Language and Literacy Centre (LAL) Funding

Report being Schools' Forum on 5 December 2022

considered by:

Report Author: Karen Bartlett / Jane Seymour

Item for: Decision By: All Forum Members

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To reach a decision on the Theale LAL funding deficit and LAL budgets for 2023-24

2. Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 To agree a contribution to the deficit which has built up in the Theale LAL budget due to under-funding of the LALs
- 2.2 To increase the budget allocation to both LALs from 2023-24 to cover costs.

| Will the recommendation require the matter | | |
|--|--------|-------|
| to be referred to the Council or the | Yes: 📙 | No: X |
| Executive for final determination? | | |

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1 West Berkshire maintains two Language and Literacy Centres to support children of primary age with specific literacy difficulties, at Theale and Winchcombe Primary Schools. The LALs are an important part of the Authority's provision for children with specific literacy difficulties and help to prevent placements in costly specialist schools for children with dyslexia.
- 3.2 The funding for the LALs over the past 4 years has not been adequate to cover costs which has resulted in the Theale LAL accruing a deficit of approximately £69,000. By the end of 2020-21. The Winchcombe LAL does not have a deficit due to being without a teacher in charge for two terms which enabled them to balance their budget.
- 3.3 The table in section 4 below shows that between 2019-20 and 2021-22 the budget allocated for the LALs did not fully cover the cost of the teacher in charge. In 2022-23 the budget was increased and now covers the teacher's salary, but still does not allow sufficient funding to cover other costs related to the LAL.
- 3.4 The table sets out a proposed model for funding of the LALs which would increase the budget from £67,870 to £80,845, a difference of £12,984 per LAL. The table also sets out what LAL funding would have been in the previous three financial years if this model were applied retrospectively, and therefore what would be an appropriate amount to contribute to the Theale LAL deficit. It is suggested that £51,813 is contributed towards the accrued deficit. The rationale for the proposed funding model is set out below. It should be borne in mind that children who attend LAL are not on the roll of the host school and therefore the host school does not attract AWPU funding for these pupils, unlike schools with resourced provision.

- 3.5 The teacher in charge of a LAL needs to have a Master's level qualification in SpLD. This means most people applying for the post will already be on UPS1-3. To reflect the responsibility and the required qualification an SEN point and TLR are also paid. The proposed budget for the teacher in charge is therefore based on UPS plus SEN & TLR, plus on costs.
- 3.6 There is an agreement in place, which is historical, that the LAL budgets will include an allowance for the Governors to pay the Headteacher additional management points for running the LAL. This was previously allowed for in the LAL budgets, but as the costs of the teachers' salaries have increased, the funding to meet this cost has effectively been eroded. The model below includes an allowance for this purpose.
- 3.7 An allowance has been included for administrative support for the LAL of 0.1FTE.
- 3.8 The allowance for premises costs enables the school to recharge the LAL budget for premises costs relating to the area occupied by the LAL, including heating, lighting, maintenance etc. The amount has been based on an average of actual amounts charged for premises by both schools which host LALs.
- 3.9 The "other costs" line in the proposed budget is to cover supply teacher insurance, stationery, postage, phones, travel expenses, training, photocopying, equipment, resources and a share of the schools' buy back costs for Finance, Payroll etc.
- 3.10 The allowance for IT is intended to allow the school to replace the laptop for the teacher in charge approximately every 5 years.

4. Supporting Information

4.1 Proposed LAL funding model

| | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Staffing | | | | | |
| Teacher | 57474 | 58992 | 63597 | 65064 | 67241 |
| Management Points | 6110 | 6215 | 6324 | 6324 | 6324 |
| Admin | 2661 | 3012 | 3012 | 3208 | 3580 |
| | | | | | |
| Premises Costs | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Other Costs | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Π | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 |
| | | | | | |
| Total proposed | 69945 | 71919 | 76723 | 78296 | 80845 |
| LAL budget | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Actual LAL Budget | 58100 | 58100 | 61000 | 67870 | |
| Difference | 11845 | 13819 | 15723 | 10426 | |
| | | | | | |
| Total prop | 51813 | | | | |
| Total | | 80845 | | | |

5. Options for Consideration

- 5.1 To increase the budgets for both LALs as set out above in 2023-24
- 5.2 To contribute £51,813 towards the deficit at Theale as detailed in 4.1
- 6. Proposals
- 6.1 As above as set out in 5.1 and 5.2 above.

7. Conclusion

7.1 This report sets out a proposal to increase the LAL budgets from April 2023 to cover actual costs as well as contribute to the deficit incurred at Theale which has come about as a result of the budget allocated not adequately covering true costs. Winchcombe LAL does not have a deficit due to a vacancy saving.

8. Consultation and Engagement

8.1 Karen Bartlett, Jane Seymour and Lisa Potts

9. Appendices

Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix A

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality (the relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected, but on the significance of the impact on them):

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the Council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

| What is the prop are asking the So | | | | To agree a contribution has built up in the under-funding of the | Theale L | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--------------------|------------------|
| Name of Service/Directorate: | | Education | | | | |
| Name of assessor: | | Karen Bartlett | | | | |
| Date of assessment: | | | 20 th September 202 | 22 | | |
| Is this a ? | | | Is this policy, strategy, function or service ? | | | |
| Policy | | Yes 🗌 No | | New or proposed | | Yes 🗌 No 🗌 |
| Strategy | | Yes □ No | | Already exists an being reviewed | d is | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Function | | <mark>Yes</mark> ☐ No | | Is changing | | Yes 🗌 No 🗌 |
| Service | | Yes 🗌 No | | | | |
| (1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it? | | | | | | |
| Aims: | To ensure | | e appropriate funding for LAL provision | | | |
| Objectives: | | | | | | |
| Outcomes: Children a support. | | | attending LALs will receive appropriate | | | |
| Benefits: | | | | | | |
| what sources (Please demons | of inforn strate co arriage ar | nation have nsideration nd Civil Partr | bee of | I how? Is it positing used to determing all strands — Anip, Pregnancy and M | e this? ge, Dis | sability, Gender |
| Group Affected | | | | otential Negative pacts | Evide | nce |
| Age | | | | | | |
| Disability | Children dyslexia receive appropri resource | will | | | | |

| | provision. | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|--|
| Gender Reassignment | | | | |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | | | | |
| Pregnancy and Maternity | | | | |
| Race | | | | |
| Religion or Belief | | | | |
| Sex | | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | |
| Further Comme | nts: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| (3) Result | | | | |
| Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? Yes \square No | | | | |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: | | | | |
| Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users? Yes □ No □ | | | | |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: | | | | |
| If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqIA 2. If an EqIA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqIA guidance and template – http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255 . | | | | |
| (4) Identify next | steps as appropriate: | : | | |
| EqIA Stage 2 red | EqIA Stage 2 required | | | |
| Owner of EqIA S | Stage Two: | | | |
| Timescale for E | qIA Stage Two: | | | |
| Name: Karen | Bartlett | Date: 20th Se | ptember 2022 | |

West Berkshire Council Schools' Forum 5 December 2022