



Centre for Policy Studies

FAIR FUNDING OR FISCAL FUDGE?

CONTINUING CHAOS IN
SCHOOL FUNDING

Nick Seaton

THE POINTMAKER



Centre for Policy Studies

FAIR FUNDING OR FISCAL FUDGE?

CONTINUING CHAOS IN
SCHOOL FUNDING

Nick Seaton

THE AUTHOR

Nick Seaton is an experienced school governor and chairman of the Campaign for Real Education (CRE). His publications include *School Funding: present chaos and future clarity* (Centre for Policy Studies, 1996), *A Brief Guide for Good Governors: how to get started and be effective*, ed. (CRE, 1992), *The Empire Strikes Back: the 'creative subversion' of the National Curriculum* (with David Marsland, CRE, 1993), and *New Gods for Schools: self, society and the environment* (CRE, 1998). His articles on education have appeared in *The Yorkshire Post*, *The Times Educational Supplement*, *Primary School Manager* and *Education Monitor* (Australia).

He is most grateful to everyone who has helped him in the preparation of this paper. Any errors or omissions, however, are his own.

Acknowledgements

Support for this publication was given by the Institute for Policy Research.

The Centre for Policy Studies never expresses a corporate view in any of its publications. Contributions are chosen for their independence of thought and cogency of argument.

© Centre for Policy Studies, June 1999

ISBN No: 1 897969 93 7

Centre for Policy Studies

57 Tufton Street, London SW1P 3QL

Tel: 0171 222 4488 Fax: 0171 222 4388

e-mail: mail@cps.org.uk

website: www.cps.org.uk

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
THE PREVIOUS SYSTEM AND THE GREAT DECEIT	5
THE GOVERNMENT'S REFORMS	7
REACTION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S REFORMS	10
CONCLUSIONS	12
APPENDIX A: HOW THE PREVIOUS SYSTEM WORKED IN SHEFFIELD	
APPENDIX B: TABLE OF LEA EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1998/99	

SUMMARY

On 23 June 1999, the Government published Funding Tables which are intended to show how government funding on education reaches schools and the proportion of funds which Local Education Authorities (LEAs) are holding back from schools.

The Centre for Policy Studies welcomes the Funding Tables, having campaigned for their publication since 1996 (when the CPS published *School Funding: Present Chaos and Future Clarity*).

However there are a number of serious concerns which need to be addressed:

1. **The Government has failed to deliver on its commitment to delegate 100% of funding to schools.** On 23 June 1998, the Secretary of State for Education and Employment, David Blunkett MP, wrote in *The Times*: 'We are extending financial delegation to 100% for all schools. The Tories proposed increasing it to 90%, then withdrew after some limited opposition.' The Funding Tables make it clear that LEAs are currently taking an average of 17.6% of schools' budgets for the year 1999-2000.
2. There are several flaws in the Funding Tables. In particular, **capital expenditure and capital financing costs are not included** in the tables; the total Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) allocation is not revealed; and the basis of the comparisons between the data for this financial year and the previous years is questionable.

3. The method by which funding is allocated to schools remains opaque. LEAs continue to have the right to retain funds which would otherwise be delegated to schools. LEAs are still able to set their own budgets before handing on what is left to the schools under their control: there are a total of 89 exceptions under which they are able to withhold funds.
4. The only constraint on LEA extravagance is the continuing publication of such Tables.
5. Direct financing of schools which enables schools to buy in the services they wanted – as in the case of the Grant Maintained Sector – has been shown to contribute to the raising of facilities and standards. While the publication of Funding Tables is welcome, this should not obscure the importance of delegating a far greater proportion of funds directly to schools.
6. Greater delegation of funds to schools remains a priority. The Secretary of State was right to set a target of 100% delegation of funds. He has taken the first tentative steps in tightening LEA extravagance. There is still much more to do.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Of all the money that is allocated to state schools, what proportion should be withheld by the LEA for the central services which it provides? Should it be 10%, 15% or even 20%?

In the financial year 1998-99, the proportion withheld by one LEA was 38.7%. On average, it was over 26%. For that year, the most recent for which figures are available, the funds held back by LEAs in England totalled £4.58 billion, out of a total schools budget of £17.55 billion. (These figures include capital expenditure and capital financing costs, in comparison to the Government's Funding Tables which exclude them). A full breakdown of expenditure for each LEA for the year 1998-99 is published for the first time in the Appendix B.

