

# Department for Education & Skills Simplification Plan 2006/07

PHOTO REDACTED DUE TO THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OR OTHER LEGAL ISSUES



## Contents

Section	Page
Foreword	3
Introduction	5
The Department for Education and Skills	5
The Better Regulation Agenda: The Hampton Report and “Less is More”	6
DfES Simplification Plan – what does it cover?	7
Stakeholder involvement in the DfES Simplification Plan: The Bureaucracy Gatekeeper Groups	8
The DfES Efficiency Review	10
Value for Money/Initial RIA Framework	11
Progress against the Admin Burden target	11
Administrative Burdens Measurement and Reduction in the Public Sector	19
<b>Simplification Grid: measures to reduce bureaucratic burdens on:</b>	21 – 51
Providers of services to <b>Children, Young People and Families</b>	21
<b>Schools</b>	29
Providers of <b>Post 16 Further Education and Training</b>	36
Providers of <b>Higher Education</b>	44
<b>Cross-cutting</b> Simplification measures	49
How to submit Simplification Proposals	52
Annex 1: New Relationships with Schools	53
Annex 2: New Relationships with FE	57
Annex 3: full Final Report on the DfES Administrative Burdens Measurement Exercise (available as a PDF document on the DfES Reducing Bureaucracy website: <a href="http://www.dfes.gov.uk/reducingbureaucracy">www.dfes.gov.uk/reducingbureaucracy</a> )	-

## Foreword



As Minister for Better Regulation within the Department for Education and Skills, I am very pleased to introduce the Department's first Simplification Plan. The Plan pulls together all the significant initiatives within the Department which, together, will reduce the burden of bureaucracy on those working with parents, children and learners. The Plan will be published annually and will be the main mechanism for informing stakeholders about the Department's progress on this agenda.

I see this work as part of the Department's wider, strategic role of ensuring best value for money within the whole of the education and children's services system. Simplifying regulation, guidance and processes, reducing administrative burdens and, at the same time, rationalising the number of regulators, will all contribute to that.

The three independent "gatekeeper" groups of frontline practitioners that we've established play a valuable role in ensuring we continue to meet these objectives, by helping us reduce existing bureaucracy and advising how new policies should be developed in order to be as effective as possible, and to impose the least possible burden on schools, colleges and universities. They are crucial in allowing us to assess how change is experienced on the ground.

Frontline professionals are the most valuable resource we have in delivering our challenging agenda for improving the life chances of all children and learners. So, it is absolutely vital that we free them from the burden of unnecessary red-tape, to concentrate on teaching and delivering other frontline services. Over the past ten years, we have seen a major programme of reform in the education and skills sector, and a step change in investment. To make the very best of this programme and investment, we have been making major changes so that as much money as possible is devoted to frontline activities; and so that our systems are simple, and help rather than hinder the lives of our public service professionals. For example, since April 2005, we have put in place an integrated approach to the inspection of early years services that fall within Ofsted's remit, including: a common 3 year inspection cycle; consistent inspection reporting arrangements against *Every Child Matters* outcomes; and, single inspection events leading to a single

report where necessary. Early years providers now benefit from a common frequency of inspection, where education and childcare are offered as an integrated package.

But we need to do more. A key commitment in this Plan is our target to reduce by 25% the administrative burdens arising from the Department's regulations which impact on the private and voluntary sectors. We have also recently committed ourselves to a process of measurement and reduction of administrative burdens within the public sector.

We have also rationalised lines of accountability and reduced unnecessary bureaucracy within schools through our New Relationship with Schools programme. The intention is to streamline processes while simultaneously reinforcing schools' autonomy and increasing public transparency. We are also introducing a New Relationship with FE Colleges and Providers to reduce regulation and increase the autonomy and self regulation of institutions.

I hope that this Plan will signal our commitment to an ongoing programme of work which will simplify the working lives of all those involved in this field.

A handwritten signature in brown ink that reads "Bill Rammell". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style. The word "Bill" is on the left and "Rammell" is on the right, with a small gap between them.

**BILL RAMMELL**  
**Better Regulation Minister and Minister of State for Lifelong Learning,  
Further and Higher Education**

## Introduction

This is the first Department for Education and Skills Simplification Plan. It details all of our key proposals for reducing burdens on ‘front line’ staff working in the areas of education, training and children’s services across all sectors: public, voluntary, businesses and charities. There are proposals for whole system changes to free the workforce from administrative tasks and to allow more time to be spent on teaching and learning – for example through the New Relationship with Schools programme described in detail in Annex 1 – as well as proposals for change to administrative processes. Groups of stakeholders across all sectors have been involved from the outset in developing these proposals and in ensuring that implementation plans take account of how change will be experienced “on the ground”.

We intend to publish future proposals in an annual series of Simplification Plans, which will also report on progress against earlier proposals.

## The Department for Education and Skills (DfES)

The DfES is responsible for children’s services, education and lifelong learning for England. It also has wider responsibilities for a range of policies, some of which it shares with other Government Departments such as the Sure Start programme (shared with the Department for Work and Pensions).

The Department’s **aim** is to help build a competitive economy and inclusive society by:

- Creating opportunities for everyone to develop their learning;
- Releasing potential in people to make the most of themselves; and
- Achieving excellence in standards of education and levels of skills.

The Department’s **objectives** are:

- (i) Safeguard children and young people, improve their life outcomes and general well being and break cycles of deprivation.
- (ii) Raise standards and tackle the attainment gap in schools.
- (iii) All young people to reach age 19 ready for skilled employment or higher education.
- (iv) Tackle the skills gap.
- (v) Raise and widen participation in Higher Education.

For further information please see the DfES website [www.dfes.gov.uk](http://www.dfes.gov.uk). Here you can read information specifically about the Department including our departmental reports and our strategy. You will also find information about our Ministerial team; a Who's Who chart and details about how to contact us for general queries (See also How to Submit a Simplification Proposal, page 52).

## **The Better Regulation agenda: The Hampton Report and “Less is More”**

In the 2005/06 Budget, the Government announced a package of radical reforms to tackle the burden of regulation in the private and public sectors. Specifically, it accepted the recommendations of two independent reports, Philip Hampton’s report *Reducing administrative burdens: Effective inspection and enforcement*<sup>1</sup> and the Better Regulation Task Force’s (BRTF) report *Regulation - Less Is More: Reducing burdens, improving outcomes*<sup>2</sup> which were published alongside the Budget, and established the Better Regulation Executive (BRE) to take forward their implementation.

Implementation of the recommendations of both reports will reduce bureaucracy in the public and private sectors, and will involve: Government departments and agencies regulating only when necessary, and in proportion to risk; departments and agencies delivering year on year reductions in total administrative burdens faced by business; and, rationalising the inspection and enforcement arrangements for both business and the public sector. The Simplification Plan will be a key accountability mechanism for this programme of work.

DfES regulation impacts directly on only five areas of private sector activity. These are Early years (private nurseries, daycare, and childminders); independent schools, non-maintained special schools, repayment of student loans through payroll and the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority. Of these, the first is the largest and imposes the greatest burdens on the private sector. Outside of these, we are also aware of areas of the Department’s activity – such as FE and skills - which may impact on the private sector in the future. We intend to ensure that better regulation principles are applied to all of our proposals in these areas.

The Hampton Report will be implemented within the DfES mainly through the proposals to designate the Health and Safety Executive as the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority (AALA) later in this financial year. At that point, the AALA will cease to exist. DfES legislation also regulates inspection of independent schools and private nurseries and childminders.

### Independent schools

Independent schools are inspected as required by the Education Act 2002. Approximately half of the 2300 independent schools in England belong to an association affiliated to the Independent Schools Council (ISC) and are inspected by the Independent Schools Inspectorate, the inspection arm of the ISC. Ofsted inspect the remaining schools. The schools are currently inspected every 6 years to ensure that they continue to meet the Department’s standards in relation to quality of education and care.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hampton report available online at: [www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pre\\_budget\\_report/prebud\\_pbr04/assoc\\_docs/prebud\\_pbr04\\_hampton.cfm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pre_budget_report/prebud_pbr04/assoc_docs/prebud_pbr04_hampton.cfm)

<sup>2</sup> The Less is More report is available online at: <http://www.brc.gov.uk/publications/lessismoreentry.asp>

Inspection processes make use of management and performance information collected by the schools for their own use but the inspection of independent schools must strike a careful balance between reducing burdens and ensuring sufficient rigour to adequately protect all pupils in independent schools. Ofsted are currently consulting on a revised inspection framework which proposes that inspections are risk based with lighter touch inspections for successful schools. The revised framework would also introduce an element of self-assessment. It will be for the ISC/ISI to decide if those elements are appropriate for their member schools as it is for them to determine, as part of their accreditation requirements, what will be inspected over and above the minimum requirements under the Education Act 2002.

### Private nurseries and childminders

The Childcare Act 2006 has provided the opportunity to streamline the registration and inspection of childcare - private nurseries, childminders, etc. A single framework setting the standards against which early years provision is inspected will, from 2008, replace the different frameworks and inspection arrangements now in operation. Currently registered and approved childcare is governed by around a dozen sets of regulations which specify the legal requirements. All these are being reviewed and rationalised as part of the process for moving from the current system of childcare regulation to the new regime under the Childcare Act. A new voluntary Ofsted registration scheme will be introduced from April 2007, replacing two different schemes currently operated by the Department, and a recent consultation has proposed that only 10% of providers on this register are inspected each year - either in response to complaints or through a random sample. We are looking carefully at the responses to this consultation to determine what level of inspection would be a proportionate response to concerns about the risks to children.

### Government Public Service Inspection Strategy

While the Hampton review looked at inspection within the private sector, work within the public sector has been carried forward in parallel through the Government Public Service Inspection Strategy. The Strategy has been implemented within DfES through a programme of changes to inspection which involves enlarging Ofsted's inspection remit to cover a range of services for children and young people as well as life long learning for all. The new Ofsted will be operational from 1 April 2007.

Ofsted, together with relevant inspectorates, has developed proposals to reduce the new Ofsted's costs by about a third over the medium term, in line with the Chancellor's stated commitment in the 2005/06 budget and the Government's policy on inspection. The proposals are part of ongoing work to refocus, rationalise and reduce the work of inspectorates and will realise savings in the region of £80 million.

