

## SCHOOLS FORUM – 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015

<b>Title of paper:</b>	De-delegation of 2016/17 Health and Safety Building Maintenance funding
<b>Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):</b>	Alison Michalska, Corporate Director for Children and Adults
<b>Report author(s) and contact details:</b>	David Thompson, Schools H&S Manager, Children and Adults Tel: (0115) 87 64608 e-mail: <a href="mailto:davidm.thompson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk">davidm.thompson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</a>
<b>Other colleagues who have provided input:</b>	Andy Fletcher, Team Leader, Property Safety & Compliance Julia Holmes, Finance Analyst, Strategic Finance - Children and Adults
<b>Summary</b>	
<p>The purpose of this report is to update Schools Forum on the statutory and legislative responsibilities of the Local Authority (LA) in relation to health and safety maintenance and testing of maintained school properties and how the funding requested to be de delegated is used to support this.</p> <p>This report seeks approval from Schools Forum to de-delegate the funding for schools health and safety building maintenance for maintained primary and secondary schools in 2016/17.</p>	
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	
<b>1</b>	To note the statutory and legislative responsibilities of the LA in relation to Health and Safety Building Maintenance of maintained primary and secondary schools and the type of costs that the requested funding will be used to fund, detailed in paragraph 1.4.
<b>2</b>	For maintained mainstream primary schools to approve the de-delegation of the Health and Safety Building Maintenance funding in 2016/17 based on a rate of £13.92 per pupil.  Total estimated funding requested to be de-delegated for mainstream maintained primary schools is £0.176m.
<b>3</b>	For maintained mainstream secondary schools to approve the de-delegation of the Health and Safety Building Maintenance funding in 2016/17 based on a rate of £13.92 per pupil.  Total estimated funding requested to be de-delegated for mainstream maintained secondary schools is £0.018m.

### **1. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1.1 The overall responsibility for health and safety lies with the employer. The Health and Safety Executive state that in England the Local Authority is the employer in community schools.

The Health and Safety at Work Etc. Act 1974 and subsequent legislation places a general duty on employers to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable the health, safety and welfare at work of all of their employees and non-employees.

- 1.2 To meet the statutory responsibilities the Property Safety and Compliance Team at the LA ensure that the Statutory and Legislative maintenance and testing regimes are undertaken within Nottingham City Council's portfolio of properties, which includes schools, and ensure that all property health and safety issues are identified and addressed on known assets.
- 1.3 Approval of the de-delegation of Health and Safety Building Maintenance is required for maintained mainstream school sites to enable the LA to deliver its statutory obligation regarding the Health and Safety of these sites.
- 1.4 The funding requested to be de-delegated in this report in 2016/17 is to be used to fund the tests and inspections in maintained primary and secondary schools. These tests and inspections include:
- Air Conditioning Units
  - Asbestos surveys
  - Automatic doors and gates
  - Boilers
  - Electrical circuit testing
  - Emergency lighting
  - Fire alarms
  - Heat pumps
  - Legionella risk assessments
  - Lifts
  - Lightning protection
  - Pressure sets
  - Stage lighting
- 1.5 Any remedial works that are required due to schools failing any tests or inspections will be organised and paid for from the Dedicated Schools Grant against the Capital expenditure from revenue funding held centrally within the Schools Block.
- 1.6 Advantages of Property Safety and Compliance organising the inspections and tests will be:
- The contracts will meet current statutory and best practice
  - The contracts are arranged without any sourcing, tendering and other associated administration required by the school
  - The contracts will deliver best value through the Local Authority's framework agreement
  - All costs are met centrally and peaks and troughs in expenditure would be managed through the health and safety building maintenance reserve enabling for better budget forecasting.
- 1.7 Approvals for de-delegations are annual regardless of the statutory nature.

## **2. BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)**

- 2.1 In order to achieve a competent level of functionality the LA will consider the relevant legislation and documentation, which may include:
- Statutory legislation and regulation

- Industry regulation
- Approved Codes of Practice
- Guidance documentation
- Equipment manufacturer's instructions and recommendations
- Best practice

2.2 A policy has been produced by the Property Safety and Compliance Team "Statutory Testing & Inspection of Fixed Installations in Nottingham City Council Properties – Policy statement & Testing Procedures (October 2013 v 1.2b)". This document confirms Nottingham City Council's responsibilities and intentions as Corporate Landlord in relation to tests and inspections carried out in Nottingham City properties, in line with corporate policies. The aim of the document is to give support and advice and ensure clarifications of property related health and safety responsibilities are understood. This document can be found in the [Schools Safety Manual](#).

