

Financial transparency of local authority maintained schools and academy trusts

Government consultation

Launch date: 17 July 2019

Respond by: 30 September 2019

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
Who this is for	3
Issue date	4
Enquiries	4
Additional copies.....	4
The response	4
2. About this consultation	5
3. Proposed new financial accountability measures... ..	6
4. Academy Self-Assessment Tool and the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS)14	
5. Annex A: Financial Transparency Comparison Table	15
6. Annex B: Consultation Questions... ..	24
7. Respond Online.....	42
Other ways to respond.....	42
Deadline.....	42

1. Introduction

1.1 We are inviting interested individuals and organisations to comment on proposed new measures that aim to improve transparency of the financial health of LA maintained schools.

1.2 The purpose of this consultation is to outline the current financial transparency arrangements for maintained schools, and to consider possible changes. In doing so, this consultation also outlines the current arrangements for academy trusts. While both academy trusts and maintained schools are now funded through DfE specific grants – the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for maintained schools and General Annual Grant (GAG) for academy trusts – current financial transparency arrangements are different and provide different levels of assurance. Current arrangements for academy trusts therefore provide a useful comparison against which to consider maintained schools. We believe that the current transparency measures used in academies are generally stronger than those in the maintained school sector, which is why this consultation will focus on using or adapting existing academy measures to help change and improve maintained schools' financial transparency and financial health.

1.3 We would welcome views on the new measures that we are proposing to implement across the local authority maintained schools sector, as well as any other changes to financial transparency that you believe would be of benefit to maintained schools or local authorities. We are interested to hear views from local authorities on whether you believe any of the new measures would constitute a New Burden on authorities and, if so, how much the cost would be. The department will assess the New Burdens issue as part of considering how to go forward after the consultation.

1.4 The questions we would like answers to are set out in a separate online survey. Please respond using this as other forms of response will not be so easy to analyse. Before you respond to the online survey questions, please read the rest of this document. You don't have to answer all the questions, but it would be very helpful if you would answer the initial questions so we can see whether you are responding on behalf of a particular type of organisation.

Who this is for

1.5 This consultation is for:

- Local authorities
- Maintained schools
- Any other interested organisations or individuals

Issue date

1.6 The consultation was issued on 17 July 2019.

Enquiries

1.7 If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact the team via email:

Lafinancialaccountability.Consultation@education.gov.uk

1.8 If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the DfE Ministerial and Public Communications Division by email: consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the [DfE Contact us page](#).

Additional copies

1.9 Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from [GOV.UK DfE consultations](#).

The response

1.10 The results of the consultation and the Department's response will be [published on GOV.UK](#) later in 2019.

2. About this consultation

2.1 Since the start of the academies programme there has been a significant focus on the financial transparency of the academy sector and the department has introduced a number of measures that have improved the transparency and accountability of trusts. It has been reported by a number of trusts that they feel more accountable for their academies' financial position, now that they are in the academy sector, than they did previously as a local authority maintained school. Transparency measures such as the requirement for them to publish independently audited accounts each year, with particular scrutiny on any related party transactions, provide public assurance of the financial health and probity of trusts.

2.2 Maintained schools, like academies, are funded by grant from the Department for Education (the Dedicated Schools Grant). Local authorities (LAs) are the accountable body for maintained schools and, in line with national frameworks and guidance set by the department, monitor and intervene in these schools to reduce the risk of financial failure or misuse of funds. Each local authority has a scheme for financing schools which sets out the financial relationship between it and its maintained schools, and the department publishes guidance setting out what is required or permitted in schemes.

2.3 The table in Annex A outlines current financial transparency arrangements for the academy and maintained school sectors. Current arrangements for academies are generally stronger than those in place for maintained schools. We recognise that many local authorities do a good job in overseeing the financial affairs of their maintained schools, but financial data collected in 2016-17 and 2017-18 showed that across England as a whole a larger percentage of maintained schools had an accumulated deficit compared to academy trusts, and the rise in 2017-18 continued to be higher in maintained schools. For this reason, we believe that there is a strong case to consider whether the current academy transparency measures can be adapted and successfully implemented across the maintained school sector, in order to strengthen the arrangements for maintained schools and so reduce the future likelihood of growing deficits or misuse of funds in those schools.

2.4 We recognise that some new measures may potentially create additional burdens on local authorities and schools, and we are including that aspect in the consultation. We will ensure that the benefits of any new measures introduced outweigh potential burdens on local authorities and schools.

2.5 This consultation outlines the measures we are proposing to implement. In identifying them, we have looked at the financial measures that are already successful in the academy trust sector. Where, following the consultation, new transparency measures are to be introduced, they will be implemented in the financial year 2020-2021.

3. Proposed new financial transparency measures

3.1 This chapter sets out proposals for what we might do to strengthen current maintained school financial transparency arrangements by bringing them more closely in line with the arrangements for academies.