### **DfES Simplification Plan – what does it cover?**

We have structured the Simplification Plan into four areas: Children, Young

People and Families; Schools; Further Education; and, Higher Education followed by a section that looks at wider, more cross-cutting issues.

Some key areas covered by the Plan are:

Within Children's services (pages 21 - 28):

- The Information Sharing Index, which will enable the sharing of information held by all the relevant agencies supporting an individual, is expected to save practitioners' time to the value of around £88m per annum, starting in 2009.

Within Schools (pages 29 – 35):

- Streamlining of data collection/surveys for secondary schools is expected to save around £0.6m in terms of teacher and headteacher time.

Within Further Education (pages 36 – 43):

- Simplification of audit activity is expected to save Further Education Colleges around £8m annually.

Within Higher Education (pages 44 – 48):

- The Higher Education Regulation Review Group estimates savings will ultimately amount to around £15m per year for Higher Education Institutions when the concordat on data collection and quality assurance is fully implemented.

For Cross-cutting areas (Pages 49 – 51):

- We estimate savings of £62.3m over three years (2006-8) from the Department's E-strategy in terms of productive time, lower costs and re-use of resources for all front-line staff across the system as a whole.

## **Stakeholder Involvement in the DfES Simplification Plan**

### Private Sector

In the area of early years, we are able to raise issues with stakeholders through Ofsted's National Consultative Forum consisting of national provider organisations such as the National Childminders Association, the National Day Nurseries Association, the Daycare Trust, the Pre-school Learning Alliance and 4Children.

We are considering more formal mechanisms for engaging employers but at present such contacts are mainly tied into the consultative process.



More widely, the Department has established an Employer Programme Board to look at how employers are engaged in policy development. This reflects the fact that employers are critical to achieving a significant number of the Department's objectives and targets. The Board will oversee a project to:

- a. Make better use of our understanding of employers when developing and communicating policy to ensure we are responding to employers' stated needs and motivations.
- b. Strengthen our corporate policy towards employers, and develop a business plan to identify, prioritise and evaluate our work with employers across the range of our policies.
- c. Improve co-ordination of our engagement and communication with employers across the Department.

### Public Sector - The Bureaucracy Gatekeeper groups

The DfES has three 'gatekeeper' groups to look at the level of bureaucracy that is being imposed on the front line and to challenge existing ways of working with the front line and between agencies.

The Implementation Review Unit (IRU), which covers **Schools** policies and has a membership of heads, senior teachers and a school bursar, was launched in April 2003. It has been influential both in promoting the use of impact assessments for new and changing policies and in challenging and supporting policy officials to consider the practitioner perspective in the development of implementation plans in order to reduce any negative impact on the frontline. The Group has worked closely with the Department in developing the New Relationship with Schools programme and in other areas of policy. It has been, and will continue to be, a key influence in setting the direction of the Department's work in reducing bureaucracy in Schools. See [www.dfes.gov.uk/iru](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/iru) for further details on the Group.

There has been an independent **Further Education** (FE) gatekeeper group in existence since 2003. It has been a crucial element in promoting initiatives to reduce bureaucracy in the FE and training sector, both those already underway and the proposals contained in this Plan, and aims to encourage lasting change which will lead to a higher quality service. The current group, the Bureaucracy Reduction Group (BRG), was established in 2005 and has a wider more representative membership, and a wider remit than its predecessor. The BRG's guiding principles are: trust, accountability, simplicity and clarity and these principles are used to assess proposals for change. The BRG has developed an action plan to establish a clear vision, principles and actions to influence the sector to reduce bureaucracy from within and to deal with issues raised in the BRE report *Reducing Burdens in Colleges of Further education*<sup>3</sup>. A web-based communication platform will be

---

<sup>3</sup> Report available online at:  
[http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/regulation/reviewing\\_regulation/public\\_sector/projects/mad/fe.asp](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/regulation/reviewing_regulation/public_sector/projects/mad/fe.asp)

launched shortly but, in the meantime, see the *Success For All* website that contains 'Busting Bureaucracy' pages for more information:

[www.dfes.gov.uk/successforall/index.cfm?pg=110](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/successforall/index.cfm?pg=110)

The independent **Higher Education** Regulation Review Group (HERRG) was set up in June 2004 and has a mandate to review policies for their impact on higher education (HE) in England, explore existing areas of bureaucratic demand and recommend ways of doing things better. Its members are frontline practitioners, mainly Registrars and Directors of Finance from universities. HERRG has been the main driver behind the Concordat on Data Collection and Quality Assurance which is expected to deliver annual savings of £15m in terms of reduced bureaucracy for HE institutions. More information can be found at:

[www.dfes.gov.uk/hegateway/hereform/improvingregulation/index.cfm](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/hegateway/hereform/improvingregulation/index.cfm)

Bureaucracy in the children's services area is being addressed as part of a wider drive on simplification being directed by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) who announced the creation of the Lifting Burdens Task Force. The DCLG are directing this group at requirements that cause the most aggravation and add the least value to practitioners on the ground. This group will get under way in autumn 2006. In addition, Directors of Children's Services have regular meetings with DfES officials where issues around bureaucracy are raised and discussed.

As already mentioned, all the gatekeeping groups have been influential, within their own sectors, on the development of the initiatives contained in this Plan. They have also been involved in looking at the "user friendliness" of the Plan in terms of content and structure. It has been received positively by all the groups.

### **The DfES Efficiency Review**

Simplification plays an important part in the Department's Efficiency Programme: many of the initiatives described in this Plan contribute significantly to the Department's overall efficiency targets. It is clear that reductions in administrative burdens, and improvements, through streamlining, in the way that the education system is managed and regulated, are inextricably linked to the efficiency of the system as a whole. We expect our Efficiency Programme to deliver annual savings of £4.3bn over the period 2006-07, the majority of which will be recycled to the frontline.

An example of an efficiency measure which we expect to lead to reductions in the amount of time which frontline staff will spend outside of their core responsibilities for teaching and learning is the establishment of the DfES Centre for Procurement Performance (CPP). The CPP will work with schools, local authorities, Higher Education Institutions, Colleges and delivery partners to streamline procurement activities, improve skills, structures and processes as well as allowing better access to good deals on commodities where they exist in the system. While this work requires some initial investment,

anticipated savings will offset this many times in the longer term. For example, savings in 2006/07 are estimated at £972.5m.

### **Value for Money (VfM)/Initial RIA Framework**

DfES has aligned its VfM Assessment with Initial Regulatory Impact Assessment, providing a single framework for the assessment of costs and benefits and the impact of delivery of policies on the frontline. The assessment of all significant policy initiatives using this new approach will give us a broad baseline for ensuring that the overall burden on the frontline is considered and, where possible, reduced.

### **Progress against the administrative burdens reduction target**

In their report *Regulation – Less is More: Reducing Burdens, Improving Outcomes*, the Better Regulation Task Force (now the Better Regulation Commission) recommended to government that administrative costs on businesses, associated with central government regulations, should be systematically measured, and subsequently reduced. Measurement of the administrative costs has been completed, and the Department has set a challenging but achievable reduction target of 25% by May 2010. A copy of the PricewaterhouseCoopers final report on the measurement work is attached (Annex 3). The regulatory framework affecting each of the Department's business stakeholders was mapped, and each regulation was then broken down into its constituent information obligations (IOs) – pieces of information which businesses are required to provide to other individuals or bodies. These IOs were numbered to give them a unique identifier, and this numbering system is presented in the final report. The Standard Cost Model (SCM) was applied to each IO in order to give an indication of the annual cost to businesses of meeting these requirements.

In the SCM, the administrative requirement associated with every regulation is separately identified using the formula  $N \times W \times T$ , where N is the number of businesses affected by the requirement; W is the hourly tariff of those involved in meeting the requirement; and, T is the number of hours taken to meet the requirement in a year.

The regulatory frameworks that affect the Department's business stakeholders fall into five main areas: early years and day care settings; independent schools; non-maintained special schools and other settings with provision for special educational needs; repayment of student loans through payroll; and, adventure activity centres. As the final report of the measurement work shows, the indicative total administrative cost imposed by the Department is £345.3 million per annum.

The administrative burdens measurement exercise has also identified and captured the costs of activities that businesses would be likely to carry out regardless of the regulation measured being in place. These activities, and the estimates for the 'business as usual' costs they represent, could lead to distortion in the focus of our reduction efforts. The actual administrative

burden is the additional cost imposed by regulation, over and above what businesses would do anyway.

To ensure that our reduction strategy focuses on areas where regulation adds specific additional burdens, the Department took part in a cross-government process, developed by the Cabinet Office and agreed with business stakeholders, to identify those activities within our total administrative cost that might be classified as 'business as usual'. Using a pragmatic methodology to apportion the estimates captured by the measurement exercise, an independent panel of business representatives looked at the activities that make up 70% of our total administrative cost to consider the apportionment of 'business as usual' costs. It has been estimated that 32% of our gross administrative costs are 'business as usual' costs, so that the indicative net administrative cost imposed by the Department is £234.4 million per annum. To achieve its target of a 25% reduction by May 2010, the Department will need to put in place measures that will reduce administrative costs to businesses by £58.6 million per annum.

We will measure our progress in delivering the reduction through the Government's proposed Impact Assessment process (a revision of the existing system of Regulatory Impact Assessment). It is proposed that the revised assessment system will incorporate the SCM.

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	Reduction target (£m)
234.4	58.6

## 1. Early Years and Day Care Settings

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	% of DfES Total
138.7	59

Regulations associated with early years and day care settings represent 59% of the total administrative costs, and can be split into two areas.

First, the following set of regulations account for £64.1 million per annum, and are currently subject to major revision through the Childcare Act 2006, and associated secondary legislation and guidance:

- The Day Care and Childminding (National Standards) (England) Regulations 2003;
- Day Care (Applications to Schools) (England) Regulations 2003;
- Child Minding and Day Care (Applications for Registration) (England) Regulations 2001;
- Tax Credit (New Category of Child Care Provider) Regulations 1999;
- Tax Credits (Approval of Child Care Providers) Scheme 2005; and,

- certain relevant parts of the Children Act 1989 and School Standards and Framework Act 1998.

