making the Connections
Modern Foreign Language Strategy in Primary Schools
NQH
NQT & EPD
Pupil Participation Grant
Primary Free Schools Breakfasts
Primary Heads Induction Phase
RAISE
LAC RAISE
PE and School Sport
School Uniform Financial Assistance
School Based Counselling Services
Schools Special Grant
School Effectiveness Framework
Senior Learning Modules for Schools Heads
Small and Rural Schools Grant (community focused schools element)
Small and Rural Schools Grant
Grant for the Education of Travellers
School Milk Grant 5-11
Nursery Milk Grant
Appetite for Life
Immersion Scheme
Basic Skills Strategy
BS Quality Mark
BS teacher training
BS LAP – Language and play
BS Strategic Intervention Grant
BS Family Programmes
BS Read a Million Words
Youth Work Grant
Youth Work Training Grant
School Transport Project grants
Transition Grant (key stage 2 – 3)
Electronic Attendance
14 – 19 bilingual development collaboration grant
Speech and Language Pilot Projects
Unlocking the potential – special schools
Inclusion Quality Mark
Specialist Equipment Learners Additional Needs
SLM Grant (middle management training)
Induction Funding
Arson Small Grants Programme
Reading Grant Support for Looked After Children

Grants to Promote Welsh Language Education (WLB Grant)
Inspiring Learning Grant Scheme (Cymal) for libraries.

Capital
SBIG
Voluntary Aided Schools Capital Grants
Foundation Phase – capital element
Flying Start – capital element
14 – 19 Learning Pathways – capital element

Sports Council of Wales (SCW)
Dragon Sport
5 x 60 Scheme
Free Swimming under 16
Disability Sports Officer
PESS Development Centre
PESS Coordinator
Secondary School Sports Programme
Tennis Development Officer
Football Development Officer
Netball Development Officer
Netball Development Officer
Golf Development Officer
Cricket Development Officer
Welsh Hockey

Lottery Funding
Healthy Families: Childs Play
People and Places
Reaching Out, Young People’s Fund

European Funding
14 – 19 Network ESF
Springboard
Education Grants in Newport

The Education Service administers large number of grants from two key sources i.e. Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) and Basic Skills Agency (BSA) for a range of grants. These range from some that are small in value and require very little administrative input / support, to some grants where it has been deemed necessary to employ dedicated staff to oversee them. This is a result of the proliferation in specific grants and to ensure outputs are delivered in accordance with individual grant terms and conditions. In such instances, a business case is required along with formal job descriptions before formal Council approval is obtained.

In many cases where a full or part-time post is not required, it is difficult to accurately calculate the true cost of administering a grant without incurring additional costs to calculate / track these costs as such costs are largely absorbed within existing staff costs.

The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) recently reported (February 2009) that 100 or more grants are accessed by local authorities for children, young people and lifelong learning. Whilst some of these are not available to or relevant to the Local Education Authority and its schools, it is widely accepted throughout Wales that unless there is a specific amount detailed within a grant’s terms and conditions as an actual or maximum level for meeting the costs of administration, that 10% of the grant funding will be used on administration.

Newport City Council’s Education Service continues to adopt this practice as it has done in previous financial years, during the 2009/10 financial year i.e. unless otherwise specified, 10% of all grants will be top-sliced and paid into the Education Management account to be used to meet costs associated with unplanned expenditure / new initiatives that occur in-year; monitoring and evaluation costs associated with grants; and, external audit costs linked to these grants.
Lifelong Learning Finance Team
Grants Monitoring Guidance Notes

Purpose: To ensure all the grants are handled in a consistent manner across the Lifelong Learning and Leisure division and to ensure that there is a designated person to project manager and oversee all grant processes, grant claims and grant receipts for the service.

Audit: The LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator will be the first point of contact for all internal and external grant audit queries. The LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator will provide the auditors with details of spend and the grant reconciliation (please refer to Appendix A) for the period in question. The LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator will then point the audit contact in the direction of the service contact to explain spending pattern, outcome of spend etc.