3.2 Issue 1: Making public where local authorities are failing to comply with deadlines for completing assurance returns and financial collections

Background:

3.3 Local authorities, and maintained schools, are obliged to complete the following assurance returns and financial collections:

- Schools Financial Value Standard
- Dedicated Schools Grant

3.4 **Schools Financial Value Standard:** Schools complete the standard at the end of the financial year, with LAs submitting a signed Chief Financial Officer (CFO) statement of assurance to the department to show the number of schools that complied with the standard. For the financial year 2017 to 2018 0.20% of schools (29 out of 14,395) failed to complete/submit the SFVS. The 29 schools were across 11 LAs.

3.5 The Directed Revisions made in 2012 to the [Schemes for Financing Schools](#) make it a mandatory requirement for all LA maintained schools to complete the SFVS assessment form, other than in agreed exceptional cases – for example when a school is about to convert to academy status.

3.6 **Dedicated Schools Grant:** We require local authorities to provide an annual Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) assurance statement signed by the chief financial officer (CFO). This is a key statement that forms part of our overall management of the DSG. The assurance statements are issued on the 31st July to coincide with the closing and publishing of LA accounts. However, 32 LAs for the 2017-18 collection failed to submit their assurance statement before the deadline of 14th September due to late internal audit.

3.7 In addition to the assurance statements above, we think that we should consider compliance over a range of other annual returns to more closely replicate the ESFA approach to academy trusts. This would include the statutory funding returns such as:

- Section 251 Budget/Outturn

- Consistent Financial Reporting

3.8 We have reviewed the approach to late returns that the ESFA has adopted this year for the academy sector, whereby they publish (on GOV.UK) the names of trusts who are late in submitting more than 2 out of 4 annual returns.

3.9 We have considered whether it would be appropriate to publish the name of schools that failed to comply with the SFVS without a good reason. As local authorities are the accountable body for maintained schools, however, we think it would be more appropriate to consider publishing compliance data at a local authority rather than school level.

Proposal 1:

3.10 Following the same principle as with academy trusts, if a local authority fails to comply with more than two deadlines from the following collections, we propose to publish the name of the local authority on GOV.UK:

- School Financial Value Standard (SFVS)
- Dedicated Schools Grant CFO assurance statement
- Consistent Financial Reporting
- Section 251 Budget
- Section 251 Outturn

This should not involve any cost burden to local authorities.

3.11 Issue 2: Strengthening DSG annual assurance returns

Background:

3.12 Local authorities can withdraw delegation from schools for financial reasons or issue a notice of financial concern. We do not currently collect this information. The department publishes notices of financial concern it issues to academies on the gov.uk website. It would be possible to require local authorities to publish equivalent information on their websites; however, we cannot mandate the format or structure of local authority websites and in practice it would not therefore be particularly easy for the public to find the information.

3.13 Currently, local authorities recover funds from fraud investigations but only publish the number and value of reported cases, not the value of money recovered.

Proposal 2a:

3.14 We propose to collect the number of schools with suspended budgets and notices of financial concern through the existing DSG assurance statement signed by the local authority CFO at the end of the financial year. This will enable the Department to devote further support to authorities that report a high number of suspended delegations or notices of financial concern.

Proposal 2b:

3.15 We propose to add a new section to the DSG assurance statement that captures the amounts that LAs have recovered from investigating fraud. Monies recovered from fraud reported in different financial years would be reflected in the statement. The Department would analyse responses and request further details from local authorities that reported the highest incidence/value of fraud. Further details would include the nature of the case, including the steps the LA has put in place to prevent further misuse of the DSG. We would also challenge those that we think have not made sufficient efforts to recover the DSG.

We do not think that these small additions to the DSG assurance statement would place any significant cost burdens on local authorities.

3.16 Issue 3: Maintained schools are not required to provide local authorities with 3-year budget forecasts

Background:

3.17 Local authorities are required to maintain schemes for financing schools, which set out the financial relationship they have with their maintained schools. These cover areas such as the submission of budget plans, loans and deficits, and procurement rules. We publish statutory guidance which authorities must have regard to when determining or revising their schemes. We can only require them to incorporate specific wording, however, by making a directed revision.

3.18 The scheme guidance currently allows authorities to require multi-year budget plans from maintained schools. Some already do so, and others provide modelling software as part of their traded finance service; schools should in any case be making their own plans over several years.

3.19 We have recently introduced a requirement for academies to send us a three-year budget plan and we propose to extend the requirement to maintained schools in the form of sending a three-year budget plan to their maintaining authority.

3.20 We understand that schools will not have complete information on future levels of funding. This is no different to other parts of the public sector, however, and schools should plan on a range of scenarios. For example, it is usually the case that changes in pupil numbers have a greater effect on budgets than changes in overall levels of per pupil funding, and schools should therefore be considering the range of likely changes to their intake in future years and planning accordingly.

Proposal 3:

3.21 We are proposing a directed revision of the schemes for financing schools to make it a requirement for maintained schools to provide local authorities with three-year budget forecasts. Whilst this might take maintained schools slightly longer to complete than a single year forecast we believe that any costs associated with this would be more than recouped by enabling LAs to have early sight of emerging financial issues, enabling preventive action which is almost always less costly than remedial action.