One of the key objectives of the Act is to simplify the current systems of regulation and approval, and, as secondary legislation and guidance is rolled out, we will, with Ofsted as the regulatory authority, look carefully at introducing more streamlined administrative processes, including:

- whether it would be possible to remove some obligations altogether;
- whether forms could be made easier to complete and some processes could be completed electronically; and,
- whether some information could be collected less frequently or from fewer businesses.

More specifically, the early years registration arrangements for providers will change from 2008. We will be changing the scope of the exemptions to Ofsted childcare registration so that not all childcare providers who are currently required to be registered will have to be registered in future. Instead, they will have the option of joining a new register, which will operate in a more streamlined way, without a regular programme of inspection. This will be particularly beneficial to forms of short term and occasional childcare, such as crèche facilities at shops and leisure centres, which are subject to the current system of compulsory registration. We estimate that changes to the scope of compulsory registration will reduce overall costs to the sector by about £1.4m, although some of these savings may be offset by additional requirements elsewhere in the new system.

We will be working with Ofsted on the application process for registration, both in terms of what information is required and how this should be provided. The Childcare Act 2006 provisions ensure that Ofsted does not have to collect duplicate information if a provider applies to more than one register (for example if they offer childcare for young and older children). Furthermore, Ofsted is working on new processes, so that childcare providers can apply and notify changes to them online, and these new procedures will include better arrangements for the face-to-face identity checks that form part of the checks carried out through the Criminal Records Bureau. We are not yet at a stage where we can quantify the benefits to providers of a more streamlined system of application and exchange of information.

Second, the Code of Practice on the provision of free nursery education places for three and four year olds 2004-2005 accounts for the remaining £74.6 million costs associated with early years and day care settings. Revised statutory guidance underpinning the free entitlement will be consulted on in 2008, and may provide the opportunity to reduce administrative costs. In particular, we intend to consider both the potential for combining a number of different reporting requirements on providers into a single and more efficient process, and the scope for allowing more local discretion in audit arrangements (removing another central requirement on providers). We will

also evaluate options for simplifying the ways in which information is given to parents on fees for additional services.

<b>Code of Practice on the provision of free nursery education places for three and four year olds 2004-2005</b>		
<b>Information Obligation</b>	<b>Total (Net) Costs (£m)</b>	<b>Action</b>
IO 41819: informing the local authority when a child leaves the nursery.	52.7	We will consider options for providing a model template for providers to use when they need to supply local authorities with information. This might represent a potential saving of up to £30.8 million per annum. This figure is based upon 241,000 providers having access to a template requiring no more than 30 minutes to complete for each of up to 10 'leavers' outside the normal end of term arrangements.

#### New childcare legislation - minimising new burdens

The reforms introduced by the Childcare Act 2006 will modify the relationship between private and voluntary sector childcare providers and their local authorities as well as between providers and their registration authority, which is Ofsted. Current regulations and statutory guidance will be entirely replaced, and a better regulation project has been set up within the Sure Start, Extended Schools and Childcare Group to monitor the net effect of new legislation and guidance, in terms of the overall burden on childcare businesses. Policy decisions will take account of the better regulation agenda, as well as objectives to ensure basic protections for children and to raise standards in childcare. The project team will ensure that the contribution this area makes to achievement of the Department's targets, for example the target to reduce administrative burdens, is maximised.

**Proposals identified could deliver £30.8 million of the overall target**

## 2. Independent Schools

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	% of DfES Total
44.1	19

Regulations associated with the registration and monitoring of independent schools represent 19% of the total administrative costs.

<b>The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2003</b>		
Information Obligation	Total (Net) Costs (£m)	Action
IO 1482: providing a copy of the complaints procedure.	4.5	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £4.5 million per annum.
IO 1480: providing a copy of the school's anti-bullying, welfare, and health and safety policy.	4.4	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £4.4 million per annum.
IO 17748: providing a copy of the complaint panel's findings and recommendations.	3.7	We propose that schools should only be required to make complaint outcomes available to view in schools. This will represent a potential saving of £3.7 million per annum.
IO 1501: providing a copy of a summary report following an inspection under the Education Act 2002.	1.8	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place inspection reports and details of these policies

		on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £1.8 million per annum.
IO 1315: providing details of the school's curriculum.	0.8	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £0.8 million per annum.
IO 1486: providing the number of formal complaints registered during the preceding school year.	0.8	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £0.8 million per annum.
IO 17651: providing DfES with a copy of the fire safety risk assessment.	0.7	We propose to amend the regulations to remove this requirement altogether, as recent changes in Fire Service policy cover fire safety in independent schools. This will represent a potential saving of £0.7 million per annum.
IO 1269: providing a copy of the school's policy on and arrangements for admissions, discipline and exclusions.	0.6	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access,



		make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £0.6 million per annum.
IO 1532: providing a copy of the school's complaints procedure.	0.5	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £0.5 million per annum.
IO 1481: providing information on academic performance for the preceding school year.	0.3	We propose to amend the regulations to allow schools to place copies of these policies on websites, or, for those schools or parents without internet access, make them available to view in school. This will represent a potential saving of £0.3 million per annum.

**The Education (Provision of Information Independent Schools) (England) Regulations 2003**

Information Obligation	Total Costs (Net) (£m)	Action
IO 17566: submitting a fire risk assessment relating to obligations under Part 11 of the Fire Precautions (Workplace) Regulations 1997.	0.0	Connects to IO 17651 (above). Savings as shown previously.

The proposals above cover areas where we believe it is appropriate for independent schools to self-regulate. In a mature market such as this, schools themselves are best placed to meet parental expectation.

**Proposals identified will deliver £18.1 million of the overall target**

### 3. Non-Maintained Special Schools and other Settings with Provision for Special Educational Needs

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	% of DfES Total
26.8	11

The highest cost IOs under specific parts of the Education Act 1996 are statutory requirements for children with special educational needs in all settings, and we have no plans to change this particular framework. The highest cost IO under the Education (Non-Maintained Special Schools) (England) Regulations 1999 is to ensure financial propriety of these schools (one of the conditions of a school gaining approval). We have no plans to change this. A number of changes to regulations are proposed in the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Administrative burdens will be an important consideration in the formulation of a new regulatory framework.

### 4. Repayment of Student Loans through Payroll

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	% of DfES Total
19.6	8

The Department reviews the effectiveness of the repayment system through regular meetings with employer representatives. For example, last year, we added a tick box to the P46 form to enable employers to start making deductions from employees straight after they commence employment. In the consultation around the Regulatory Impact Assessment that was produced, employers felt that this would reduce the administrative burden, as they would be able to set up student loan deductions when a new employee starts, rather than separately at a later date.

Generally, though, the student loans collection system is significantly tied up with the tax system as a whole. It was originally designed to use the existing system – so, for example, no new forms have been introduced. This means achieving reduction targets is very difficult without corresponding reductions in the burden of the tax system as a whole. We will continue to work with HMRC to identify any wider reduction in burdens that can also be attributable to student loans collection.

<b>Education (Student Loans) (Repayment) Regulations 2000</b>		
Information Obligation	Total (Net) Costs (£m)	Action
IO 41899: accounting for repayment of student loans in the same manner as deduction of income tax.	3.3	The changes to allow the P46 form to function as a start notice are expected to result in reductions in administrative costs to employers of between £0.1 and £0.3 million per annum.

**Proposals identified will deliver £0.1 to £0.3 million of the overall target**

## **5. Adventure Activity Centres**

Total (Net) Costs (£m)	% of DfES Total
5.2	2

The Government will designate the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) as the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority sometime in the latter half of the 2006/2007 financial year, and will transfer the sponsoring department role to the Department of Work and Pensions. HSE will then lead within government on this area of policy, including examining any associated administrative burdens.

### **Overall Departmental Progress to Reduction Target**

**Proposals identified will deliver £49.0 to £49.2 million of the overall target (representing 84% of the target)**

### **Administrative Burdens Measurement and Reduction in the Public Sector**

Between January and May 2006, the DfES carried out four pilot projects to test whether the methodology used in measuring the administrative costs of regulations impacting on the private sector could be applied to regulations impacting on the public sector. The main findings of that work, in very broad terms, were:

- that a much more complex delivery chain has consequences for the time taken to map administrative burdens in the public sector, which has very significant impact on the costs of measurement; and,
- that nevertheless the standard cost model (SCM) provides a reasonable methodology for measuring burdens once they have been mapped.

The DfES has concluded that to use the SCM cost effectively in the public sector, efforts should be focussed on areas where it is already known that administrative burdens are relatively high. DfES has now committed itself to a programme of measurement and reduction in the public sector with frontline stakeholders being asked to identify areas which impose the greatest administrative burdens.

## **Simplification Grid**

The following Simplification Grid contains the detail of our simplification workstreams. The Grid sets out briefly what the work strand is, the desired outcome for stakeholders and the cost savings.

### Stakeholder Irritants

For some of the measures within the grid, quantification in terms of cost savings is not possible at this stage, or cost savings may be minimal. However, we have decided to include these work areas because many of them have been raised by our stakeholders and we recognise that they are key stakeholder irritants. We therefore regard them as important strands of simplification work. Quantification will be covered for future years.

## Children Young People and Families.

Children, Young People and Families is responsible for delivering the Every Child Matters agenda. The aim is to ensure that every child has the opportunity to fulfil their potential, with no child slipping through the net. This is a step change in early years provision, with health education and social care closely integrated through Sure Start Children's Centres. As well as parenting support embedded at each life stage; schools that provide high standards and a range of extended services; multi-disciplinary teams based in universal services such as clusters of schools or early years settings. More support and a wider range of positive activities in and beyond school for young people and a shift to prevention while strengthening protection. Key stakeholders are children, young people and families.

