FINANCE COMMITTEE CALL FOR EVIDENCE
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL: FINANCIAL MEMORANDUM

SUBMISSION FROM EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL

Consultation
Did you take part in either of the Scottish Government consultation exercises which preceded the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made?
1. Yes and comment was made regarding additional expenditure.

Do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM?
2. It is difficult to tell, given the necessarily summarised national picture as described in the FM. Where authorities may have atypical issues, such as a greater need to establish new provision to accommodate flexibility as required for providing 600 hours of early education and childcare, it is not possible to ascertain how this has been captured and ultimately will be addressed when allocating resources.

Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise?
3. Yes.

Costs
If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that these have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details?
4. Please see response to 2 above. In addition it is unclear which 5 models as noted in paragraph 76 were used for costing the 600 hours of early education and childcare, and so whether these would be relevant/meet the needs of our education authority. The original consultation exercise undertaken via COSLA referenced more than 5 models and councils were invited to provide alternatives.

Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM and projected over 15 years for each service are reasonable and accurate?
5. Difficult to ascertain given reasons noted above. However there are a few particular points we wish to note as follows:
   We suggest that it is better to use the number of pupils (school roll) as the basis of the calculation rather than the number of schools when determining the extent of additional administrative resources required (paragraph 55 with regards named person). There are many primary schools with larger rolls than secondary schools and needs should be better reflected.

6. In costing the 600 hours of early education and childcare the LFR returns have been used. It is noted that this will be based on the varying current position across authorities. It is not clear how the staff and other revenue additional costs noted in table 17 paragraph 70 have been determined other than as noted in
paragraph 71 that a range of exemplar models have been used for an increase of 125 hours.

7. Given the range of models, it would have been thought that a range of costs per year would also have been determined, but there is only one estimate per year provided. Has for example the average or maximum been used?

8. An assumption has been made that by local authorities secure around 40% of provision through independent, private and third sector partners. Again this will vary locally and for example is much lower in our authority.

9. There is not yet any information on proposed models of distribution of additional funding ultimately agreed, which councils would then be better able to assess if this meets their local needs in taking matters forward.

10. There is not much detail on how the total capital of £30m per year for 2014-2017 has been determined. Paragraph 83 notes some base metrics, but the starting point for each authority will be different based on existing capacity, potential development, availability of partnership provider places and model of delivery to implement the flexible 600 hours of provision agreed with stakeholders. It is therefore difficult to ascertain at a local level if the allocation of this will be sufficient to meet local needs.

If relevant, are you content that your organisation can meet the financial costs associated with the Bill which your organisation will incur? If not, how do you think these costs should be met?

11. As noted above, until the allocation of resources is made to councils it is difficult to comment.

Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the estimates and the timescales over which such costs would be expected to arise?

12. Please refer to above comments.

Wider Issues
Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom?

13. It is acknowledged that it was inevitably going to be a difficult exercise to cost. In general it captures the main head line costs. It is the agreement of the distribution of additional resources that will require finer detail.

Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs?

14. This is difficult to comment until the nature and details of any subordinate legislation is known.