3.22 Issue 4: Strengthening Related Party Transaction arrangements in maintained schools

Background:

3.23 Academy trusts must report all Related Party Transactions (RPTs) to ESFA in advance of the transaction taking place, using ESFA's on-line form. This requirement applies to transactions made on or after 1 April 2019. Since April 2019, all academy trusts have had to seek approval from the ESFA for RPT payments of more than £20,000 and all transactions below £20,000 must be declared. These changes avoid unnecessary administrative burdens to the sector whilst strengthening accountability and transparency. Any transactions with related parties, over a de minimis level, must be "at cost" (i.e. must not involve any element of profit).

3.24 The arrangements for reporting RPTs in maintained schools are not as stringent as those in academy trusts. The 2019-20 version of SFVS contains only two specific questions in relation to RPTs, so we believe that it would be appropriate to strengthen the arrangements to bring them more in line with what is asked of academy trusts.

Proposal 4:

3.25 We are making a number of alternative proposals for comment that could be added separately or introduced in combination with each other.

Proposal 4a: Making schools append a list of RPTs to their response to the new question in the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) about their arrangements for managing RPTs, so that the information goes to the local authority and can then be passed on to the department

3.26 This option is the least resource intensive for both schools and authorities, as the SFVS must be discussed and agreed by the Governing Body, so there should be little additional burden if a list of RPTs was attached to the completed SFVS. The local authority would then be in a position to analyse the RPTs submitted across all maintained schools, using this information to determine audit requirements.

3.27 We propose also to insert additional columns into the SFVS CFO Assurance Statement to request the number of RPTs and value for each.

Proposal 4b: Making a directed revision to the statutory Scheme for Financing Schools to require schools to report all RPTs, or RPTs above a certain threshold, directly to the local authority.

3.28 An alternative reporting option would be to amend the scheme for financing schools to require schools to report all RPTs, or RPTs above a certain threshold, directly to the local authority. The benefit of this option would be that local authorities would have immediate visibility of the RPTs as soon as they had been agreed, though it would be more difficult for authorities to police than if it was in the SFVS, which is an annual return with a set reporting deadline.

Proposal 4c: Making a directed revision to the statutory Scheme for Financing Schools to require schools to seek permission from the local authority to enter into RPTs above a certain amount.

3.29 Academies now have to gain approval from the department for RPTs above £20,000. To mirror this for maintained schools, we would amend schemes to require schools to seek permission from the authority to enter into RPTs above a threshold.

3.30 Issue 5: Maintained Schools internal audit is too infrequent

Background:

3.31 Schools are within the overall audit arrangements determined by the local authority's statutory section 151 officer (CFO). Authorities operate internal audit teams whose work is then relied on by their external auditors. Most audit plans use a risk-based approach with some themed audits.

3.32 We have learned in discussion with local authorities that the cycles for auditing-maintained schools vary a great deal and, in some cases, have fallen into disuse. Consequently, we think there is a case for action.

3.33 We would prescribe a minimum frequency of audit visits by making a directed revision to the scheme guidance.

Proposal 5:

3.34 Making a directed revision to the scheme guidance to require that every maintained school be subject to internal audit at least every 3 years.

3.35 Issue 6: Strengthening arrangements to help schools that are in financial difficulty

Background:

3.36 The scheme for financing schools includes a requirement for schools to manage their resources effectively to maximise pupil outcomes. LAs are also required to have a deficit and a surplus policy within their scheme for financing schools and monitor their schools' compliance with these. Across the LA schemes, there is a variance in the levels of deficit that trigger the submission of a recovery plan to LAs. There is currently no requirement for LAs to report to the department their actions to address financial difficulty and effective resource management in specific schools. We consider that this evidence base would help us to increase visibility of best practice across the whole schools sector, highlight any inconsistencies in LAs' approach and target additional support from the department. The department's monitoring of schools' financial health to date has included approaching LAs directly to find out more about their approach to managing schools' financial health. Since the end of 2018 we have also offered LAs the support of a school resource management adviser where they agree that this would help them to support or challenge schools. We have not specified thresholds of deficit that would lead to contact with the department. To ensure we work consistently with LAs, we consider that it would be helpful to clearly communicate to authorities a more structured approach at the beginning of the year.

Proposal 6:

3.37 To strengthen the arrangements to help schools in financial difficulty we propose that we should introduce the following measures, either separately or in combination:

Proposal 6a: Make a directed revision to the scheme for financing schools requiring schools to submit a recovery plan to their maintaining authority when their revenue deficit rises above 5%.

Proposal 6b: Collect information on the number of recovery plans in each LA through the DSG annual assurance return from the CFO.