Title and description of the initiative and how it will be delivered	Outcome (including sector(s) to benefit)	Source of proposal (stakeholder, department, EU, other)	Estimated cost savings and Regulatory Impact Assessment status where applicable	Milestones/deadlines for delivery
<b>Funding</b>				
<p><b>Voluntary and Community Sector Funding</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> The five grant programmes in the Voluntary &amp; Community Sector (VCS) – and the bureaucracy that this entails.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Funding Rationalisation for VCS.</p>	<p>Five existing grant programmes are brought together into a single programme – reducing time spent by voluntary organisations on bidding, monitoring and reporting.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>We estimate a potential annual saving of £12,000 for a provider currently administering 4 separate grants.</p> <p>Extrapolation of that figure gives an estimated total saving of around £428,000 per annum for the providers affected.</p>	<p>Takes effect from April 2006.</p>

<p><b>Funding streams paid to local authorities for children's services</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Burdens associated with monitoring, reporting on and auditing separate funding streams in Local Authorities.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Reducing number of funding streams paid to local authorities for children's services. We have agreed to pool 8 existing funding streams.</p>	<p>Local Authorities' work on monitoring, reporting on, and auditing separate funding streams will be reduced.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>Pilot evaluation reporting in October 2006 will allow us to begin work on estimating savings.</p>	<p>21 LAAs pilots have run between April – October 2005. A second phase of 66 LAAs began in April 2006 with a full national roll out from April 2007.</p> <p>National evaluation of LAAs is underway and will report to the Department for Communities and Local Government by the end of October 2006.</p>
<b>Information Sharing</b>				
<p><b>Information Sharing Index</b></p> <p><b>Current Problem</b> Practitioners encounter difficulties in contacting one another and sharing information about children and young people who need services.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> The IS Index will provide a tool to support better</p>	<p>It will support improved quality of information: better, more accurate and swifter identity and address verification.</p> <p>Increased effectiveness in earlier service delivery /intervention.</p> <p>Better operational and information management: more</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>The expected value of time saved by practitioners using an IS Index will be around £88m annually. This financial modeling is based on experience of developing local IS Indexes. This will take affect from 2009.</p>	<p>Spring 2006 - Local Authorities (LAs) identify an IS Index Project Lead.</p> <p>July 2006 - Index 'Data Trials' finish.</p> <p>Summer 2006 - LA 'Readiness Assessment' information collection begins.</p> <p>Jun/Jul 2006 – 'Readiness Workshops' with LA Index leads.</p>

<p>communication among practitioners across education, health, social care and youth offending and the Voluntary and community sector. The objectives of the index are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• help practitioners identify quickly a child with whom they have contact, and whether that child is getting the universal services (education, primary health care) to which he or she is entitled;</li> <li>• enable earlier identification of needs and earlier and more effective action to address these needs by providing a tool for practitioners to identify who else is involved with or has a concern about a child; and</li> <li>• be an important tool to encourage better communication and closer working between different professionals and practitioners.</li> </ul>	<p>robust MI and statistical data to assist planning and delivery.</p> <p>Improved use of data and improved information sharing practice - better capability to support service activity.</p> <p>Time and effort saved by practitioners, partly arising from the points above, allowing practitioners to devote more time to service delivery.</p>			<p>October 2006 - Implementation Toolkit available to LAs.</p> <p>October 2006 - 'Implementation Workshops held with LA Index leads.</p> <p>Early 2007 - IS Index 'full' Regulations in force.</p> <p>Summer 2007/Spring 2008 - First IS Index release deployed to local authorities.</p> <p>End 2008 - Expected availability of IS index to all LAs across England.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Planning				
<p><b>Children and Young People's Plan</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Requirements on Local Authorities to produce 19 different plans relating to children's services.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Local Authority plan rationalisation - introduction of the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP).</p>	<p>The CYPP is a new requirement that has introduced some new work for Local Authorities. However, as the introduction of the CYPP, was accompanied by the removal of the 19 other planning requirements (7 of these were statutory) administrative burdens overall will be reduced. We have also minimised the bureaucracy associated with the plan by removing any requirement for the plan to be approved by the Secretary of State. This has removed a lengthy and bureaucratic process for both central and local Government.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>RIA can be found at: <a href="http://www.dfes.gov.uk/ria/assessmentFiles/riaFile_62.pdf">www.dfes.gov.uk/ria/assessmentFiles/riaFile_62.pdf</a> Early pilots, which involved Local Authorities pulling together 4 statutory education plans into a single education plan indicated possible savings of between £28,000 and £91,000. There is good reason to believe therefore, that in the short term the production of the CYPP will be at least cost-neutral, with the potential for future savings as local authority expertise in joint planning develops.</p>	<p>The CYPP in place for all authorities April 2006, except for those authorities with a planning freedom by virtue of excellence under Comprehensive Performance Assessment.</p> <p>More information can be found at: <a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/strategy/voluntaryandcommunity/cypfgrant/">www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/strategy/voluntaryandcommunity/cypfgrant/</a></p>



## Childcare Act 2006

The annual costs to Government of regulating the early years sector are set to reduce over the next couple of years in line with the Chancellor's announcement in the 2006 Budget that the Government would be working with inspectorates to assess the scope for reducing inspection activity in order to achieve cost reductions of around a third in the medium term. The changes introduced by the Childcare Act and subordinate legislation will contribute to the reductions and simplification required to meet this target. In addition, the Act offers the opportunity to reform regulation and inspection in a way that reduces the administrative cost burdens imposed on childcare providers.

<p><b>The Childcare Act – reform of early years regulation and inspection</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Three regulatory and inspection regimes in place, one covering childcare for children aged 0-8, another covering education for 3 and 4 year olds, and a third covering school provision. Associated with these separate legal frameworks there are separate national standards documents for 5 different categories of childcare, each with separate guidance issued by Ofsted, a guidance document for those looking after 0-3 year olds (<i>Birth to Three Matters</i>), and</p>	<p>Under the provisions of the Childcare Act, early years providers in all sectors – maintained and independent (schools), private and voluntary – will be subject to a single quality framework, known as the Early Years Foundation Stage. The Early Years Foundation Stage package will replace the current national childcare standards and associated Ofsted guidance, the curriculum guidance for the Foundation Stage and the <i>Birth to Three Matters</i> framework.</p>	<p>DfES: the Government's Ten Year Strategy for Childcare – <i>Choice for parents, the best start for children</i>* published in December 2004.</p> <p>*visit: <a href="http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk">www.everychildmatters.gov.uk</a> for more detail.</p>	<p>A Regulatory Impact Assessment for the Childcare Bill can be found at: <a href="http://www.surestart.gov.uk/publications/?Document=1476">www.surestart.gov.uk/publications/?Document=1476</a></p> <p>The detail of the Early Years Foundation Stage is currently being developed in consultation with the sector. The final documentation will be given force by secondary legislation which will set out some of the detailed requirements. These will be accompanied by a full Regulatory Impact Assessment as will other regulations and orders that are required to implement</p>	<p>The Childcare Act 2006 provides the legal framework for the reform of regulation and inspection, but detailed requirements will be set through secondary legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Consultation on the new Early Years Foundation Stage concluded in July 2006. Following further development and a full assessment of regulatory impact, the final documentation will be published in the first half of 2007.</p> <p>Consultation on the secondary legislation and on the regulatory impact of that legislation, will take place during 2007, with the new system of early years</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>curriculum guidance for the Foundation Stage (for those delivering nursery education for 3 and 4 year olds).</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> The Childcare Act will introduce a single quality framework to replace the separate existing frameworks for childcare and education.</p>	<p>All provision for 0-5 year olds will be inspected in a similar way, replacing the multiple inspection frameworks currently in existence.</p> <p>Registration arrangements will be simplified and streamlined wherever possible, particularly for schools which will not be required to be registered unless they cater for very young children under the age of 3. Other providers (eg crèches providing short term occasional childcare) currently required to be registered will not be required to be registered in future.</p>		<p>the changes to the registration and inspection arrangements under the Act. Quantification of the benefits and costs to childcare providers, and an account of how these compare to current costs, will be included in this regulatory impact assessment work.</p>	<p>registration and inspection due to come into force in September 2008.</p>
<p><b>The Childcare Act – simplified registration and inspection of childcare for school aged children</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Childcare provision for children of school age is</p>	<p>The regulatory arrangements associated with the Ofsted Childcare Register will be more streamlined than the existing arrangements for under 8s childcare.</p>	<p>See above entry.</p>	<p>A Regulatory Impact Assessment for the Childcare Bill can be found above.</p> <p>A consultation on the detailed requirements of the new Ofsted Childcare</p>	<p>Consultation on the detail of the Ofsted Childcare Register: July to September 2006.</p> <p>Regulations and Regulatory Impact Assessment for the voluntary part of the register will be published early 2007.</p>

<p>covered by a variety of registration, inspection and quality assurance schemes.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> The Childcare Act will introduce a single Ofsted Childcare Register in two parts: compulsory registration for childcare providers looking after 6 and 7 year olds and voluntary registration for childcare catering for older children and those exempt from compulsory registration.</p>	<p>Providers will be expected to meet registration requirements to ensure the safety and security of children. Pre-registration visits will not take place as they do now. In addition, inspection will be risk based rather than part of a regular inspection cycle – reducing inspection to one provider in 10 per year from the current one provider in 3.</p> <p>A single register, operated by Ofsted, will be more straightforward for providers, and provide a simplified system for parents and their employers who wish to access the tax benefits available for those with childcare responsibilities.</p>		<p>Register included a partial Regulatory Impact Assessment and is available on the DfES consultations website. This will be developed into a full Assessment, following consultation, in conjunction with the associated regulations.</p>	<p>Voluntary part of the Ofsted Childcare Register will be introduced from April 2007.</p> <p>Compulsory part of the Ofsted Childcare Register will be introduced from September 2008.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Stakeholder Irritants

### **Differentiated Support and Challenge work**

#### **Current problem**

Lack of co-ordination in the provision of specialist support (through field forces/regional advisers) to local authorities, children's trusts and schools.

#### **Proposed solution**

Children's Services Advisers located in Government Offices will help co-ordinate and join up the delivery of specialist support to local delivery organisations. This will create a streamlined and improved coordination of individual engagements between field forces/regional specialist advisers and local areas. A review of the Department's field forces due to report in January 2007 will quantify the cost savings from the introduction of a more streamlined strategic network. A reduction in the number of field forces regionally and nationally will reduce the burden on local authorities and children's trusts.

## Schools

Schools policies are multifarious. For example they cover school standards, personalised learning, primary years, secondary years, school attendance, behaviour and discipline, school food, inspection, Special Educational Needs, Extended schools, Academies and Specialist Schools and more - the overarching aim is to raise standards and tackle the attainment gap in schools.

Title and description of the initiative and how it will be delivered	Outcome (including sector(s) to benefit)	Source of proposal (stakeholder, department, EU, other)	Estimated cost savings and Regulatory Impact Assessment status where applicable	Milestones/deadlines for delivery
<b>Funding</b>				
<p><b>Capital Schools Grant</b></p> <p><b>Current Problem</b> Schools having to bid for and seek approval to spend grant.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> We will pay devolved formula capital grant direct to Aided schools and remove the requirement to seek approval to spend grant (unless the total cost is over £1m for secondaries or £½m for primaries).</p>	<p>Reduced administrative burden for Aided schools.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>For the changes beginning April 2006, we estimate that this will save roughly 4 hours per year in either Headteacher or bursar time in every Aided school.</p> <p>Therefore for example: If we estimate the ratio of headteacher : bursar time in the ratio 1:3 and salaries of roughly £47/hr and £30/hr respectively savings would amount to around £585,000 per annum.</p>	<p>First phase (devolved formula capital) in April 2006; changes to other grants from April 2007.</p>

<b>Planning</b>				
<p><b>School Plan Annex</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Large amounts of paper work and form filling.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> School Plan Annex – a pre-populated single, electronic form for schools to apply for wider roles without having to duplicate information held elsewhere, such as the School's Plan and its SEF (the self-evaluation form required for inspection purposes). The annex will allow for cross-referencing to such other documentation and will be available to schools online. Schools will be directed to the website by the application guidance or prospectus for the programme.</p>	<p>Significant reduction in bureaucracy for schools by the removal of significant amounts of paperwork: there are 4 pages of the annex for schools to complete and each section is of fixed length. Forms currently used for such purposes are typically 60+ pages in length.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>Cost savings will depend on how many schools make applications via the annex. Tests of the annex by 30 schools applying for <u>one</u> programme in 2005 suggested a total saving for those schools of just over £28,000.</p> <p>If around half of schools were to use the annex – say 10,000 – this could amount to savings in excess of £9m per annum.</p>	<p>Annex live in 2006/07.</p>
<p><b>Surveys</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Existence of several disparate surveys collected at different</p>	<p>School Census termly collections will enable several pre-existing disparate surveys to be dropped.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>Secondary schools move to termly census arrangements in 2006. This has enabled the following collections to be</p>	<p>Changes to the School Census for secondaries only in 2006. Collections for all other schools will be in 2007.</p>

<p>times.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b>          Proposal to change the School Census data collection from yearly to termly.</p>			<p>dropped: (a) Termly exclusions survey (b) Youth Cohort Survey identification (c) Gifted &amp; Talented (d) September pupil count (pupil elements).</p> <p>As an estimate: the time taken in schools on each of these is as follows:          (a) 4.5 hours admin. officer, 1 hour head teacher (b) 1 hour admin. Officer (c) 1 hour Gifted &amp; Talented co-ordinator; 1 hour admin. officer; 10 mins head teacher (d) 0.75 hours admin.officer</p> <p>Using a figure of 3,600 secondary schools and using the hourly compliance costs from 2006-07 ONS compliance cost figures the total savings can be estimated at: £0.59m With around 18,000 primary schools, savings for 2007 are likely to be higher.</p>	
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>Education Bill</b>				
<p><b>Education Bill: Admissions</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Bureaucracy around Schools Admissions.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> The aim of the legislation is to: make it easier for schools to introduce admission arrangements that result in an intake representing a wider range of ability; ensure that fair admission arrangements approved for new and expanding schools remain in place unchanged for 3 years; make School Adjudicators' decisions on objections to admission arrangements binding for up to 3 years.</p>	<p>Benefits are mainly in administrative time savings currently spent in going through the existing statutory proposal process.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>As an estimate for the savings to changes on objections to admission arrangements, if there are 100 repeat objections every 3rd year (can object first year, cannot the second, can the third), in future there will only be a need for this, if at all, every 4th year (object first year, not second or third, can fourth), so costs should be 2/3 of before and we save 1/3. On this basis we estimate the saving will be £43,975 a year.</p>	<p>Timings for the Education Bill proposals: we expect them to take effect after the Bill has been given Royal assent November 2006.</p>
<p><b>Education Bill: Devolving powers to local level</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Bureaucracy placed on Local Authorities through the Secretary of State's powers of intervention. At present the Secretary of State has a</p>	<p>Reduction in bureaucracy by devolving powers to local level. This will affect both local authorities and central Government.</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>Roughly we do 30 scheme approvals a year. Based on our estimates of the cost of each one, this adds up to between £40,000 and £60,000 per year.</p> <p>We have 2-3 appeals against withdrawal of</p>	<p>As above.</p>



<p>number of miscellaneous powers of approval and intervention in respect of school funding policy. They relate to: determining appeals from schools following the withdrawal of delegation, approving changes to local authority schemes for financing schools, removing non-school members from Schools Forums following a complaint and to determine a date from which a new school must receive a delegated budget.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> To reduce bureaucracy on local authorities by repealing or amending a number of intervention powers that the Secretary of State holds currently.</p>			<p>delegation to investigate each year so this adds up to about £20,000 to £30,000 a year.</p> <p>Overall, therefore, we would make a saving of £60,000 to £90,000 a year once the provisions to devolve/repeal these powers have come into force.</p>	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

## Stakeholder Irritants

### **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).**

#### **Current problem**

The number of single year specific grants for schools - 10 separate grants – reduced flexibility.

#### **Proposed solution**

Introduction of multi year budgets for schools, supported by a guaranteed funding stream from the DfES to local authorities - the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). We will reduce the number of specific grants for schools, by bringing 10 separate grants into a single School Development Grant. The current commitment is to look at what further streamlining might be done in time for the introduction of revised school funding arrangements from 2008-09. But it's by no means clear at this stage what that further streamlining might look like. We will have a much better idea for next year's Plan.

### **School Improvement**

#### **Current problem**

Many communications with schools from different sources around school improvement.

#### **Proposed solution**

Challenge and support for school heads via a single channel of accountability - nationally accredited Schools Improvement Partners (SIP) appointed to every maintained school in England. Managed by the National Strategies (NS), DfES's delivery partner. SIPs are employed and deployed by LAs, with NS providing national quality-assurance of the programme and its implementation.

### **Data Requests**

#### **Current problem**

Overlap of data requests.

**Proposed solution**

Alignment of data gateways. Schools, CYPF, Communications and Connexions to review data requests on children's services. One gateway for all areas covering children's services. This will provide a reduction of the administrative burdens on front line staff. Alignment of the gateways is in its early stages - and starts in September 06. Estimate 6 months before we can determine reduction in burdens. No direct cost savings associated with the introduction of SIPs. However, greater efficiencies in school improvement system will be achieved because the SIP dialogue with the school replaces a variety of previously separate, fragmented conversations on individual aspects of school improvement from national and local sources.

Many of the simplification initiatives relevant to schools are part of the Departments key reform programme: **New Relationship with Schools**. The case study in **Annex 1** shows exactly how schools will be affected.

## Post-16 Further Education and Training

The core purpose of the FE sector is to equip young people and adults with skills, competencies and qualifications for employment. The key strategic challenges are to transform 14-19 education and to up-skill the adult workforce. Policies include developing functional and employability skills, specialised diplomas, apprenticeships, A-Levels, Train to Gain, helping those at the risk of disengagement and information, advice and guidance. Key stakeholders include Further Education colleges and training providers, Learning and Skills Council, the Quality Improvement Agency and the Sector Skills Development Agency.

Title and description of the initiative and how it will be delivered	Outcome (including sector(s) to benefit)	Source of proposal (stakeholder, department, EU, other)	Estimated cost savings and Regulatory Impact Assessment status where applicable	Milestones/deadlines for delivery
<b>Funding</b>				
<p><b>Planning and funding framework</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Existing planning and funding framework and audit arrangements are complex and do not encourage providers to respond to learners and employers.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> A simplified planning and funding framework as part of</p>	<p>Colleges and providers will be more responsive to the needs of adult learners. Different models for 16-19, adults and employers will reflect the different characteristics of these learners.</p> <p>Those colleges which perform best and contribute towards our targets will attract more</p>	<p>DfES/LSC through the White Paper but proposals will be informed by formal consultation in 2006/07.</p>	<p>Annual savings from curtailing Funding Audit are £14m, comprising £6m for the LSC, which has been recycled into provision, and an estimated £8m for colleges. This was offset by the £1.8m cost of the Interim Regularity Audit Statement. Replacing that with the annual statement of controls and governance will save a further £500k</p>	<p>Proposed consultation published November 2006.</p> <p>Consultation ends February 2007 following which final plans for the Demand Led System is published.</p> <p>Demand led system in operation from 2008/09 academic year.</p>

<p>the demand led system proposed in the FE White Paper. For the best performing colleges delivering priority activity there will be a light touch planning approach minimising audit burdens. Reduced audit activity in most FE colleges.</p>	<p>funding and benefit from a light touch approach. For 2006/7 LSC will replace the interim audit for most colleges with an annual statement of controls and governance by college Governors.</p>		<p>per year for colleges in staff time and audit fees. This gives a total estimated annual saving of £12.7m.</p>	
<b>Information Sharing</b>				
<p><b>Streamlining the relationship with providers</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Lack of co-ordination in and too many interactions with providers and a lack of clarity in the respective roles of organisations in the FE System.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> A New Relationship with FE providers*. The LSC will strengthen its strategic leadership capability at regional level and reduce its administrative effort at local</p>	<p>Each college or provider will have a single named strategic partner in the LSC. The strategic partner will co-ordinate the relationship and all discussions with the LSC and, for most providers, discussions will only take place twice a year once to agree the plan and once to review it. This will reduce the number of contacts and requests for information.</p> <p>Colleges and providers will in future have a</p>	<p>DfES and LSC following independent (Foster) Review of the Future Role of FE Colleges (report <a href="#">"Realising the Potential - A review of the future role of further education colleges"</a> published November 2005).</p>	<p>RIA for the FE Reform White Paper can be found at the link below.<sup>4</sup> Includes a strategic view of the costs and benefits. Impact assessments will be undertaken for each strand of the FE Reform programme by December 06.</p> <p>The LSC expect that less provider time will be spent in dialogue with the LSC, enabling a greater focus on front line delivery – we will be monitoring this impact over time.</p>	<p>The LSC Chair will advise on a new, streamlined non-executive accountability structure by autumn 2006.</p> <p>Single strategic partners will be in place by December 06.</p> <p>The DfES will reduce its staff working on the learning and skills sector by 325 between 2004 – 2008, and the LSC will reduce its staff by 1,100 by the end of 2006.</p> <p>Full QIS published autumn 2006.</p> <p>QIS fully operation April 2007.</p>