In the year 1998-99, the funds held back by LEAs in England totalled £4.58 billion (including capital expenditure and capital financing costs), out of a total schools budget of £17.55 billion

It must be a cause for grave concern that such a high proportion of funds is being withheld from schools. But what is even more alarming is the way in which such large sums of public money have been spent without any proper public awareness or accountability: there seems to be a continuing and wilful lack of clarity in the way in that funds are allocated to schools.

To its credit, New Labour appeared to be aware of the scope of the problem. In its 1997 Manifesto, New Labour promised that 'LEAs will be required to devolve power and more of their budgets to heads and governors'.

To the casual observer, it may appear that the Government has begun to carry out its pre-election promise. In May 1998, a year after New Labour took office, the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) published a consultation paper, *Fair Funding: Improving Delegation to Schools*. In January 1999, *The Financing of Maintained Schools Regulations* were placed before Parliament under Section 138(5) of the School Standards and Framework Act, 1998. Along with the Regulations, the DfEE has also published *Accompanying Guidance*, which sets out the new framework in detail.

Initially, the Government was proud to take the credit for its measures. On 23 June 1998, David Blunkett wrote in *The Times* that 'We are extending financial delegation to schools to 100% for all schools.' Again, in a press release on 23 September 1998, Estelle Morris claimed that New Labour's 'radical new proposals' meant that schools across England 'would now be able to have access to £1bn of [extra] delegated funding. This in addition to £13bn already delegated' in a 'new 100% delegation model for all schools which want it'. Estelle Morris also promised 'new annual tables of how much each LEA spends per pupil.' 'We will impose a cap where LEAs plan excessive spending on bureaucracy', she promised.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PREVIOUS SYSTEM AND THE GREAT DECEIT

Before examining the Government's new *Fair Funding* arrangements, it is necessary to understand how the previous system allowed LEAs to deduct as much as 40% of the funds provided primarily for schools. The routine was, and largely remains, as follows:

1. Central government first calculated and published an educational SSA for each LEA. This is a set sum allocated to each LEA according to a complex formula which is supposed to take account of the characteristics of the local population. In an article in *The Times Educational Supplement* on 11 June 1999, the General Secretary of the Secondary Heads Association, John Dunford, wrote that the SSA formula 'runs to 14 decimal places and is said to be understood by only two people in the whole country.'
2. After receiving the figure for their SSA, and depending on their local priorities, local councillors and their officials then decided whether they would stick to this figure, or add to it, or take some away for spending on highways or social services or whatever.
3. The LEA then decided a figure for its General Schools Budget. This covered the costs of primary, secondary and special schools, plus the costs of the LEA itself.
4. The LEA could then make deductions under two main headings: 'Mandatory Exceptions' and 'Discretionary Exceptions not subject to limit'. Both categories of expenditure were decided by LEA councillors and

officials and were intended to cover the costs of various centrally provided services (capital expenditure, special needs teaching, home-to-school transport etc.)

5. This left the 'Potential Schools Budget'. From this amount, the LEA could then deduct a third category of expenditure: 'Discretionary Exceptions subject to limit'. Up to and including the financial year 1998-99, this category of 'Exceptions' has been limited to 15% of the Potential Schools Budget.
6. When these three categories of 'Exceptions' had been deducted, the remainder, known as the Aggregated Schools Budget was the amount the LEA delegated directly to all its schools, out of which teachers were paid.

In the past, LEA officials, local councillors and even national politicians regularly claimed that LEAs were only allowed to retain up to 15% of their 'school budgets' for central services. This, however, was highly misleading as only deductions from the Potential Schools Budget were subject to this limit. But an *LEA had already had two opportunities to subtract sizeable sums from the General Schools Budget before this limit was applied.*

The lack of clarity inherent in the original system stifled constructive debate on school funding: parents, governors, teachers, the media and politicians were all reassured that the maximum amount of money that an LEA could deduct from schools was strictly limited. The reality was very different: in the last financial year, the total amounts which individual LEAs deducted from their General Schools Budgets varied from less than 14% to almost 39% (see Appendices).