Proposal 6c: Formalise the approach to working with LAs and include a request for high level action plans from some LAs:

- **Data-sharing and monitoring:** share published data on the school balances in each LA - highlighting the number and proportion with a revenue deficit of over 5% - and the available support from the department.
Share published data with LAs on their schools' financial, educational performance and pupil/school characteristics.
Timing: after publication of Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR) data
- **Targeted monitoring and support:** use of the above data and evidence-based requests for help from LAs to ensure support is focused where it is most needed (including school resource management advice) and challenge from the department where it is needed most.
Timing – throughout the year
- **Action plan and increased monitoring:** Request high level action plans from LAs in which the number or proportion of school revenue deficits over 5% is above a certain level. We would review the thresholds each year, but an example might be LAs that had more than 10 schools or more than 10% of their schools with revenue deficits of over 5% in the previous year. We would consider contextual information - such as the school balances in the LAs in previous years - when deciding the LA action plans required.
Timing: after publication of CFR data

3.38 Issue 7: There is not enough transparency when it comes to reporting high pay for school staff

Background:

3.39 Currently there is a disparity between public access to information on high salaries within maintained schools and academies. Salary ranges within the national pay framework are published annually in the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document – these apply to teachers and leaders in maintained schools and we know that the majority of academies tend to mirror these arrangements. Information on individual leadership salaries is collected annually

through the School Workforce Census and a national summary of salaries is published in the annual statistical release – however, the individual salary information is collected through the census on the understanding that it is not published at an individual level.

3.40 Academy trusts must disclose in their published financial statements information about each individual earning over £100k - specifically (i) their total FTE salary in £10k bandings, e.g. £100k - £110k, (ii) their job role and description and (iii) whether they are predominantly focussed on curriculum and education leadership or school business management leadership.

Proposal 7:

3.41 We propose that all LA maintained schools should be required to publish annually on their websites the number of individuals earning over £100K in £10K bandings.

3.42 Issue 8: There is not enough transparency when it comes to reporting maintained school income and expenditure

Background:

3.43 Local authority school accounts are part of the local authority statements of accounts that are published at a gross level for income and expenditure. .

3.44 While individual schools are not included on the LA balance sheet, individual maintained schools are required to produce annual income and expenditure statements, known as Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR), or else local authorities produce them on the schools' behalf. The department publishes all the information from CFR in a spreadsheet, but we believe it would add significantly to transparency if there were a requirement for individual schools to publish annually on their websites their latest CFR statements.

Proposal: 8:

3.45 We propose that all LA maintained schools should be required to publish annually on their website their latest Consistent Financial Reporting statement of income, expenditure and balances.

Academy Self-Assessment Tool and the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS)

4.1 There is one area in which arrangements for maintained schools are currently more rigorous than for academy trusts. Maintained schools are required to complete annually the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) - signed by the chair of governors and returned to the local authority. The SFVS comprises 29 questions in relation to value and governance, and with effect from 2019-20 it also includes a dashboard enabling schools to look at where they stand on a range of measures compared to similar schools. The SFVS has been designed with local authorities and schools to help schools in managing their finances and to give assurance that they have secure financial management in place. In 2018 we launched a similar tool for academies, the Self-Assessment Tool for academy trusts. This has been widely used by academies but is currently not mandatory. We said publicly in the SRM strategy published in August 2018 that we would consider making the use of this tool mandatory for academies.

4.2 We have now decided to make the Self-Assessment Tool mandatory for academies with effect from the end of the academic year 2018/19. This will ensure that there is no area in which we are requiring a weaker accountability of academies than of maintained schools.

5. Annex A: Financial Transparency Comparison Table

	Local Authority Maintained Schools	Academies
Accountable body	<p>LOCAL AUTHORITY = ACCOUNTABLE BODY</p> <p>Departmental frameworks, guidance and conditions of funding agreements apply at LA level. LAs are then responsible for setting local frameworks for their schools. Required to maintain <i>schemes for financing schools</i> (School Standards and Framework Act 1998).</p>	<p>ESFA = ACCOUNTABLE BODY</p> <p>Academies Financial Handbook (AFH) and conditions of individual funding agreements apply.</p> <p>The prime responsibility sits with the board of trustees, but the Secretary of State (SoS) acts as charitable regulator and this regulation is communicated through the ESFA's Academies Financial Handbook and conditions of individual funding agreements apply.</p> <p>The funding agreements set out the overall relationship with the SoS and provide for the AFH to detail financial management and governance the requirements. The AFH is effectively an appendix to the FA.</p>
Annual Accounts	<p>LA submits annual accounts at LA level. These do not contain any details relating to individual schools.</p> <p>Maintained schools, or LAs on their behalf, make annual Consistent Financial Reporting returns to DfE giving details of their income, expenditure and balances.</p>	<p>All academy trusts must produce an annual report and accounts in a format prescribed by the ESFA in its annual Accounts Direction and based on accounting standards which reflect their status as companies and charitable trusts.</p> <p>Academy trusts are also required to submit an annual accounts return, which the ESFA will consolidate into an annual Sector Annual Report and Accounts (SARA).</p>