The Property Safety and Compliance Team have put in place a timetable for tests and inspections, which reflect a combination of statutory guidance and appropriate practice. The LA uses contractors to carry out the tests and inspections that are on its framework of contractors, these include internal and external contractors.

- 2.3 Note that the funding does not include the Property Safety and Compliance Team's advisory service on such remedial matters- this service is available via an Education Services Nottingham contract.
- 2.4 The timetable for tests and inspections, undertaken in-house or by contractors, range from daily to up to every five years dependent on the particular test or inspection.
- 2.5 The cost of the Property Safety and Compliance Team who provide the service of arranging all the health and safety building maintenance tests and inspections are not paid from the funding requested in this report.
- 2.6 Where tests and inspections are required as part of a health and safety management system, such as asbestos, legionella or fire safety, separate policies relating to these items are included in the appendices B, C and D of the "Statutory Testing & Inspection of Fixed Installations in Nottingham City Council Properties – Policy statement & Testing Procedures (October 2013 v 1.2b)".
- 2.7 Approval to de-delegate the schools health and safety building maintenance budget has been given by both the primary and secondary phases representatives of Schools Forum each financial year since 2013/14. Any unspent balance at the end of the financial year is transferred to a Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve. In reverse any in year overspend would be drawn down from the Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve. As at the 31 March 2015 the balance on the Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve was £0.121m.
- 2.8 Based on the latest timetable of tests and inspections to be carried out in 2015/16 it is estimated that the forecast expenditure for 2015/16 will be approximately £0.150m.
- 2.9 Table 1 shows the budget and expenditure on the schools health and safety building maintenance in the last three years since the funding was first de-delegated.

<b>Table 1: Breakdown of Schools Health and Safety Building Maintenance</b>
---

<b>Year</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Outturn/ Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
2013/14	£0.273m	£0.231m	£0.042m	The under-spend of £0.042m at the year end was transferred to the Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve.
2014/15	£0.253m	£0.174m	£0.079m	The under-spend of £0.079m at the year end was transferred to the Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve.
2015/16	£0.208m	£0.150m	£0.058m	Any surplus at the end of the financial year will be transferred to the Schools Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve at the end of the financial year end or any overspend will be drawn down from the reserve.

2.10 Due to the basis upon which de-delegated budgets are calculated, which is on the pupil numbers in maintained schools in the Autumn Term prior to the financial year it is going to be applied, unfortunately as schools academise the costs charged against the de-delegated funding will reduce but the budget remains the same. If at any point Schools Forum wish to review the balance on the Schools Health and Safety Building Maintenance Reserve this can be undertaken as and when required.

### **3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 If the health and safety tasks were delegated to the school (i.e. the LA does not organise them on the schools' behalf) then according to health and safety legislation the LA would still retain the overall responsibility that they are undertaken. Therefore the LA would need to monitor the schools to ensure that they are taking place. In the event that they do not take place in a timely fashion to the relevant standard, the LA has the legal responsibility to instruct the school to act and/or undertake the inspection and tests automatically and recharge the school. The LA may choose to add officer time to this recharge.

### **4. OUTCOMES/DELIVERABLES**

4.1. To de-delegate this funding will enable the LA to fulfil its statutory duties in relation to Health and Safety on maintained mainstream school sites.

4.2. Schools will receive an annual report in April/May including the schedule of tests for the academic year and names of the contractors who the LA have commissioned.

### **5. FINANCE COMMENTS (INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)**

- 5.1. Based on the latest Department for Education indicator data and known academy conversions the proposal would result in maintained mainstream primary schools de-delegating £0.176m and maintained mainstream secondary schools de-delegating £0.018m. Therefore, a total of £0.194m would be de-delegated.
- 5.2. For information funding the proposal would result in the delegation of an estimated £0.325 to academies. Therefore, the total amount delegated is £0.519m.
- 5.3. The funding delegated to academies would be passed on through the local funding formula through the “Basic entitlement” factor and then the total of the academies Individual Schools Budget Shares is recouped by the Education Funding Agency.
- 5.4. These calculations are based on a rate of £13.92 per pupil for both maintained schools and academies.
- 5.5. This proposal demonstrates value for money for maintained primary and secondary schools for the reasons outlined in paragraph 1.6.