Grant Offering / Acceptance

New Grants:

Once new grants have been approved in line with council policy, the LLL Accountancy Grants Co-ordinator must be notified. This will enable a) the setting up of a financial (Oracle) code b) the recording of the grant on the monitoring spreadsheet and grant reconciliation spreadsheet, c) notification to the Head of Finance. A copy of the authorised grant acceptance letter will be forwarded to the LLL Accountancy Grant co-ordinator’s file.

Grant Monitoring

The Accountancy Finance contact for each of the grants is responsible for preparation of the monthly trading statements having met with service officers / managers who is responsible for delivering the grant.

Accountancy Finance contact to arrange monthly meetings with grants officer(s) / manager(s) to review grant spending progress against planned spending milestones, to feed figures into grants spreadsheet and record on the grants monitoring report which will go to SMT every month.

Accountancy Finance contact to meet Education Accountant and Group Accountant every month to finalise grant report and figures. All day to day monitoring is the responsibility of respective Accountancy Finance contact.

NOTE: LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator has NO involvement in the day to day monitoring. This is the role of Accountancy Finance contact.

Grant Claims

Every grant claim must be agreed by the Head of Finance prior to submission.

All the grant claim forms need to be forwarded to LLL Accountancy
Grant Co-ordinator for review prior to submission for authorisation from Head of Service / Head of Finance.

LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator to review the grant claim form to ensure the claim totals can be reconciled back to NCC Oracle report, and the funds have been spent according to the terms and conditions of the grant.

LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator to submit a copy of the claim form to Head of Service / Head of Finance for authorisation.

LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator to send out the original authorised claims form to the grant offering body and keep a copy in the grants’ file for audit trail purposes, as well as passing a copy to grant holder.

Upon sending the grant claim form, LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator to notify central finance and update grants reconciliation sheet, which will identify the full position in relation to every single grant claim made.

The Central Accountancy team will need to notify LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator upon receiving of the grants money. LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator will again update the grant reconciliation sheet to ensure the latest position in relation to receipt of grants.

**NOTE:** Every Accountancy Finance contact will keep grant reconciliation on their Excel monitoring file and they will be put at the front of every grant file at the end of the year.

**Year End Closing**

Accountancy Finance contact to complete month 12 figures and agree expenditures and grant income position with grant officers / managers in each of their grants areas.

**Supplementaries:** Only authorised expenditures with delivery notes before the year end dates can be included in Supplementaries.

Every year end supplementary in relation to grant areas must be approved and checked by the LLL Accountancy Grant Co-ordinator before they are added to the supplementary list.

All grant Supplementaries should tie into grant reconciliation.
Education Grants 2009/10

(Confirmation is awaited from awarding bodies for all allocations. Where this is the case it has been assumed that we will be granted the allocation as per the budget book estimate (this will be amended accordingly once confirmation received). Similarly, it has been assumed that the respective claim dates will also remain unaltered.)
Children & Young Peoples Partnership: Education Grants

Within the Children and Young People's Partnership Team two grants are administered for the delivery of services. These are Cymorth and Flying Start.

Newport City Council receives and administers the Cymorth Grant on behalf of Newport Children and Young People’s Partnership. This is a Welsh Assembly Government Grant and is agreed on an annual basis. No funding can be carried forward from one year to the next and this often results in short term decision making in order to spend the Grant within Newport.

In 2011 this Grant will be subsumed within RSG.

By April 1st 2010 Newport will be required to re-allocate £433K of the overall Cymorth Grant to Flying Start activities.

The Council also administers Flying Start grant through the Children and Young People’s Partnership Team. Again, it is a WAG grant and is agreed on an annual basis and no funding can be carried forward from one year to the next.

The administration of these grants is undertaken by the Children and Young People’s Partnership Support Team. Their primary functions (in relation to the Grant) are as follows:

1. Drafting, consulting on and submitting the annual Cymorth and Flying Start Plan for approval by WAG
2. Allocating funding to organisations to purchase services for children and young people (0-25).
3. Agreeing levels of service delivery, standards, reporting and monitoring mechanisms.
4. Receiving data from providers on contract delivery and reporting this to the Children and Young People’s Partnership and WAG on a quarterly basis
5. Processing and paying invoices for services bought
6. Making recommendations for the re-allocation of resources in year

The Cymorth Grant Value for 09 – 10 is £3,220,529
The Flying Start Grant Value for 09 – 10 is £1,771,378

The bidding/application costs

As the Partnership Team is funded through Cymorth and Flying Start all costs associated with these grants are accounted for within the Grant (including centralised overheads).