<p>Annual assurance returns to Department</p>	<p>LA Chief Financial Officers submit signed annual assurance statement and notes to accounts. They gain assurance from schools via the schools financial value standard (SFVS) described below.</p>	<p>The accounting officer must complete and sign a statement on regularity, propriety and compliance each year and submit this to ESFA with the audited accounts. The accounting officer must also demonstrate how the trust has secured value for money via the governance statement in the audited accounts</p>
<p>Self-assessment</p>	<p>The ESFA requires all LAs to return a signed CFO statement to confirm the number of schools that have complied with the SFVS.</p> <p>For the 2017/18 cycle LAs had until 31/5/2018 to return their SFVS assurance statements to the ESFA.</p> <p>From 2019 to 2020 the SFVS is being updated to match the academy school resource management self-assessment tool.</p> <p>The new version of the SFVS is split into two sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A checklist, which asks questions in six areas of resource management to provide assurance that the school is managing its resources effectively. • A dashboard, which shows how a school's data compares to thresholds on a range of statistics that have been identified as indicators for good resource management and outcomes. 	<p>Academy trusts are required to submit Financial Management and Government Self-assessment (FMGS) in their first year followed by annual Accounting Officer value for money statements from there on.</p> <p>Tailored version of the revised self-assessment was developed this year for academies.</p> <p>The academy version of the school resource management self-assessment tool went live in September 2018 and is available here https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-resource-management-self-assessment-tool</p>

<p>Budget Setting and Monitoring</p>	<p>Our guidance states that the scheme of finance “should contain a provision requiring each school to submit a plan to the authority by a stipulated date showing its intentions for expenditure in the current financial year and the assumptions underpinning the budget plan. The provision may require the submission of revised plans throughout the year.”</p> <p>It also says the school’s formal annual budget plan must be approved by the governing body or a committee of the governing body.</p> <p>LAs may insert in their schemes a requirement that provisional budget plans be submitted by a certain date; but these should be differentiated from the formal budget plan which should not be required before 1 May.</p>	<p>Academies must set a balanced budget and must produce monthly management accounts which must be shared with the chair of trustees each month and other trustees at least six times a year</p>
<p>Forecasts</p>	<p>LAs submit annual forecasts of their planned spend on children’s services including schools. These are published in a statistical release.</p> <p>Our guidance for local authority schemes for financing schools states the LA “may require schools to submit a financial forecast covering each year of a multi-year period.” We ask LAs to consider and explain how forecasts will be used and to ensure requirements are “proportionate to need.”</p> <p>We don’t specify the timelines for forecasts or collect information on what is requested.</p>	<p>It is a requirement for academy trusts to submit three-year financial forecasts. The ESFA, using financial data supplied by trusts, is also generating wider improvements and delivering value for money for the taxpayer by working with trusts to support effective school resource management, three-year financial forecasting and developing buying hubs and national deals for all schools.</p>

<p>Audit</p>	<p><u>Internal Audit</u></p> <p>The LA will determine an annual risk-based audit programme by reviewing the SFVS. Therefore, not all maintained schools will be subject to internal audit each year. The period within which all schools would be audited at least once will vary between LAs.</p> <p><u>External Audit</u></p> <p>Maintained schools are allowed but not required to procure independent external audits. Maintained schools are included in the remit of the LA statutory external audit but will not be individually audited.</p>	<p>All academy trusts must have an audit committee or equivalent.</p> <p>Academies are required to have an annual independent external audit of their annual report and accounts.</p>
<p>Fraud prevention and reporting</p>	<p>Both academies and maintained schools have a duty to prevent and detect fraud</p>	
	<p>Both academies and maintained schools are required to have whistleblowing policies and procedures in place</p>	
	<p>The LA are required to report instances of fraud (no minimum threshold) to the ESFA on an annual basis via the assurance statement. They provide value and description of fraud and action taken to address the issue: they do not report amounts recovered Amounts reported in the last 5 years are:</p>	<p>The trust must notify ESFA, as soon as possible, of any instances of fraud, theft and/or irregularity exceeding £5,000 individually, or £5,000 cumulatively in any academy financial year. They are required to provide full details of the event(s) with dates, the financial value of the loss, measures taken by the trust to prevent recurrence, whether the matter was referred to the police (and if not why), whether insurance or the RPA have offset any loss. Amounts reported in the last 5 years are:</p>

Year	Total (£ million)
2013-14	1.7
2014-15	2.8
2015-16	1.6
2016-17	1.4
2017-18	0.5

Fraud definition – included in footnote in the CFO assurance statement.

“We define fraud as an intentional false representation, including failure to declare information or abuse of position that is carried out to make gain, cause loss or expose another to the risk of loss. We include cases where management authorised action has been taken, including, but not limited to, disciplinary action, civil action or criminal prosecution. Further information about fraud can be found in Cabinet Office guidance”

Year	Total (£ million)
2013-14	2.8
2014-15	1.0
2015-16	1.4
2016-17	1.1
2017-18	0.9

ESFA may conduct or commission its own investigation into actual or potential fraud, theft or irregularity in any academy trust, and involve other authorities, including the police. ESFA will publish reports about its investigations and about financial management and governance reviews at academy trusts.

ESFA also publishes guidance on reducing fraud in academy trusts. Trusts are required to refer to this and to the findings from ESFA’s investigation reports, as part of its risk management approach.