**6. LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT COMMENTS (INCLUDING RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES, AND LEGAL, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS)**

- 6.1 The Schools Forum’s powers here derive from the School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations 2013 (“SEYFR”), made by the Secretary of State in exercise of powers under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and the Education Act 2002. The SEYFR came into force on 1 January 2014.
- 6.2 Chapter 2 of the SEYFR is entitled “Further Deductions and Variations to Limits Authorised by School Forums or the Secretary of State” and it contains regulation 12 of the SEYFR. Under regulation 12 of the SEYFR, on the application of a local authority the Schools Forum may authorise the redetermination of schools’ budget shares by removal of any of the expenditure referred to in Part 5 of Schedule 2 (Items That May Be Removed From Maintained Schools’ Budget Shares) [of the SEYFR] from schools’ budget shares where it is instead to be treated by the authority as if it were part of central expenditure, under regulation 11(4) (SEYFR, regulation 12(1)(d)). Part 5 of Schedule 2 of the SEYFR contains paragraph 33, which states:

Expenditure on insurance in respect of liability arising in connection with schools and schools premises.
- 6.3 Part 5 of Schedule 2 of the SEYFR contains paragraph 37, which states: Expenditure on the schools’ specific contingency.
- 6.4 Therefore, provided the proposals fall within the above legislation, Nottingham City Schools Forum has the power to approve the recommendations in this report. To be clear, that means the Schools Forum is to make the decision on whether or not to approve the recommendations in this report. In addition, by virtue of regulation 8 of the Schools Forums (England) Regulations 2012 only the representatives of the maintained primary schools and the maintained secondary

schools have a vote on this. Moreover, this power should be exercised lawfully. Provided the amounts sought through use of this power have been correctly and lawfully calculated, the exercise of this power will be lawful.

6.7 It should be noted that there is no equivalent power for the Schools Forum in relation to Academies.

6.8 The EIA shows an apparent negative impact on younger people identified if the proposal were not to be implemented.

## 7. **HR ISSUES**

7.1 There are no people implications arising from this report.

## 8. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Has the equality impact been assessed?

Not needed (report does not contain proposals or financial decisions)

No

Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached

Due regard should be given to the equality implications identified in the EIA.

## 9. **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION**

9.1 None

## 10. **PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT**

Nottingham City Council Policies:

- Statutory Testing & Inspection of Fixed Installations in Nottingham City Council Properties – Policy statement & Testing Procedures (October 2013 v 1.2b)

Legislation:

- The Schools and Early Years Financial (England) Regulations 2013
- The Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and associated legislation.

## APPENDIX A – EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### Name and brief description of proposal / policy / service being assessed

The purpose of this report is to ask Schools Forum representatives of maintained primary and maintained secondary schools to approve the de-delegation of the Building Maintenance funding in 2016/17

### Information used to analyse the effects on equality

	Could particularly benefit (X)	May adversely impact (X)	How different groups could be affected: Summary of impacts	Details of actions to reduce negative or increase positive impact (or why action not possible)
People from different ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Local Authority (LA) has a statutory duty regarding Health and Safety of maintained school sites. To ensure that the LA is able to carry out its statutory duty it has to on an annual basis request Schools Forum to approve the de-delegation of this funding.</p> <p>As the costs incurred by each school annually in relation to health and safety vary, this funding will be used to cover “peaks” and “troughs “ associated with the maintenance of maintained school sites. Any unspent balances at the end of the financial year will added back into the a sinking fund which has been set up to manage the peaks and troughs of expenditure. Likewise if there is an overspend the funding will be drawn down from the sinking fund.</p> <p>By implementing this proposal it will stop the likelihood of schools incurring budget pressures caused by having to fund health and safety maintenance costs in relation to their sites. If</p>	<p>The LA are recommending this proposal to reduce the likelihood of a negative impact on the pupils of maintained primary and secondary schools.</p>
Men, women (including maternity/pregnancy impact), transgender people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Disabled people or carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
People from different faith groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Lesbian, gay or bisexual people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Older or younger people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other (e.g. marriage/civil partnership, looked after children, cohesion/good relations, vulnerable children/adults)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

		<p>schools had to fund this and the costs were higher than they had budgeted it may require them to move resources from the education of their pupils to cover health and safety maintenance costs of the site.</p> <p>By retaining this funding centrally it will enable a consistent approach as to how money is spent pupils by resources not being taken away from the education of pupils in some schools and not in others.</p> <p>There are no staffing issues generated by this decision.</p>	
--	--	---	--

**Outcome(s) of equality impact assessment:**

No major change needed  Adjust the policy/proposal  Adverse impact but continue  Stop and remove the policy/proposal

**Arrangements for future monitoring of equality impact of this proposal / policy / service:**

**If this proposal is approved then no equality impact monitoring will need to be undertaken. However, if the proposal is not approved and the budget is delegated to maintained schools then the schools would be responsible and the LA would have no influence over the equality impact.**

Approved by: David Thompson Schools H&S Manager  
4 September 2015

Date sent to equality team for publishing: 4 September 2015