Neither grant value is subject to an application process as they are allocated by WAG through a formula funding model.

An on annual basis we are required to submit a Cymorth Plan, which is agreed by the Children and Young People’s Partnership and a Flying Start Plan.

The administration costs

To administer the Grant, the Partnership Team employs:
The costs for staff that support the administration of Cymorth is £45,394.

The costs for staff that support the administration of Flying Start is £59,567.

However, these figures do not include the costs associated with the Children and Young People’s Partnership Manager (@ £52,919) who supports the planning, administration and reporting processes for both these grants, plus other substantial duties. We would have to make an assumption regarding the proportion of time spent supporting Cymorth and Flying Start. A rough guess without medium term analysis would be around 20%.

The reporting costs

The Council is required to report on the delivery of services plus spend on a quarterly basis. These costs are included within the administration costs.

Audit costs (including the external auditor)

Cymorth makes a contribution of £15,000 to central costs and Flying Start makes a contribution of £10,000. These costs include audit costs.
Community Learning Grants

Direct Grant from DECLLS £515,245

Received annually, there is no bidding process as such but the Authority is required to submit a Community Learning delivery Plan to DECLLS which states what will be delivered through the grant funding. This plan is produced through liason with key stakeholders and submitted to DECLLS in June of each year. The Plan is approved by the cabinet member for Leisure and Continuing Learning. A report is sent to DECLLS on the outturn of the previous years plan.

The costs of producing the plan are related to staff time in preparing the plan and are in the region of £1500.

The grant is made for direct delivery of post 16 community learning as agreed under the Welsh Assembly community Learning Planning and Funding mechanism and to support the infrastructure needed in order to deliver that learning.

In addition the service receives funding from the franchise arrangement with Coleg Gwent. This funding which amounts to approx £1.269m is also WAG monies under the Planning and funding Mechanism for post 16 community learning but comes via Coleg Gwent and not direct from the Assembly.

The monies are allocated according to a target number of Credit Equivalent Units as agreed via a programme of learning submitted to coleg gwent for approval. The amount of the grant is calculated through the target number of CEU’s. Failure to achieve the target number of CEU’s can result in a clawback of funding.