Proven fraud since 2012 totals £4.9m. This involved theft of money by a member of staff over a substantial period.

Last year the value of reported fraud committed against academy trusts was **£778,894** and the amount recovered by academy trusts was £429,681

Reporting of Related Party Transactions (RPTs)

The 2019-20 version of SFVS contains specific questions relating to RPTs:

Question 4: "Are business interests of governing body members and staff properly registered and taken into account so as to avoid conflicts of interest?"

Question 24: "Are there adequate arrangements in place to manage conflicts of interest or any related party transactions?"

Trusts must report all RPTs to ESFA in advance of the transaction taking place, using ESFA's on-line form. This requirement applies to transactions made on or after 1 April 2019.

From April 2019, all academy trusts have to seek approval from the ESFA for RPT payments of more than £20,000 and all transactions below £20,000 will be declared. These changes will focus on high-risk transactions, but will avoid unnecessary administrative burden to the sector whilst strengthening accountability and transparency. Any transactions with related parties, over a de minimis level, must be "at cost" (i.e. must not involve any element of profit).

Reporting on high pay

LAs are required to list the salaries of all senior officer posts by job title in their statutory accounts. They are also required to list the total number of salaries in pay bands from £50k.

Maintained schools are not required to publish salary levels

Academy trusts are required to make an anonymised disclosure of any staff earning over £60,000 in their annual report and accounts. It should be noted that this is a charity accounting requirement rather than something the ESFA has imposed.

Effective from the 2018/19 Accounts Return, academy trusts will be required to report the total salary expenditure, broken down into teachers, leadership, and administration and support. For individuals whose full-time equivalent emoluments exceed £100,000, the job title and role description should be disclosed per £10,000 bands; and whether the role is predominantly curriculum and education leadership, (e.g. improving pupil attainment and examination performance), or school business management leadership, (e.g. HR and facilities management functions).

Governance and personal liability

In all types of maintained school the governing body is responsible for selecting, appointing and holding the head teacher to account, and for overseeing the financial performance of the school and making sure its money is well spent.

Individual maintained schools have autonomy over the use of their budgets and their governing bodies are responsible and accountable in law and in practice for all of their schools' major decisions.

It is the overall governing body that in all cases remains accountable in law and to Ofsted for the exercise of its functions.

Academies differ in three key ways:

1. trustees have additional duties under the Companies Act, which reflect their parallel status as company directors, including acting in the public interest, exercising independent judgement and avoiding conflicts of interest.
2. trusts must appoint a senior executive as accounting officer who is personally responsible for the proper stewardship of public funds, including the securing of propriety, regularity and value for money. This is personal responsibility which cannot be delegated. These arrangements ensure that there is a chain of accountability for public money. This chain runs from parliament to the Permanent Secretary as Principal Accounting Officer, through the Chief Executive and Accounting Officer of the Education and Skills Funding Agency to each individual accounting officer of an academy trust.
3. Academies have a greater degree of flexibility in determining the make-up of boards (governed by their Articles of Association) and the prime responsibility for determining the suitability of individuals joining academy trusts rests with trusts themselves.

The Department's Governor's Handbook applies to both academies and maintained schools and sets out in detail the responsibilities and required high standards, behaviours and skills for all members of governing bodies.

Intervention and powers to remove governing bodies

- Local authorities can:
- Issue a notice of concern which may place restrictions, limitations and prohibitions on the governing body.
 - Require the governing body to appoint additional governors.

Where an academy breaches its terms and conditions the ESFA may issue a Financial Notice to Improve (FNtI).
 The ESFA can require a trust to dismiss an individual.
 If the trust refuses to act on such requirements the ESFA ultimately reserves the right to withdraw the academy's funding agreement.
 Because academy trusts are a charity, they are subject to intervention by the Charity Commission in certain circumstances

- Number of FNtIs issued (Total): 79
- Number of live FNtIs (Total): 42

	<p>- Suspend the delegated budget of a school.</p> <p>- Suspend a governing body and appoint an Interim Executive Board</p> <p>The DfE does not collect data on how often LAs use these powers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of FNtIs issued (since October 2013 – last 5 years): 76 • Number of live FNtIs (since October 2013 – last 5 years): 42
<p>Procurement</p>	<p>Both academies and LA schools operate within the public sector and are required to follow public sector procurement rules concerning free and full competition.</p>	

6. Annex B: Consultation Questions

About You

A) Please provide your name:

Neil Hardwick

B) What is your email address?

Neil.hardwick@rotherham.gov.uk

C) Are you responding as an individual, or as **part of an organisation**? (Circle)

D) What is your role?

Head of Finance - CYPS

E) What is the name of your organisation?

Rotherham MBC

F) What type of organisation is this?

Local Authority

G) Which local authority are you responding from?

Rotherham MBC

H) Are you happy to be contacted directly about your response?

Yes

I) How did you hear about the consultation?

ESFA Bulletin

Information provided in response to consultations, including personal data, may be subject to publication or disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want all, or any part, of a response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department for Education will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018, and your personal information will only be used for the purposes of this consultation. Your information will not be shared with third parties unless the law allows it.