Sheffield LEA was able to withhold 36% of its General Schools Budget for 'central services' in 1998-99

A graphic illustration of how the previous system operated can be found in Appendix A which explains how Sheffield LEA was able to withhold 36% of its General Schools Budget for 'central services'. Naturally, this level of retention has a direct impact on the performance of local schools. On 9 May, the *Sunday Telegraph* reported that the City's Greenhill Primary School, praised as 'truly outstanding' by Chris Woodhead, the Chief Inspector of Schools, faced a shortfall of £32,000 for the coming year and would have to make one teacher redundant.

CHAPTER THREE

THE GOVERNMENT'S REFORMS

To its credit, the Government's consultation paper, *Fair Funding: Improving Delegation to Schools*, correctly identified some of the main problems inherent in the previous system.

SOME STEPS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Under the Government's new arrangements, the following items will be transferred from LEA central services to individual schools:

- building repairs and maintenance;
- central support and ancillary services such as payroll management and financial advice;
- secondary school meals unless they are covered by an existing contract (primary schools will have the choice of whether or not they receive delegated funds for meals);
- advisory and inspection expenditure, unless it is part of an Education and Development Plan (EDP);
- some insurance costs, if schools apply for these to be delegated;
- library and museum services used by secondary schools (primary schools will also get a devolved budget for these services but they must use the library services run by their own or another LEA);
- special support for ethnic minority pupils, unless it is part of an EDP.

In addition to the above (commendable) measures, the Government has published Funding Tables which identify LEA expenditure under seven headings.

... BUT CAN DO MUCH BETTER

Despite the above improvements, questions must be asked about whether these changes really will give schools a better deal. Unfortunately, three main problems still remain:

1. The system remains, at best, opaque to head teachers, school governors, local politicians and the media.
2. LEAs will still be able to decide how much of their education budgets they choose to retain.
3. The Funding Tables are a commendable attempt to identify current LEA spending patterns but can be substantially improved.

Three main problems still remain

FUNDING REMAINS OPAQUE

While much of the terminology in allocating funding has changed (for the worse), the detail methodology for allocating school budgets is largely untouched.

General Schools Budgets will be renamed Local Schools Budgets (LSBs); Aggregated Schools Budgets will become Individual Schools Budgets (ISBs).

Nor is the figure for central government's Standard Spending Assessment included.

Moreover, all reference to capital expenditure and capital financing costs have been omitted. These can be substantial. In the case of Sheffield, capital financing costs for the year 1998-99 totalled £18.5 million.

LEAS WILL CONTINUE TO RETAIN FUNDS

Close study of *The Financing of Maintained Schools Regulations* shows that LEAs still have plenty of opportunity to retain funds which should be delegated to schools.

Schedule 1 of the *Regulations* has five headings under which LEAs may withhold funds:

- expenditure supported by specific grants;
- (some) special education provision;
- school improvement;
- access to education;
- strategic management.

There are many as 89 separate Exceptions under which LEAs can claim funds which would otherwise be passed on to schools

However, the *Regulations* also include no less than 11 detailed categories of 'Exceptions' under special education, 16 under access to education, and around 48 under strategic management. It has been estimated that there are many as

89 separate Exceptions under which LEAs can claim funds which would otherwise be passed on to schools. In every case, it appears that the LEA can decide the amount to be spent on the 'Exception', giving it a free hand to protect its own budget and services using funds that would otherwise be passed to the classroom. Furthermore, these LEA costs will appear in the new LSBs under the misleading heading of 'expenditure on schools' (they are of course expenditure by the LEA for its own services).

An additional category of 'non-school funding' is also to be included. Again, it appears that it is the LEA which decides the amount to be spent on these items. They include:

- education for under-fives including nursery schools;
- adult and community education; support for students such as mandatory/discretionary awards and student support under new arrangements;
- home to college transport (16-18);
- residual pension liability for FE, careers service etc;
- and youth service.

So although the new arrangements have removed the previous distinction between Mandatory and (two forms of) Discretionary Exceptions, they have followed the pattern of the previous system by introducing a new variant of 'Exceptions' from what was the Potential Schools Budget. These exceptions will now become 'non-school funding'.