<sup>4</sup> [www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=21](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=21)

<p>level. DfES will concentrate on strategic leadership and policy formulation. The Quality Improvement Agency (QIA) will lead on quality improvement discussion and action planning with colleges supported by a single Quality Improvement Strategy (QIS) for the sector.</p> <p>Both LSC and DfES will streamline their organisational structures.</p> <p>* All elements of the <b>New Relationship with FE</b> set out in Annex 2.</p>	<p>single source of support on all quality issues.</p>			
<b>Inspection</b>				
<p><b>Reducing the impact and burden of inspections on providers</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Providers have overly bureaucratic and time-consuming inspections – in terms of number of visits, number of inspection days, and time spent preparing for them.</p>	<p>All providers (colleges and private sector) are inspected by Ofsted. The single inspectorate is able to bring together different inspections together into one visit more efficiently.</p> <p>Average number of inspection days per provider reduces by 30% (50% for good and excellent providers).</p>	<p>DfES, Ofsted</p>	<p>Inspectorate budgets reduced by 30% by 08-09, a total reduction of £13m on 03-04.</p> <p>All colleges prepare for inspection in different ways but there will be commensurate savings in colleges as fewer staff days are spent on inspection.</p>	<p>ALI/Ofsted remit taken forward by new Ofsted from April 2007.</p> <p>Budget reductions made by 08-9.</p> <p>Reducing impact of inspection from 07-8 (eg AAVs, short more focussed inspections).</p>

<p><b>Proposed solution</b> Reducing the average number of inspection days per provider, more so for good and excellent providers; relying on Annual Assessment Visits (AAVs) between inspections to flag potential problems and good practice; development of self assessment to identify performance; ALI/Ofsted merger ends joint inspections – single inspectorate.</p>	<p>Inspection visits are short, less intense, focus on management and leadership and capacity to improve. Notice of inspections is shortened, reducing the preparation burden on the provider and time required to deal with inspections.</p> <p>Annual assessment visits provide low input check of performance and quality.</p>			
<p><b>Streamlining and Rationalisation</b></p>				
<p><b>Transforming FE Sector Data</b></p> <p><b>Current Problem</b> A need for better use of data, greater control over demands, improved supply of data and a more efficient, effective and accountable service.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> i) a new FE Information Standards Authority (ISA) as a gatekeeper and</p>	<p>Improved quality and use of information in support of effective decision making by all stakeholders. (improvements in data relevance, consistency, timeliness and accuracy).</p> <p>Greater stability for providers and reduced bureaucracy across the FE system releasing time, resources and</p>	<p>DfES / The Foster Report.</p>	<p>Work on standards is still at an early stage, including an extensive stakeholder engagement stage – so no estimates of costs or savings are yet available.</p> <p>On data collection, savings to be confirmed but preliminary estimate that 400 – 500 Staff Unit Years can be released in colleges and providers fairly quickly ( i.e. there is a</p>	<p>Options paper completed 3 July 2006.</p> <p>Blueprint developed 11 August 2006.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement on blueprint due to be completed 4 September 2006.</p> <p>Decision to establish independently chaired ISA Board with key data user and data supplier representatives due 1</p>

<p>decision maker on data standards, collections and reporting.</p> <p>ii) A new Data Service to implement and deliver the agreed standards, collections and outputs. (Proposal subject to consultation).</p> <p>iii) Further reductions in information and data required by LSC for 2007/08 following MIAP principles (See <b>Cross-cutting</b> simplification measures for more information on MIAP).</p>	<p>energy for front line services.</p> <p>Improved accountability to customers for the quality of the service providing data and statistics.</p> <p>Easier data sharing between agencies on a “collect once, use by many” basis.</p>		<p>net time saving equivalent to 400 – 500 admin staff. However, these are not concentrated in, for example, one identifiable post per college).</p> <p>Different colleges do things in different ways. If we made a conservative estimate that one unit represents about £20k this could release up to around £9m.</p>	<p>September 2006 (likely to have interim DfES Chair).</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> ISA Board meeting by end-September 2006.</p> <p>Decision on options for Data Service (inc possibly external procurement) due end-Dec 2006.</p>
<p><b>Key Performance Indicators</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Many different indicators used to measure the success of learners and the performance of FE providers.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> A single set of standard performance indicators for all colleges and providers covering responsiveness, quality and finance. 7 key performance indicators will produce a single, overall</p>	<p>Simpler identification of quality for all stakeholders including learners and employers.</p> <p>The sector wide framework will bring together into a single set the myriad different measures currently used by different stakeholders to assess the same aspects of performance. The new PIs will mainly use data which is collected and analysed</p>	<p>DfES/LSC following sector wide consultation.</p>	<p>Savings will depend on design. The Learning &amp; Skills Council is consulting on the approach and definitions during summer 2006.</p>	<p>Framework for Excellence Consultation published July 06, closes on 20 October.</p> <p>Prototypes established – 2007.</p> <p>FE colleges will be using new indicators in Autumn 07 and they will in use for LSC planning in April 08.</p> <p>Other providers will be using the new indicators 12 months later.</p>



performance marking on a balanced scorecard basis.	by providers for their own planning an management purposes.			
<p><b>Qualifications</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Large number of qualifications and awarding bodies with different and complex administration.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> i) Rationalisation of qualifications with the introduction of Diplomas and Framework for Achievement.</p> <p>ii) Introduction of web-based system for qualifications administration and accrediting new qualifications, including a fast track process for organisations with a good track record.</p> <p>iii) Reduced monitoring and inspection related directly to risk.</p> <p>iv) Introduction of standard data definitions to be used by all awarding bodies, colleges</p>	<p>A streamlined qualifications system both in terms of numbers and types of qualifications and the associated administration will provide clarity within the system and will reduce the amount of time colleges and providers spend managing and administering it.</p> <p>Providers with a good record of qualifications delivery will be subject to fewer monitoring checks and there will be a reduction in multiple inspections by awarding bodies reducing the bureaucracy on centres.</p> <p>Colleges and providers will no longer need to keep data in different formats for different awarding bodies.</p>	<p>DfES/QCA. Some elements are UK wide with consultation led by the regulatory authorities for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland with awarding bodies and centres.</p>	<p>For low risk awarding bodies the time taken for accreditation will be reduced from the average of 8 weeks in 2004-5 to 5 working days.</p> <p>Work to measure the costs of centre recognition may form part of the public sector administrative burdens measurement exercise.</p>	<p>QCA expects that 80% of all provision will be covered in the fast track process by end 2006.</p> <p>New approaches to inspection trialled by start 07/08 and introduced more widely by 08/09.</p> <p>Data definitions: Phase 1 (simple data) consultation completed and rolled out spring 2006. Phase 2 (complex data) completed and rolled-out second and third quarters 2006.</p> <p>Roll-out standard centre recognition arrangements to begin autumn 2006 and be completed September 2007.</p> <p>Publish outcomes of the RIA on centre recognition project in autumn 2006. Implementation of centre recognition arrangements and sanction processes across UK in September 2007.</p>

<p>and providers for learners, participation, achievement, etc.</p> <p>v) Introduction of a standard process and requirements for “centres” (i.e. colleges and providers) to be recognised to deliver qualifications.</p> <p>vi) Employers put in the driving seat through SSCs and their Sector Qualifications Strategies which will simplify and streamline qualifications.</p>	<p>Agencies will be able to share data and thus reduce parallel collection.</p> <p>“Centres” will no longer need to supply similar information to different awarding bodies, or re-apply if using a different awarding body’s qualifications. Once approved, a centre would stay approved unless a quality issue arose.</p>			
<p><b>Learner identity</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Separate learner identifiers and systems currently used.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> DfES, LSC and QCA will lead sector partners to introduce a “Unique Learner Number” (through MIAP – see Cross Cutting section) to replace the many separate learner identifiers and systems currently used in the sector.</p>	<p>This will make data much more portable and help funding bodies, awarding bodies, colleges and providers.</p>	<p>DfES - long standing need identified in consultations.</p>	<p>Estimated up to £4.25m annual recurrent savings from quicker enrolment, easier identification of eligibility and tracking and reduction in double funding.</p>	<p>Trial underway with volunteer colleges, providers and awarding bodies in 2006/7.</p> <p>Full roll-out 2007/8.</p>

## Stakeholder Irritants

### Communications

#### Current Problem

Uncoordinated distribution of publications and consultation papers to providers.

#### Proposed solution

LSC to establish a single communications gateway for all documentation. Colleges and providers will only receive the publications they need or request. The cost savings will be estimated as part of an initial scoping study to be carried out during autumn 2006.

**Annex 2** details the Departments **New Relationship with FE** which underpins the reforms set out in the White Paper Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances.

## Higher Education

Policies in Higher Education aim to ensure access to a world class higher education system for all those with the potential to benefit, with an HE sector that is high-performing, diverse, improving and economically sustainable. Key Stakeholders are individuals and employers.

Title and description of the initiative and how it will be delivered	Outcome (including sector(s) to benefit)	Source of proposal (stakeholder, department, EU, other)	Estimated cost savings and Regulatory Impact Assessment status where applicable	Milestones/deadlines for delivery
<b>Monitoring, Funding and Quality Assurance</b>				
<p><b>Monitoring requirements, funding arrangements and Quality Assurance (via the Quality Assurance Agency)</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Monitoring and accountability burdens, bureaucracy around funding arrangements and the role of quality assurance in HE.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> To develop the risk assessment process to make monitoring proportionate to risk. Streamlining funding</p>	<p>Monitoring: Lower risk Higher Education Institutions to benefit from fewer monitoring requirements.</p> <p>Funding: HEFCE's aim is to review constantly its processes, programmes and funding arrangements, in order to eliminate any requirements which are no longer necessary and to try to simplify and consolidate the demands they make on the sector.</p>	<p>HERRG, HEFCE, QAA, Universities UK and the Standing Conference of Principals.</p>	<p>These measures and other minor changes will together bring about a cumulative reduction of 20% of annual administrative costs by 2008 i.e: around £42m at 2004 prices.</p>	<p>Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations with the HE sector carried out in 2006.</li> <li>• Pilot new arrangements late 2006 &amp; evaluate early 2007;</li> <li>• Draft revised Financial Memorandum (FM) for consultation by summer 2007.</li> <li>• New FM implemented for all HEIs in 2008.</li> </ul> <p>Funding: this will be delivered over the years 2005-2008.</p> <p>Quality Assurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Published revised audit</li> </ul>

<p>arrangements; and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) is consulting the sector about making improvements to the quality assurance framework.</p>	<p>Quality Assurance: The objective is for arrangements that will enable QAA to continue to provide the necessary assurance of quality but with a lighter touch and fewer visits for the best institutions. Higher Education Institutions will benefit from reduced burdens.</p>			<p>method in 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First QAA audit visits using revised, less burdensome methodology, January 2007.</li> <li>• Revised audit cycle (with less frequent visits to each HEI) 2005/06 – 2010/11.</li> <li>• Report from QA Framework Review Group on the impact, costs and benefits of Teaching Quality Information with recommendations to improve approach, October 2006.</li> <li>• Consultation about TQI for FE Colleges delivering HE by end 2006.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Concordat on Data Collection &amp; Quality Assurance</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Burdens around monitoring, inspection visits and demands for quality assurance information.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Concordat on Data Collection and Quality Assurance. Agreement has been reached on a concordat between HE</p>	<p>The aim will be that agencies and regulatory bodies would rely upon inspection and other quality data produced by each other. Higher Education Institutions will benefit from fewer monitoring or inspection visits or demands for quality assurance information.</p> <p>For data provision the aim would be to develop</p>	<p>Higher Education Regulation Review Group (HERRG)</p>	<p>HERRG estimated that better co-ordination of inspection and data collection in higher education could ultimately save at least £15 million annually, although some of these changes were already in the pipeline and had been taken into account in the overall savings above.</p>	<p>The Concordat launched May 2006.</p> <p>Informal review of progress with signatories by end of 2006.</p> <p>Formal review with all signatories in May 2007 and revision of their individual business plans for delivering the Concordat's principles.</p> <p>Additional organisations will sign up to the Concordat over the coming years; HERRG has</p>

<p>funding bodies, Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and other major bodies which monitor the quality of provision by or seek data and information from HE institutions, whereby the HESA would become the single source of base data and the QAA would supply basic inspection and quality assurance.</p>	<p>the role of HESA to meet all external demands for data and information. Higher Education Institutions will benefit from the elimination of duplicated and overlapping demands for data.</p>			<p>targeted those which have the greatest impact to join in the Concordat's first year (ie by May 2007).</p> <p>HERRG will review the situation after May 2007 and decide how to build further support.</p> <p>HERRG will report to Ministers following the reviews in May 2007.</p>
<p><b>Student Finance systems</b></p> <p><b>Current Problem</b> Inconsistency and lack of accountability in Student Finance systems for those applying for, receiving and repaying student support (including, in the future, HEI bursaries).</p> <p><b>Proposed Solution</b> Centralised student finance service with online applications and centralised assessment and delivery. Coordination of student funding applications with UCAS to reduce repetition</p>	<p>Responsibility for assessment and payment of student support will rest with a single delivery organisation instead of many different approaches by Local Authorities. Student Finance applications will be simpler and faster. Assessment and delivery of student loans will be more consistent and on time. Variation in student finance applications and delivery will be reduced. New technology and</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>As the work is centralised and assessment function is removed from Local Authorities - by financial year 2010 -11 £20m per annum should be released from bureaucracy to spend on other priorities.</p>	<p>A 2 year pilot programme is running from 2006-2008. All new students applying for entry to HE in 2009/10 will do so through the new transformed service.</p>

and duplication of information.	centralised assessment will provide more efficient use of resources and realise real cost savings.			
---------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

### Stakeholder Irritants

#### **Bursaries – data sharing**

##### **Current problem**

Administrative impact of delivering bursaries.

##### **Proposed solution**

The Education (Supply of Student Information to Governing Bodies) Regulations 2006 will enable the Student Loans Company, LEAs and the Secretary of State to share with a student's HEI (with the student and/ or sponsor's permission) information that the student or their sponsor provide in connection with the student's application for support, specifically for the purpose of administering bursaries or scholarships. This will reduce the administrative impact (on HEIs, students and their parents/sponsors) of delivering bursaries by giving HEIs the option of accessing from the student support system information they need to administer their bursaries and avoiding the need to approach students directly. The cost savings for any single HEI are quite small, will vary according to their particular administrative arrangements and there is no requirement for an HEI to use this arrangement, so the saving to the sector is unquantifiable. But these regulations meet a political commitment to keep to a minimum the administrative costs of delivering bursaries for HEIs and removes a potential duplication of information requests to students and their parents/sponsors.

#### **Leasehold Reform Act**

##### **Current problem**

The need for Government consent to the imposition of restrictive covenants by universities when they sell land.

**Proposed solution**

A clause in the Education Bill will remove the requirement for university bodies to seek the consent of the Secretary of State to the imposition of restrictive covenants under section 29 of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967. It is also proposed that this amendment will apply in relation to Wales.

This will reduce the bureaucratic burdens placed on university bodies, as well as the burdens and expense placed on tenants of making representations to the Secretary of State or National Assembly for Wales as to why consent should not be given. This solution is unquantifiable, as it is not known what land sales HEIs might want to make and the actual administrative costs would vary according to the complexity of the transaction and the number of purchasers of any land being sold off. Again, however, it demonstrates the Government intent to give HEIs the maximum freedom to govern themselves, without petty and unnecessary external controls.

**University Governance**

**Current problem**

Universities need Government approval to make minor changes to their instruments of governance.

**Proposed solution**

Deregulating University Governance. To reduce the issues within their governance documents for which universities must seek Privy Council approval for changes to the absolute minimum required to safeguard the quality of UK university education. The current position is that all changes to Charters and Statutes or Instruments and Articles of Governance have to be approved by the Privy Council. However, institutions are now being encouraged to simplify their governing documents and remove provisions with no public interest into Ordinances, Rules or Bye-Laws. This will give institutions more autonomy to change their own governance arrangements. The Minister has set the parameters for what are key public principles which must remain in governance documents and which may be removed. Again, this measure is unquantifiable, as it is not known what changes HEIs might want to make and the administrative costs of seeking Privy Council approval are not significant, but is an important demonstration of intent to free HEIs from unnecessary control by Government and it will enable changes agreed by Councils to be implemented more quickly and flexibly.



## Cross-cutting Simplification measures

### Information and Communications Technologies

The use of ICT is a fundamental element of our simplified relationships with different aspects of education. The DfES is pushing forward three major strands of work which will ease administrative burdens: the DfES e-strategy, Managing Information Across Partners (MIAP), and work in connection with Schools and ICT.

Title and description of the initiative and how it will be delivered	Outcome (including sector(s) to benefit)	Source of proposal (stakeholder, department, EU, other)	Estimated cost savings and Regulatory Impact Assessment status where applicable	Milestones/deadlines for delivery
<p><b>The DfES E-strategy.</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> Use of ICT resources in teaching not quite joined up.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> The e-strategy is an integrated and holistic view of ICT across the whole of DfES services and policies. There are four objectives to this strategy: transforming teaching &amp; learning; engaging hard to</p>	<p>The strategy focuses on what technology can do for informing and advising citizens, for supporting children &amp; learners of all ages in their encounter 'with the system', and for transforming the 'ICT experience' - all of which are user-centric and which are about freeing up time through effective deployment of technology be that in</p>	<p>DfES</p>	<p>Cash savings of £62.3m in productive time, reduced costs and re-use of resources over three years 2005-6 to 2007-8.</p> <p>An initial RIA was undertaken ahead of the publication of the strategy in March 2005. No issues resulting directly from the strategy that are likely to be burdensome to businesses, charities or voluntary organisations</p>	<p>Detailed programme briefs are currently being developed for the four key delivery themes: e-Maturity, knowledge architecture, strategic technology and personalised content.</p>

reach learners; building an open and accessible system; and achieving greater efficiency & effectiveness.	administrative processes, reduced lesson planning, etc.		were identified. More detailed assessments will be undertaken on individual policies arising from the strategy as they are developed.	
<p><b>ICT and Schools.</b></p> <p><b>Current problem</b> ICT procurement and use.</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Increased volumes of ICT equipment in schools and further embedding of use of ICT in teaching and learning.</p>	<p>Increased use of ICT will: make lesson planning easier involving savings in teachers' and administrators' productive time.</p> <p>Easier and quicker access to online resources.</p> <p>Easier and quicker assessment of students' progress allowing simpler, more timely, and more personalised remedial action.</p> <p>Simpler, quicker, and cheaper procurement through the use of managed services and framework contracts.</p>	DfES	<p>Landmark deal with Microsoft using "virtual" aggregation to achieve £46m of savings on a wide range of Microsoft licenses for all schools. Savings of £14m in 2004-05 through laptops for teachers and Interactive whiteboards framework contracts. Operating system and office productivity software initiative launched April 2005.</p> <p>Productive time savings for schools of £925 million over three years 2005-6 to 2007-8.</p>	Schools are already benefiting from the programme and making efficiency savings. The pace will accelerate over the next two to three years as the managed services contracts go live and the use of learning platforms and other technologies accelerates.
<b>Managing Information Across Partners (MIAP)</b>	Benefits will include:	DfES	We expect MIAP to deliver considerable	MIAP is a long-term programme of change involving phased

<p><b>Current problem</b> Databases cannot easily share information causing a bureaucratic burden on data providers (providing the same information many times).</p> <p><b>Proposed solution</b> Managing Information Across Partners (MIAP) on a collect 'data once, use data many times, used by all' approach. This is a UK wide approach, with a phased implementation through to the end of the decade, which will contain 'Common Data Definitions' - a Learner Registration Service to issue Unique Learner Numbers; a UK Register of Learning Providers and a mechanism for linking agreed datasets from schools, LSC-funded provision &amp; Higher Education.</p>	<p>Improved personalisation and choice for learners and employers, e.g. learners will have one lifelong learning record number enabling e-portfolios and verification of achievement by employers.</p> <p>Improved data sharing between post-14 learning bodies leading to better planning and more tailored services, e.g. use of the UK Register of Learning Providers by IAG service providers.</p> <p>Simplified data flows.</p> <p>Administrative savings, e.g. in enrolling learners.</p>		<p>administrative cost savings for those organisations dealing with learners for enrolment and assessment purposes. Early work suggests that this may be as high as £72.5 million over a five year period from 2010 when the full MIAP service is in place.</p>	<p>implementation to the end of this decade and ongoing running costs.</p> <p>By autumn 2006, there will be firm MIAP standards, prototype MIAP systems being tested and extended access to quality assured data under the UK Register of Learning Providers.</p> <p>By spring 2007 key MIAP systems will be available for integration testing.</p> <p>By autumn 2007, to coincide with the academic year, MIAP Learner Registration Service will be introduced, initially using National Pupil Data.</p> <p>By spring 2008, LSC data form Individual Learner Records will be added to MIAP.</p> <p>By autumn 2007, the UK Register of Learning Providers will provide extended services based on enhanced provider data.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **How to submit Simplification proposals**

We have developed a mechanism so that stakeholders can submit proposals for simplification. The DfES Simplification proposal template is available online at [www.dfes.gov.uk/reducingbureaucracy](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/reducingbureaucracy)

We welcome comments, feedback and further thoughts on this Plan as well as suggestions for other areas of simplification.

The Better Regulation Executive has its own portal. The website: [www.betterregulation.gov.uk](http://www.betterregulation.gov.uk) provides an online Simplification proposal template for stakeholders to complete for any aspect of Government policy.

**Annex 1: New Relationships with Schools (NRwS)** The NRwS programme is a complete package of simplification and reduction in bureaucracy. For 2006/07 there will be an estimated £57.6 million of savings as a result of the below.

### The Main Changes at a Glance

<b>KEY FEATURES</b>	<b>old</b>	<b>new</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Inspection</b>	6-10 weeks' notice before an inspection.  Maximum 6-year interval between inspections.  Relatively large inspection teams visiting for a week.	2-5 days' notice  Maximum 3-year interval.  Small team visiting for no more than 2 days – around a quarter of current inspection weight.	New inspections introduced September 2006.
<b>Public accountability</b>	Governors' annual report. Annual parents' meeting.	Profile.	Profile launched Jan 2006.
<b>School funding</b>	One-year funding aligned with financial year.  Over 20 separate grants.	Multi-year funding aligned with academic years.  Fewer than 5 separate grants.	Introduced from April 2006.
<b>External support</b>	Link advisers.	Nationally accredited School Improvement Partners working to local authorities.	SIPs introduced in secondary schools between September 2005 and September 2006; in primary to be introduced in Jan 07, April 07, Sept 07 and April 08; in special Sept 07, Jan 08 and April 08.
<b>School self-evaluation and planning</b>	Most schools undertake some form of evaluation, but not all, and not linked to planning and inspection.  Multiple accountabilities and support	Self-evaluation as the starting point for inspection, planning, external relations.  "Single conversation" with School	The new inspection system, introduced in Sept 05, is based on schools' reported summary of their self-evaluation.

	programmes.	Improvement Partner.	
<b>Data</b>	Multiple surveys.  Data on school performance not aligned across inspection, monitoring, planning.	School Census: data collected once, used many times.  Data aligned.	School census collected termly from secondary schools since Jan 06 and will be from primaries from Jan 07.
<b>Communications</b>	Monthly batch of paper to all schools.  3 web portals for schools, and over 16 different usernames and passwords per school	Online ordering.  A single coordinated web portal for schools with one username and password per school	Online Ordering was available to all schools from the end of December 2005  Schoolsweb is currently in development and we will provide an update for the next iteration of this Plan.

The New Relationship with Schools (NRwS) is breaking new ground in making life simpler for schools by reducing unnecessary bureaucracy, sharpening challenge and improving support. Within the context of relatively few basic national expectations, schools will increasingly be able to devise and deliver the mix of activity in their area that best meets local pupil needs. Peer review, through nationally accredited School Improvement Partners, and user pressure, through increased choice, contestability and empowerment of parents and pupils, will be much more significant influences on performance than nationally administered programmes, rules and procedures.

### **What is planned?**

- Radical simplification of planning, funding and reporting requirements.
- Build the capacity of schools to drive their own improvement, creating more space and opportunity for them to do so.
- A more intelligent, coherent, evidence-based accountability framework built up from school self evaluation.
- A nationally accredited School Improvement Partner (SIP) for every school.
- Better use of data, collected once, used many times.

- Communication systems that place schools in control of what they receive, when and in what format.

### **How and when schools will feel the benefit?**

The following practical changes are under way:

**Budgets:** greater certainty and predictability for schools in their future funding through the introduction of multi-year school budgets with very many fewer distinct funding streams.

**Inspections:** The new inspection system involves more self evaluation, less advance notice, smaller inspection teams and shorter reports. The new arrangements are based on a proportionate approach which Ofsted intend to implement by September 2006. These arrangements are expected to deliver a substantial reduction in the burdens of Inspection on Schools, but no less of the rigour established by Ofsted in its first decade.

**Communicating with parents:** better information for parents through a School Profile which replaces requirements for the governors' annual report and an annual parents' meeting. The regulations for the school Prospectus have also been simplified, so that there is much more flexibility over what is included, and schools will have more freedom to respond to requests from parents for particular pieces of information.

**Self-evaluation:** as the starting point for all planning, inspection and the SIP's engagement with the school.

**Secondary Impact Assessments mapping exercise:** Reviewing proposed policy initiatives/programmes which impact upon Schools from now until 2010. It will cover all programmes, but initially focusing on activities we require schools to undertake. It will highlight what we are asking schools to do and when and the effects of our policies/programmes on them. Policy Teams will be able to investigate in advance different requests and policy impacts upon schools enabling them to determine when to roll out their policy/programme imposing minimum burden.

**More accurate data:** Ofsted and the DfES are working closely to streamline the provision of data analysis to schools by merging the Performance and Assessment Reports (the PANDA) with the Pupil Achievement Tracker (PAT). The new product will be known as RAISEonline (Reporting and Analysis for Improvement through School self-Evaluation). The merger of the PAT and PANDA will provide schools, LAs, School Improvement Partners and inspectors with a wide range of analytical information from one convenient source as well as providing schools with a tool for reviewing their performance data in greater depth as part of their self evaluation and target setting. Currently the data available about individual pupils and their progression is better than ever before, this package will make best use of this data. Where we hold data centrally we will pre-populate the tool to enable interactive analysis without the need for schools to upload data themselves. The product

will build on the existing functionality and presentations found in PANDA and PAT to ensure that existing user needs are met. The system will go live in Summer 2006.

**Access to information:** Bulk mailings to schools abolished. Replaced by fast, easy, electronic communications with schools, putting them in control of what they receive and allowing them to choose whether they read a summary of a document or the whole thing, or download or order hard copies of materials in the multiples they need. In place since early 2005.

**Coordination with local agencies:** the Common Assessment Framework being introduced under the Every Child Matters: Change for Children programme will help schools to identify their role in meeting pupils' needs and to target referral to other specialist services when needed. Schools will be able to work with local children's trusts to find places for hard-to-place pupils. (See previous Children, Young People & Families section for additional information).



## **Annex 2: A New Relationship with FE Colleges and Providers**

To underpin the reforms set out in the White Paper Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances<sup>5</sup> we are developing, with the LSC, a new relationship between central Government (and its agencies) and providers. This removes unnecessary bureaucracy, secures better alignment between local and national objectives, supports individual providers to improve and build capacity and holds providers to account in ways that are rigorous, but lighter touch and proportional.

We anticipate that the New Relationship will produce sizeable savings and release significant resources to the front line. We need to work up our plans in more detail before we can estimate the extent of these savings.

The key features of the New Relationship are set out below.

**Improved Communications with Providers:** A single gateway for all LSC publications, consultations and data returns. DfES will not routinely communicate directly with providers but, where it does, these will be put through the gateway. QIA will hold all its resources and materials on its website and only distribute copies to those that request it.

**Simplified Planning and Funding:** An annual planning dialogue between the LSC and providers which focuses on agreeing priorities and reviewing performance and delivery against those priorities. Interaction between the LSC and the majority of provider will be reduced and providers will be clearer about the rationale for funding decisions.

**Single LSC Strategic Partner:** A single nominated partner will manage the LSC's relationship with each provider reducing and streamlining interactions.

**Reduced Burdens of the Examination System:** The Framework for Achievement will reduce bureaucracy in the examination system. Work being undertaken by QCA and awarding bodies to streamline examination administration for general qualifications and specialised Diplomas will further reduce the burden on providers.

**Streamlined Data Flows:** A single mechanism/ data agency for setting information standards and reporting requirements and ensuring that only priority information is collected and reports are standardised. This will build on MIAP which is continuing to introduce a range of simplification measures.

**New Freedoms:** Greater freedoms from the planning infrastructure for high performing providers.

For FE colleges, the ultimate aim is to create a modern, **more self regulating form of autonomy** where colleges work together to set, review and raise

---

<sup>5</sup> White Paper can be found at:

[www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=21](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=21)

standards with minimal and proportionate intervention from the LSC. The role and profile of Governing Bodies will be strengthened to enable them to lead self regulating institutions.

## **Acknowledgements**

We thank the Schools Implementation Review Unit, the FE Bureaucracy Reduction Group, and the Higher Education Regulation Review Group in addition to all our policy colleagues who have contributed to the development of this Simplification Plan

## **Feedback**

Please send comments on this report to [chris.senior@dfes.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:chris.senior@dfes.gsi.gov.uk)  
Tel: 0114 2593780

## **Production team**

Jim Constantinou, Lesley Jones and Christopher Senior

© Crown Copyright 2006

The text in this document (excluding the Royal arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.