You can read more about what the DfE does when we ask for and hold your personal information in our [personal information charter](#).

I) Do you wish for your response to remain confidential?

No

Proposals

Proposal 1: Making public where local authorities are failing to comply with deadlines for completing assurance returns and financial collections

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.2 - 3.10** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Local authorities, and maintained schools, are obliged to complete the following assurance returns and financial collections:

- Schools Financial Value Standard
- Dedicated Schools Grant

We have reviewed the approach to late returns that the ESFA has adopted this year for the academy sector, whereby they publish (on GOV.UK) the names of trusts who are late in submitting more than 2 out of 4 annual returns and believe similar measures could be used in the LA maintained schools sector.

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to publish the names of local authorities on GOV.UK who fail to comply in any financial year with more than two deadlines from the following collections: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ School Financial Value Standard (SFVS)▪ Dedicated Schools Grant CFO assurance statement▪ Consistent Financial Reporting▪ Section 251 Budget▪ Section 251 Outturn	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		

Comments

Proposal 2a: Strengthening DSG annual assurance returns: Collecting the number of schools with suspended budgets and notices of financial concern through existing DSG assurance statement

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.11 - 3.14** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to collect the number of schools with suspended budgets and notices of financial concern through the existing DSG assurance statement signed by the local authority CFO at the end of the financial year.	✓		

Comments

Proposal 2b: Strengthening DSG annual assurance returns: Adding a new section to the DSG assurance statement that captures the amounts that LAs have recovered from investigating fraud

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.11 - 3.15** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Currently, local authorities recover funds from fraud investigations but only inform DfE of the number and value of reported cases, not the value of money recovered

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to add a new section to the DSG assurance statement that captures the amounts that LAs have recovered from investigating fraud	✓		

Comments

Proposal 3: Requiring maintained schools to provide local authorities with 3-year budget forecasts

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.16 – 3.21** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Local authorities are required to maintain schemes for financing schools, which set out the financial relationship they have with their maintained schools. We have recently introduced a requirement for academies to send the department a three-year budget plan and we believe that this could be extended to maintained schools in the form of sending a three-year budget plan to their maintained authority.

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose a directed revision of the schemes for financing schools to make it a requirement for maintained schools to provide local authorities with three-year budget forecasts	✓		

Comments

This will enable us to ensure all schools complete a three year budget plan and identify future year issues earlier.

Proposals 4 (a,b,c): Strengthening Related Party Transaction arrangements in maintained schools:

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.22 – 3.29** of the consultation document before responding to these proposals. The three proposals are alternatives to one another.

Academy trusts must report all Related Party Transactions (RPTs) to ESFA in advance of the transaction taking place, using ESFA’s on-line form. This requirement applies to transactions made on or after 1 April 2019. Since April 2019, all academy trusts have had to seek approval from the ESFA for RPT payments of more than £20,000 and all

transactions below £20,000 must be declared. The arrangements for reporting RPTs in maintained schools are not as stringent as those in academy trusts.

Proposal 4a: : Making schools append a list of RPTs to their response to the new question in the Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) about their arrangements for managing RPTs, so that the information goes to the local authority and can be passed on to the department

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to make schools append a list of RPTs to their response to the new question in the SFVS about their arrangements for managing RPTs.	✓		
In addition, we would insert additional columns into the CFO Assurance Statement, to request the number of RPTs and value for each to be disclosed.	✓		

Comments

Would a lower threshold than £20,000 be more useful?

Clear, concise guidance for schools would be of great benefit.

Proposal 4b: Making a directed revision to the statutory Scheme for Financing Schools to require schools to report all RPTs, or RPTs above a certain threshold, directly to the local authority

1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to amend the scheme for financing schools to require schools to report all RPTs, or RPTs above a certain threshold, directly to the local authority.	✓		

Comments

Proposal 4c: Making a directed revision to the statutory Scheme for Financing Schools to require schools to seek permission from the local authority to enter into RPTs above a certain amount.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below. Please Tick (✓)

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to amend schemes to require schools to seek permission from the authority to enter RPTs above a threshold.	✓		

Comments

Proposal 5: Requiring maintained schools to be subject to internal audit at least every 3 years

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.30 – 3.34** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Schools are within the overall audit arrangements determined by the local authority's statutory section 151 officer (CFO). Authorities operate internal audit teams whose work is then relied on by their external auditors. Most audit plans use a risk-based approach with some themed audits. We have learned in discussion with local authorities that the cycles for auditing-maintained schools vary a great deal and, in some cases, have fallen into disuse. Consequently, we think there is a case for action.

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to make a directed revision to the scheme guidance to require that every maintained school be subject to internal audit at least every 3 years.	✓		

Comments

Additional funding to enable the local authority to undertake audits to all schools every three years will be required

Proposals 6 (a,b,c): Strengthening arrangements to help schools that are in financial difficulty:

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.35 – 3.37** of the consultation document before responding to these proposals. These proposals are additive, and we could implement all three together.