CHAPTER FOUR

REACTION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S REFORMS

These new arrangements only began to take effect from April 1999, so it is too early to measure their overall effectiveness. But already the reaction of those most closely involved is more than a little hostile and disappointed.

MINISTERS, TEACHERS AND GOVERNORS ARE CONCERNED...

On 9 April 1999, the *Times Educational Supplement* reported that Ministers were 'worried' that the extra cash New Labour had allocated to education was not getting through. For the financial year 1999-2000, 46 councils were reported to be spending less than their SSA grants on education. Bradford and Oxfordshire had each retained more than £6 million from their education SSAs for other services. David Blunkett had written to 18 of the worst offenders, yet bizarrely, at least four of these – Dorset, Hertfordshire, Somerset and West Sussex – were complaining that Ministers were wrong: they had planned to spend more than the Government required. West Sussex claimed to be spending '£12.75m more than the Government guidelines'. Yet again, central government can blame local government and local government can blame central government, simply because the amounts for SSAs and any other central government grants will not be shown in the new LSBs for all to see.

Then, on 17 June 1999, at the Local Government Association education conference, David Blunkett said that ministers are 'considering ring-fencing councils' education spending to protect the £10 billion extra budget allocated for schools in 2001...There would be no point as a government in announcing large increases for spending on children and schools only to find that it went instead on roads or skating rinks.'

David Blunkett's concerns are widely shared by head teachers. On 9 May, the *Sunday Telegraph* reported that: 'Head teachers across the country say they actually have less to spend because the extra resources promised by the Prime Minister are being siphoned off by town halls'. Tomlinscote School in Surrey was reported to have a £190,000 shortfall in its budget, which would cause the loss of eight teachers. 85% of Surrey Schools were reported to be looking at budgetary shortfalls and head teachers in Bradford, Essex, Haringey and Sheffield had met to protest to their LEAs.

David Blunkett's concerns are widely shared by head teachers

Former Grant Maintained schools appear to be suffering most. Whereas under the previous Conservative administration, these schools were largely free from LEA interference with their budgets, their enforced return to LEA control is costing them dearly. Governors and former governors of Harrogate Grammar School in North Yorkshire have recorded that the school has lost £115,000 for 1999-2000 under just one budgetary heading.

A few weeks later, on 4 June 1999, the *Times Educational Supplement* carried a banner headline: 'No sign of extra money say schools'. Teachers' pay rises, increased pupil numbers, over-spending on special needs and changes to delegated funding formulas were all blamed. Cornwall and Leicestershire joined the list of LEAs already mentioned where schools were having problems. The chairman of Cornwall's Secondary Heads Association, John Shears said: 'We are struggling to understand why, when it seems the Government is announcing this money, we don't get it.'

'We are struggling to understand why, when it seems the Government is announcing this money, we don't get it.'

...WHILE LEAS SEEM HAPPY WITH THE REFORMS

When they were first announced, Sheffield LEA warmly welcomed the *Fair Funding* proposals. A council document claimed that 'The Education Directorate believes that the City Council should positively embrace the changes that are necessary to implement Fair Funding'. But if an LEA that had retained nearly £72m (or 36%) of its £199m GSB last year is welcoming the Government's proposals, this must raise questions about how effective the changes will be. How can such a profligate LEA square the circle and protect its bureaucracy, while still giving a fair deal to its schools?

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Ministerial claims that their 'radical proposals' will offer '100 per cent delegation' for schools that want it are disingenuous. The whole ethos of *Fair Funding* is to concentrate on 'Exclusions' from delegation, instead of encouraging or enforcing maximum delegation.

These reforms are not a 'cap' on bureaucracy as Estelle Morris has claimed. Schools will not necessarily benefit by as much as they should.

Nor is there added clarity in the system. It is almost certain that those LEAs wishing to obscure their profligacy will continue to do so.

In addition, there are several flaws in the Funding Tables. In particular:

- capital expenditure and capital financing costs are not included in the tables;
- the total SSA allocation is not revealed;
- and the basis of the comparisons between the data for this financial year and the previous years is questionable.

Finally, it must be remembered that previous government attempts to increase the control of individual schools over their own budgets – through, for example, Local Management of Schools and the introduction of Grant Maintained status – contributed significantly to the raising of standards. The present Government's *Fair Funding* reforms and the publication of the Funding Tables are welcome but fail to address the central question of school independence from red tape and local bureaucracy.

APPENDIX A

HOW THE PREVIOUS SYSTEM WORKED FOR A TYPICAL LEA – SHEFFIELD

In order to illustrate how the previous system worked, it is instructive to look at the example of Sheffield LEA. There, the LEA subtracted the equivalent of 36% of its education funds before passing the remainder on to its schools.

General Schools Budget	£k 199,424
Minus (a) Mandatory Exceptions	£k 41,736*
Minus (b) Discretionary Exceptions (not subject to a 15% limit of the PSB)	£k 14,208
Deduct (a+b)	£k 55,944 = 28% of the GSB
Leaving the Potential Schools Budget	£k 143,480
Minus Further Discretionary Exceptions (limited to 15% of the PSB)	£k 15,657 = 8% of the GSB -----
Leaving the Aggregated Schools Budget (the amount delegated to schools)	£k 127,823
Out of a General Schools Budget totalling:	£k 199,424,
the LEA is withholding in total (a+b+c)	£k 71,601 = 36% of the GSB
And delegating the Aggregated Schools Budget:	£k 127,823 = 64% of the GSB

*This amount includes £9.8 million for capital expenditure and £18.5 million for capital financing costs.

NOTES

'Mandatory Exceptions' typically included items such as capital expenditure and capital financing costs, plus the costs of education welfare, educational psychology services and statements of Special Needs. In Sheffield's case, these deductions totalled £41.7 million.

'Discretionary Exception's in this category were not subject to any limit. These included items such as home-to-school transport, school meals and milk and 'LEA initiatives'. Sheffield's figure under this heading was £14.2 million.

The figure remaining after the Mandatory Exceptions and Discretionary Exceptions not subject to limit was the 'Potential Schools Budget' (£143.4 million for Sheffield).

LEAs were then allowed to deduct 'Further Exceptions to delegation' (totalling £15.6 million for Sheffield), which, in this category, are subject to a limit of 15% of the PSB. These Further Exceptions usually included items such as management and administration, advisory and inspection services, library and museum services, peripatetic staff costs and some insurance costs. In Sheffield's case, these Exceptions amounted to a re-assuring 8% of the PSB. This was the percentage that was usually cited by LEAs and their supporters.

After these 'subject to limit' Further Exceptions had been deducted from the PSB, the amount remaining was the Aggregated Schools Budget. The ASB is the amount the LEA delegates for sharing out among all its schools. Three slices of the cake have been devoured by the LEA before the schools get any. In the case of Sheffield, these three slices amount to 36% of the GSB, leaving only 64% to fund all the City's schools and their teachers.

Note: these figures include
capital expenditure and
capital financing costs

APPENDIX B

LEA EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1998/99

Figures in £000s

	GSB 1998-99	ASB 1998-99	LEA SHARE	PER CENTAGE RETAINED	RANK
Wokingham	52,324	45,171	7,153	13.67	1
Medway Towns	78,476	64,418	14,058	17.91	2
West Berkshire	44,955	36,867	8,088	17.99	3
Merton	57,340	46,347	10,993	19.17	4
Southend-on-Sea	32,544	26,296	6,248	19.20	5
Warrington	73,737	59,039	14,698	19.93	6
Richmond	51,461	41,034	10,427	20.26	7
Suffolk	242,266	192,304	49,962	20.62	8
Solihull	85,799	68,075	17,724	20.66	9
Nottinghamshire	283,955	225,158	58,797	20.71	10
Torbay	40,319	31,903	8,416	20.87	11
Sefton	114,630	90,525	24,106	21.03	12
Hampshire	380,745	299,740	81,005	21.28	13
Bracknell Forest	37,284	29,329	7,954	21.33	14
Hillingdon	52,865	41,565	11,300	21.38	15
Lincolnshire	156,185	122,265	33,920	21.72	16
Portsmouth	61,282	47,889	13,393	21.85	17
Windsor & Maidenhead	44,981	35,144	9,837	21.87	18
Rotherham	105,832	82,652	23,180	21.90	19
Havering	85,744	66,874	18,871	22.01	20
Sandwell	123,667	96,236	27,431	22.18	21
Dudley	107,077	83,298	23,779	22.21	22
Southampton	76,883	59,675	17,208	22.38	23
Hounslow	91,914	71,225	20,689	22.51	24
Hartlepool	37,591	29,124	8,467	22.52	25
West Sussex	260,755	201,515	59,240	22.72	26
Telford & Wrekin	49,136	37,955	11,181	22.76	27
North Yorkshire	215,816	166,577	49,239	22.82	28
Sunderland	121,183	93,463	27,720	22.87	29
Isle of Wight	48,153	37,132	11,021	22.89	30
York	59,287	45,662	13,625	22.98	31
North East Lincolnshire	69,802	53,745	16,057	23.00	32
Bristol	134,855	103,745	31,110	23.07	33
Hertfordshire	351,665	270,356	81,309	23.12	34
Slough	30,907	23,720	7,187	23.25	35
Kent	352,445	270,191	82,254	23.34	36
Redcar & Cleveland	61,848	47,386	14,462	23.38	37
Stockton-on-Tees	78,161	59,868	18,293	23.40	38
Salford	88,464	67,742	20,722	23.42	39
Wigan	128,279	98,226	30,053	23.43	40
Brent	63,965	48,976	14,989	23.43	41
Knowsley	73,538	56,250	17,288	23.51	42
Worcestershire	175,267	133,945	41,322	23.58	43
Bath & NE Somerset	60,779	46,432	14,347	23.61	44
Thurrock	37,550	28,654	8,896	23.69	45
Harrow	77,276	58,962	18,314	23.70	46
Plymouth	97,335	74,266	23,069	23.70	47
Hull	103,125	78,681	24,444	23.70	48
Lambeth	64,660	49,288	15,372	23.77	49
Herefordshire	55,221	42,049	13,172	23.85	50
Leicestershire	218,593	166,088	52,505	24.02	51
Stoke-on-Trent	87,424	66,345	21,079	24.11	52
Northumberland	121,299	91,981	29,318	24.17	53
Oldham	106,606	80,807	25,799	24.20	54
Greenwich	113,520	85,900	27,621	24.33	55
Halton	54,117	40,904	13,213	24.42	56
Bedfordshire	135,407	102,333	33,074	24.43	57
Cheshire	264,125	199,603	64,522	24.43	58
Bury	66,052	49,869	16,183	24.50	59
North Somerset	69,306	52,321	16,985	24.51	60

**Note: these figures include
capital expenditure and
capital financing costs**

APPENDIX B

LEA EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1998/99

	GSB 1998-99	ASB 1998-99	LEA SHARE	PER CENTAGE RETAINED	RANK
Isles of Scilly	1,159	872	287	24.76	61
St Helens	75,242	56,602	18,640	24.77	62
Redbridge	105,170	79,079	26,091	24.81	63
Brighton & Hove	76,967	57,859	19,108	24.83	64
Walsall	95,711	71,928	23,783	24.85	65
Newcastle	102,477	76,977	25,500	24.88	66
South Gloucestershire	97,947	73,497	24,450	24.96	67
Oxfordshire	203,625	152,760	50,865	24.98	68
Rochdale	76,000	56,997	19,003	25.00	69
Lewisham	109,330	81,984	27,346	25.01	70
East Sussex	165,854	124,341	41,513	25.03	71
Somerset	167,292	125,401	41,891	25.04	72
Rutland	5,353	4,010	1,343	25.09	73
Darlington	36,429	27,228	9,201	25.26	74
Doncaster	127,157	95,039	32,118	25.26	75
Coventry	136,530	101,954	34,576	25.32	76
East Riding	121,492	90,715	30,777	25.33	77
Bournemouth	37,298	27,842	9,456	25.35	78
Gloucestershire	123,978	92,539	31,439	25.36	79
Reading	32,142	23,978	8,164	25.40	80
Middlesborough	61,067	45,532	15,535	25.44	81
South Tyneside	61,778	46,062	15,716	25.44	82
Sutton	52,649	39,235	13,414	25.48	83
Swindon	53,783	40,076	13,707	25.49	84
Northamptonshire	214,300	159,466	54,834	25.59	85
Dorset	119,812	89,119	30,693	25.62	86
Birmingham	455,194	338,420	116,774	25.65	87
Staffordshire	303,087	225,248	77,840	25.68	88
Surrey	280,458	208,275	72,183	25.74	89
Tameside	81,926	60,799	21,127	25.79	90
Norfolk	247,890	183,873	64,017	25.82	91
Warwickshire	167,185	123,878	43,307	25.90	92
Poole	32,412	23,989	8,424	25.99	93
Manchester	187,592	138,513	49,079	26.16	94
Cumbria	152,637	112,415	40,222	26.35	95
Bolton	105,113	77,285	27,828	26.47	96
Wolverhampton	98,743	72,543	26,200	26.53	97
Kensington & Chelsea	34,445	25,292	9,153	26.57	98
Shropshire	95,889	70,308	25,581	26.68	99
Wirral	133,067	97,538	35,529	26.70	100
Lancashire	432,648	316,358	116,290	26.88	101
North Lincolnshire	63,618	46,511	17,107	26.89	102
Hammersmith & Fulham	52,048	38,022	14,026	26.95	103
Kingston	40,313	29,433	10,880	26.99	104
Stockport	105,463	76,948	28,515	27.04	105
Waltham Forest	97,267	70,832	26,434	27.18	106
Hackney	86,018	62,450	23,567	27.40	107
North Tyneside	79,357	57,482	21,875	27.57	108
Liverpool	206,341	149,121	57,220	27.73	109
Devon	223,219	161,186	62,033	27.79	110
Croydon	102,609	74,029	28,580	27.85	111
Essex	295,015	212,747	82,268	27.89	112
Durham	200,913	144,424	56,489	28.12	113
Enfield	114,414	82,059	32,355	28.28	114
Kirklees	154,734	110,189	44,544	28.79	115
Blackpool	50,279	35,741	14,538	28.91	116
Nottingham City	101,766	72,231	29,535	29.02	117
Barking and Dagenham	83,495	58,978	24,517	29.36	118
Bexley	90,460	63,821	26,639	29.45	119
Leeds	315,271	222,290	92,981	29.49	120
Barnet	104,009	73,241	30,768	29.58	121
Ealing	98,117	69,052	29,065	29.62	122

Note: these figures include
capital expenditure and
capital financing costs

APPENDIX B

LEA EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1998/99

	GSB 1998-99	ASB 1998-99	LEA SHARE	PER CENTAGE RETAINED	RANK
Wandsworth	67,398	47,406	19,992	29.66	123
Cornwall	180,050	126,340	53,710	29.83	124
Blackburn with Darwen	61,703	43,203	18,501	29.98	125
Bromley	58,763	41,116	17,647	30.03	126
Buckinghamshire	165,367	115,424	49,943	30.20	127
Wiltshire	107,381	74,784	32,597	30.36	128
Westminster	63,115	43,932	19,183	30.39	129
Derbyshire	235,267	163,700	71,567	30.42	130
Calderdale	56,720	39,423	17,297	30.50	131
Islington	85,895	58,960	26,935	31.36	132
Luton	70,353	47,728	22,625	32.16	133
Leicester City	135,485	91,714	43,771	32.31	134
Tower Hamlets	128,484	86,720	41,763	32.50	135
Gateshead	82,461	55,591	26,870	32.59	136
Derby City	72,189	48,595	23,594	32.68	137
Bradford	210,536	141,116	69,420	32.97	138
Southwark	98,643	65,726	32,917	33.37	139
Trafford	70,445	46,763	23,682	33.62	140
Barnsley	86,271	57,268	29,003	33.62	141
Peterborough	56,556	37,525	19,031	33.65	142
Milton Keynes	73,297	48,527	24,770	33.79	143
Camden	79,249	51,934	27,315	34.47	144
Cambridgeshire	162,577	105,589	56,988	35.05	145
City of London	1,014	658	356	35.11	146
Haringey	109,061	70,675	38,386	35.20	147
Wakefield	137,759	88,468	49,291	35.78	148
Sheffield	199,424	127,823	71,601	35.90	149
Newham	145,382	89,123	56,259	38.70	150
Totals	17,550,175	12,965,534	4,584,641	26.12	
1997-98	16,711,367	12,438,062	4,273,305	25.57	
Increase on last year	838,808	527,472	311,336	0.55	