These two grants together with course income form the Community Learning service budget. Administration of that budget and monitoring of performance against that budget is a core activity of senior managers within the service and therefore difficult to quantify in monetary terms.
<p>| Grant | Allocation (As per budget book) | Approved Allocation (If changed since original) | Funding Body | Contact Details | Within Finance | Within Service | Within Funding Body | Date of Claim Submissions | Grant Funding Body | External | Internal |
|-------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| 14-19 Pathways | 796,534 | 786,334 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Steve Roach | Emma Graczyk | 31/08/2009 | 31/07/2009 | 31 December 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| Anti-Social Behaviour Project | 176,608 | 176,608 | SBF | Name | Phone | Email | Gary Phillips | Ruth Connelly | 53 July 2009 | 52 October 2009 | 31 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Appetite for Life | 188,364 | 188,364 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Amanda Davies | Kevin O’Regan | 30 September 2009 | 31 December 2009 | Not condominated | Required | Not Required |
| Assembly Learning Grants | 32,584 | 32,584 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Helen Powell | Kevin O’Regan | 30 September 2009 | 31 December 2009 | Required | Required | Not Required |
| Assistance to Heads Teaching in Block | 82,230 | 82,230 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Steve Roach | Nina Davies | 31/08/2009 | 31/07/2009 | 31 December 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| Bagatelle School Fund | 1,786,400 | 1,786,400 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Paul Martin | Tracey Steens | 30 September 2009 | 31 January 2010 | 31 March 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Breakfast Clubs | 15,371 | 15,371 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Amanda Davies | Sarah Lewis | 31 August 2009 | 31 January 2010 | 30 April 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| RAAS Quality Mark | 20,200 | 20,200 | WAG/BSC | Name | Phone | Email | Steve Roach | Tony Steens | 5th June 2009 | 5th December 2009 | 5th December 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Community-focused Schools | 335,462 | 335,462 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Sue Rowlands | Tony Steens | 31 April 2009 | 31 September 2009 | 31 December 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| Eynsham | 3,209,529 | 3,209,529 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Mark Cole | Jennifer Cooper | 15 July 2009 | 15 October 2009 | 15 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Family Learning | 82,080 | 82,080 | WAG/BSC | Name | Phone | Email | Linda Jordan | Jennifer Cooper | 15 July 2009 | 15 October 2009 | 15 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Flying Start | 1,775,378 | 1,775,378 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Monika Wilde | Michael Izzard | 31 July 2009 | 31 October 2009 | 31 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Foundation Phase Funding | 2,369,020 | 2,369,020 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Gary Brindle | Jan Hesford | 15th August 2009 | 15th August 2010 | 15th August 2011 | Required | Not Required |
| Swansea 2 | 533,289 | 533,289 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Mark Cole | Jennifer Cooper | 15 July 2009 | 15 October 2009 | 15 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| Healthy Schools | 78,000 | 78,000 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Sarah Morgan | Nicola Glenn | 31 May 2009 | 30 September 2009 | 30 November 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| Innovation in Small Schools | 58,675 | 58,675 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Sarah Morgan | Jennifer Cooper | 30 June 2009 | 30 September 2009 | 30 November 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| Language and Play | 78,000 | 78,000 | WAG/BSC | Name | Phone | Email | Linda Jordan | Jennifer Cooper | 15 July 2009 | 15 October 2009 | 15 January 2010 | Required | Not Required |
| ME&amp;I | 182,010 | 182,010 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Tracey Philips | Therna Davies | 30 September 2009 | 31 December 2009 | Not condominated | Required | Not Required |
| Past 16 Gift | 7,515,196 | 7,515,196 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Jessica Brown | Berfah Couwen | Certificate of Excellence in Compassions | Required | Required | Required |
| RAAS | 318,000 | 318,000 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Jason Brown | Richard Matthews | 30 September 2009 | 30 September 2009 | 30 September 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| School-Based Counselling | 97,820 | 97,820 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Sally Morris | Elliott Smith | 31 August 2009 | 31 December 2009 | Not condominated | Required | Not Required |
| School Energy/ Special Grant | 402,800 | 402,800 | WAG | Name | Phone | Email | Jason Brown | Amy Pased | 31 May 2009 | 30 June 2009 | 31 August 2009 | Required | Not Required |
| SPLEASH | 20,000 | 20,000 | YJBI | Name | Phone | Email | Amy Pased | Zara Lavender | 15 May 2009 | 15 June 2009 | 15 July 2009 | Required | Not Required |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Allocation (As per budget)</th>
<th>Approved Allocation (If changed since original)</th>
<th>Funding Body</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>White Finance</th>
<th>White Service</th>
<th>Within Funding Body</th>
<th>State of Claim Submissions</th>
<th>Audit Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets Ahead</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>WAG/BSC</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Andy Peadie</td>
<td>26th July 2009</td>
<td>26th December 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets Ahead</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>WAG/BSC</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Andy Peadie</td>
<td>26th July 2009</td>
<td>26th December 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for Youth Staff</td>
<td>32,575</td>
<td>47,294</td>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Vince Peadie</td>
<td>01 October 2009</td>
<td>01 March 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTGS</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>WAG/BSC</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Andy Peadie</td>
<td>26th July 2009</td>
<td>26th December 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlocking the Potential of Special Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Andy Peadie</td>
<td>01 October 2009</td>
<td>01 March 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAG Clothing Grant</td>
<td>44,521</td>
<td>44,521</td>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Angela Davies</td>
<td>01 September 09</td>
<td>01 December 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Language Board</td>
<td>118,771</td>
<td>118,771</td>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Sally Morris</td>
<td>Ruth Salary</td>
<td>01 December 09</td>
<td>01 March 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £21,067,885