There is currently no requirement for local authorities to report to the department their plans for addressing financial difficulty in specific schools. Local authorities include both a deficit and surplus policy within their scheme for financing schools and monitor their schools' compliance with these. We have not previously collected information from authorities on the number of schools they intervene in but consider that this evidence base would help us to understand any variances in the level of support provided and target additional support from the Department.

Proposal 6a: Requiring schools to submit a recovery plan to their maintaining authority when their deficit rises above 5%

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to make a directed revision to the scheme for financing schools requiring schools to submit a recovery plan to their maintaining authority when their deficit rises above 5%.	✓		

Comments

The LA currently works with schools on recovery plans but welcome the DFE's recognition of this as a necessary part deficit recovery.

Proposal 6b: Collecting information on the number of recovery plans in each LA through DSG annual assurance returns from the CFO

1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose to collect information on the number of recovery plans in each LA through the DSG annual assurance return from the CFO.	✓		

Comments

As per question 6a this proposal will identify that the local authority are taking position action in working with schools that are in financial difficulties.

Proposal 6c: Writing to local authorities each year when the end-year data is published, specifying the threshold of deficit that would trigger contact with the Department

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
<p>We propose to formalise the approach to working with LAs and include a request for high level action plans from some LAs. This will be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing published data on the school balances in each LA • Use this data and evidence-based requests from LAs to ensure support is focused where it is needed • Request high level action plans from LAs in which the number or proportion of school revenue deficits over 5% is above a certain level. 	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>		

Comments

Proposal 7: Increasing transparency in the reporting of high pay for school staff

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.38 – 3.41** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Currently there is a disparity between public access to information on high salaries within maintained schools and academies. Salary ranges within the national pay framework are published annually in the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document – these apply to teachers and leaders in maintained schools.

Academy trusts must disclose in their published financial statements information about each individual earning over £100k - specifically (i) their total FTE salary in £10k bandings, e.g. £100k - £110k, (ii) their job role and description and (iii) whether they are predominantly focussed on curriculum and education leadership or school business management leadership. We believe that this measure should be introduced for LA maintained schools and would require them to publish annually on their websites the number of individuals earning over £100K in £10K bandings.

**1) Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below.
Please Tick (✓)**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose that all LA maintained schools should be required to publish annually on their websites the number of individuals (if any) earning over £100K in £10K bandings	✓		

Comments

Perhaps a lower threshold as £100,000+ salaries will likely not apply to the majority of the sector, perhaps there should be different thresholds for Primary and Secondary Schools, etc..

Proposal 8: Increasing transparency in reporting maintained school income and expenditure

Please refer to **paragraphs 3.42 – 3.45** of the consultation document before responding to this proposal.

Local authority school accounts are part of the local authority statements of accounts that are published at gross level for income and expenditure. While individual schools are not included on the LA balance sheet, individual maintained schools are required to produce annual income and expenditure statements, known as Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR), or else local authorities produce them on the schools' behalf. The department publishes all the information from CFR in a spreadsheet but we believe it would add significantly to transparency if there were a requirement for individual schools to publish annually on their websites their latest CFR statements.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the proposal below. Please Tick (✓)

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
We propose that all LA maintained schools should be required to publish annually on their websites their latest Consistent Financial Reporting statement of income, expenditure and balances.	✓		

Comments

New financial burdens on local authorities

Local authorities are invited to fill in the table below to indicate and quantify any new burdens they believe would arise from the proposals in this document. Please specify in as much detail as possible what costs you believe would arise and provide figures.

Proposal	Yes/No	Details and quantification of cost
2a		
2b		
3		
4a		
4b		
4c		
5		The resources required to undertake an internal audit of all schools will require additional funding.
6a		Whether the establishment of a Schools in Financial Difficulties contingency fund must be established from DSG in all local authorities to enable funding to be available to support maintained schools with exceptional costs to help expedite their recovery plan eg interim head teachers
6b		
Other proposals (please specify)		

Additional costs for schools

Respondents are invited to fill in the table below to indicate and quantify any additional costs they believe would arise for schools from the proposals in this document. Please specify in as much detail as possible what costs you believe would arise and provide figures.

Proposal	Yes/No	Details and quantification of cost
----------	--------	------------------------------------

3		
4a		
4b		

4c		
5		
6a		
7		
8		
Other proposals (please specify)		

7. Respond Online

7.1 To help us analyse the responses please use the online system wherever possible. Visit www.education.gov.uk/consultations to submit your response.

Other ways to respond

7.2 If for exceptional reasons, you are unable to use the online system, for example because you use specialist accessibility software that is not compatible with the system, please email or write to the addresses below and we will send you a word document version.

By email

- LAFinancialTransparency.CONULTATION@education.gov.uk

By post

LA Financial Transparency Measures
Department for Education
5th Floor
2 St Pauls Place
125 Norfolk Street

Sheffield
S1 2JF

Deadline

7.3 The consultation closes on 30 September 2019



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2019

This document/publication (not included logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit: www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to: Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries: www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download: www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: [DfE-00146-2019]



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk