

<b>Title:</b> Amendment to the regulations underpinning the School Census and Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) Census collections <b>IA No:</b> DFE0016  <b>Lead department or agency:</b> Department for Education <b>Other departments or agencies:</b>	<b>Impact Assessment (IA)</b>		
	<b>Date:</b> 11/03/2012		
	<b>Stage:</b> Final		
	<b>Source of intervention:</b> Domestic		
	<b>Type of measure:</b> Secondary legislation		
<b>Contact for enquiries:</b> Gill Turner, DDU, DSD, gill.turner@education.gsi.gov.uk, 01142742551			
<b>Summary: Intervention and Options</b>			<b>RPC Opinion:</b> AMBER

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option			
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB on 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Measure qualifies as One-Out?
£N/A	£-0.010m	£0.001m	Yes   IN

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**

A change in the Education (Information About Individual Pupils) (England) Regulations 2006 is required to enable us to collect one new data item via the 2013 School and PRU Census collections, indicating which students aged 16-19 have been awarded bursaries. This management information from schools is necessary to monitor the efficiency and equity of the £180m spend on the Bursary Fund, something publicly committed to by the Secretary of State for Education. Without this amendment to the Regulations, schools would not be compelled to return the data. They may also have concerns that the Data Protection Act (DPA)1998 would not permit them to do so voluntarily.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**

The aim of the 16-19 Bursary Fund is to enable education providers to target financial support on young people who need it most to participate in education post 16. The Secretary of State has publicly committed to looking for evidence that the Bursary is removing barriers to participation and helping the very poorest young people. This commitment was reinforced in the published Equality Impact Assessment, which noted the importance of monitoring the impact of the Bursary on young people with characteristics protected by equality law. The intended effects of the policy are to reduce the financial barriers to participation in post 16 education for the most economically disadvantaged young people.

**What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)**

Option 1 (regulatory): to change the regulations to put the data collection on a statutory basis. All schools that complete census returns already record individual student data on their management information systems and are compelled to keep records of Bursary awards for audit purposes. They would simply need an extra data item to record which student has received a bursary. Preferred option.

Option 2 (non-regulatory): to request the data from schools on a voluntary basis. The data we require includes students' personal details and so would get caught by the Data Protection Act. The costs per school returning data would be higher than under Option 1 and the response rate would likely not be high enough to make meaningful evaluation of Bursary Fund spending possible. Option rejected.

Option 3 (non-regulatory): not to collect any data from schools. This would make it impossible for us to run any meaningful evaluation of Bursary Fund spending. Option rejected.

<b>Will the policy be reviewed?</b> It will be reviewed. <b>If applicable, set review date:</b> 01/2015					
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			No		
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.		<b>Micro</b> No	<b>&lt; 20</b> Yes	<b>Small</b> Yes	<b>Medium</b> Yes
What is the CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)				<b>Traded:</b>	<b>Non-traded:</b>

**I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that (a) it represents a fair and reasonable view of the expected costs, benefits and impact of the policy, and (b) that the benefits justify the costs.**

Signed by the responsible Minister: \_\_\_\_\_ Lord Hill \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ 30/04/12 \_\_\_\_\_

# Summary: Analysis & Evidence

# Policy Option 1

**Description:** Change the regulations to put the collection of information from schools about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund on a statutory basis.

## FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: N/A

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	£63,900	£531,000

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Estimated value of 2 hours of school administration time to complete the data return in all schools.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Cost of educating additional students as a result of increased participation brought about by targeting bursaries better on the basis of information from the data collection (£2,900 annual cost per student).

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	N/A	N/A

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

N/A

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Better targeting of bursaries resulting from information gathered by the data collection can be expected to improve A-level attainment. We cannot quantify the number of students affected, but the estimated average additional lifetime productivity benefits associated with achieving 2 or more A-levels are substantial (£95,000 per student). In addition, there are other benefits for the individual and society from raising student attainment, such as reduced crime and better health.

### Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5

Estimate of benefits assumes the data collected will yield useful information about how to target bursaries better, and that this will be put into practice.

## BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:	In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: 0.001      Benefits: 0      Net: -0.001	Yes	IN

# Summary: Analysis & Evidence

# Policy Option 2

**Description:** Collect information about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund on a voluntary basis

## FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: N/A

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	£40,800	£339,000

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Estimated value of 30 minutes local authority legal adviser time plus 2.5 hours of school administration time to ensure compliance with the DPA and complete the data return for 33% of schools.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Cost of educating additional students as a result of increased participation brought about by targeting bursaries better on the basis of information collected (£2,900 per student). Those schools choosing not to return the data may not have sufficient funds to cover both elements of the scheme in future years. Such schools would be required to enter into lengthy negotiations with the EFA to request further allocations and at that stage would be required to return the data anyway.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	N/A	N/A

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

N/A

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

The partial information gathered would provide us with only limited information with which to try and improve the targeting of bursaries. It is possible there could be some beneficial attainment impact, although less than there would be with complete data. We cannot quantify the number of students affected, but the estimated average additional lifetime productivity benefits associated with achieving 2 + A-levels are substantial (£95,000 per student). There are also wider benefits from raising student attainment.

<b>Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks</b>	<b>Discount rate (%)</b>	3.5
--	--------------------------	-----

Estimate of benefits assumes the data collected will yield useful information about how to target bursaries better, and that this will be put into practice. Voluntary data response from schools may be lower than estimated. There may be a disproportionate impact on our ability to draw conclusions from incomplete data, meaning no improvement in targeting of bursaries and rise in A-level attainment is achieved.

## BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 2)

<b>Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:</b>			<b>In scope of OIOO?</b>	<b>Measure qualifies as</b>
Costs: 0.001	Benefits: 0	Net: -0.001	No	NA

# Summary: Analysis & Evidence

# Policy Option 3

**Description:** Don't collect any information about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund (do nothing).

## FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: £0

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	£0	£0

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There are no additional costs associated with this option as it is the 'do nothing' option and so the baseline for the assessment of other options.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	£0	£0	£0

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

There are no additional benefits associated with this option as it is the 'do nothing' option and so the baseline for the assessment of other options.

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks	Discount rate (%)	3.5
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----

## BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 3)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:	In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: 0	No	NA
Benefits: 0		
Net: 0		

# Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

## 1) Problem under consideration

The 16 to 19 Bursary Fund is a £180 million a year fund distributed to schools, Academies, colleges and training providers to enable them to target support on those young people who most need help to continue their education and training post-16. The scheme is not administered centrally and eligibility criteria are set and awards made to young people by individual institutions.

A change in the Education (Information About Individual Pupils) (England) Regulations 2006 is required to enable us to collect one new data item, via the 2013 School and PRU Census collections, indicating which students aged 16 to 19 have been awarded a bursary during the current academic year. Similar information is being collected from colleges and post-16 training providers via the ILR. Without this information we would have no individual level management information with which to evaluate the scheme and honour the Secretary of State's commitment to ensure the scheme is targeted at the most disadvantaged young people. Essentially if we do not collect this information £180million a year will be allocated to the post-16 school and FE sectors without any auditable means of knowing who was benefiting from it or whether it was meeting the needs of the target group it is intended to help.

The proposal is to add one data item, Learner Support Code, to the School Census and PRU Census collections. For students in receipt of one or both of the bursaries, schools will select the appropriate code/description from the drop down menu in their systems to indicate that the student has been awarded either or both the vulnerable group bursary and discretionary bursary. For students who have not been awarded either bursary the data item will simply be left blank. The data item will be collected annually in the PRU Census and twice a year, in the Spring and Summer School Census collections. The Spring Census will collect those bursaries awarded since the start of the academic year up until the Spring Census Day and the Summer Census those bursaries awarded since the start of the academic year up until the Summer Census Day. This information will be added to other information already collected about the students such as gender, date of birth, home post code, ethnicity and free school meal eligibility which will allow detailed analysis of students awarded bursaries to be undertaken.

The change in regulations impacts on the civil society sector as the School Census collects information from non-maintained special schools (NMSSs). All other schools from which the data will be collected in the School Census and PRU Census collections are in the public sector. There are 49 NMSSs providing post-16 education that will be impacted by the change in regulations. This impact assessment therefore highlights the costs and benefits to this group of schools.

Although the overall numbers of potentially eligible young people in NMSSs are low (just under 1,000 according to Autumn 2011 School Census returns) we do believe that one very specific group of bursary recipients will be over-represented in them. Certain categories of learners with learning difficulties and disabilities automatically qualify for a guaranteed bursary of £1,200 under the 'vulnerable group' element of the scheme and it is these learners who are likely to be over-represented in NMSSs. For this reason we feel that any subsequent data we gathered would be highly misleading with regard to these young people if it did not include returns from NMSSs.

As at the Autumn 2011 Census collection there were 73 NMSSs, 49 of which provide post-16 education. According to the information available (2010 School Census staffing figures and NMSS websites), none of these 49 NMSSs have less than ten staff.

## 2) Rationale for intervention

The rationale for intervention is to ensure the Bursary Fund is being used efficiently. We need to ensure that Bursary awards are being made by providers to those young people who most need financial help to participate in post-16 education.

By far the simplest and cheapest way of accomplishing this is to add a new data field to the School and PRU Census. All the providers in receipt of Bursary Funding already complete the appropriate Census for every individual student they enrol. Moreover, they are already compelled for audit purposes to keep their own records of who has been awarded a Bursary. All we are asking is that they combine this information and indicate on each student's record whether or not that student has been awarded a Bursary.

This raw data will then be used by contractors to build a three year independent qualitative evaluation of the scheme to measure the extent to which the fund is meeting the policy objectives. However, without the basic information provided through the census – i.e. who is receiving a bursary and who isn't – we will have no way of targeting recipients for qualitative follow-up research.

Amending the 2006 Regulations to include a new data item to collect information on which students are in receipt of a 16-19 bursary will:

- (a) help ensure compliance by data providers (schools, pupil referral units and local authorities); and
- (b) provide statutory cover for data providers without which they might be open to challenges from pupils or parents that by providing information voluntarily they had breached the Data Protection Act 1998 and their duty of confidentiality to pupils.

### 3) Policy objective

The aim of the 16 to 19 Bursary Fund is to enable schools, Academies, colleges and training providers to target support on those young people who most need help to continue their education and training post-16. The Secretary of State has made a public commitment that the Department will be looking for evidence on the ground to ensure that financial barriers to participation are removed and that the scheme will be reviewed to ensure that it helps the most disadvantaged young people. This commitment was reinforced in the published Equality Impact Assessment, which noted the importance of monitoring the impact of the new arrangements on young people with characteristics protected by equality law.

In order to achieve this, it will be necessary to collect information from all providers in receipt of 16-19 bursary funding (including schools, Academies, colleges and training organisations) about which students have been awarded a bursary. This is both to: a) monitor the spending and numbers of young people being supported; and b) ensure that the right funding levels are allocated to the providers in subsequent years. The information collected will play a crucial role in the proposed formal independent evaluation of the impact of the scheme (a £500,000 contract for which has already been awarded to the independent evaluators). This evaluation will go ahead whether or not the data is collected, but the quality of its findings would be reduced if the data were not available. It will be particularly important to assess the impact of the arrangements for financial support for young people in education or training in the context of the introduction of the Raising of the Participation Age, to 17 in 2013 and to 18 in 2015. The information will also be used to inform future allocations to providers.

### 4) Description of options considered (including do nothing)

**Option One:** Change the regulations to put the collection of information from schools about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund on a statutory basis.

**Option Two:** Collect information about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund on a voluntary basis

The problem with this option from the schools' perspective is that returning or sharing data on named individuals (even with/to government departments) is problematical from a Data Protection angle. Schools would be forced to seek legal advice prior to returning data and depending on who they sought the advice from it may be conflicting and expensive. A meaningful evaluation of the Bursary Fund would require a sufficient number of schools with different characteristics to respond and it is unlikely this would be achieved on a voluntary basis.

**Option Three:** Don't collect any information about which students have been awarded a 16-19 bursary fund (do nothing).

The problem with this option is self-evident: it would leave us blind as to which students in the maintained schools sector were being awarded support and make it impossible for us to run any meaningful evaluation of the scheme. We would have no way of assessing how the scheme was being administered on the ground and whether or not the overall policy objectives of the Bursary Fund – to reduce the financial barriers to participation for the most economically disadvantaged young people – were being met.

## 5) Monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of each option (including administrative burden)

Note that the potential benefits and costs from increased A-level participation described below are only indirectly related to this regulatory change, and are dependent on a large number of external factors. These include the impact of other government policies on attainment and changing labour market conditions which may affect participation rates in post-16 education.

### (a) Benefits

**Option One:** We would be able to gather all the data and management information that we require to fully evaluate the Bursary Fund in terms of the overall policy objectives. The change in the regulations would also automatically cover the schools from a Data Protection angle in exactly the same way they are covered in relation to all the other existing data fields that they are required to complete and return to the department.

A 16-19 year old student in publicly funded full time education in an FE College, Sixth Form College or a School with its own sixth form (included NMSSs) attracts the single national funding rate of a minimum of £2,920 per year and in terms of this Impact Assessment this is part of the cost of Option One (see cost section). The biggest obstacle faced in the recruitment of 16-19 students from disadvantaged backgrounds is financial support. The fundamental policy objective of the 16-19 Bursary Fund is to give schools and colleges a source of funding which they can use at their own discretion to help disadvantaged students who are facing financial barriers to participation – either by agreeing an award with the student at enrolment time (thereby securing the enrolment in the first place) or by agreeing an award with the student part way through their course if they are facing barriers which may force them to drop out.

As a result of information gathered through the data collection about how the Bursary Fund is being spent, it should be possible to ensure the bursaries being allocated are better targeted to the students who need them most. There are two reasons for this:

- (a) currently allocations of bursary funding to institutions are based on historical EMA data to cover the vulnerable groups' element of the scheme and the discretionary element. In future years the plan is to ensure that institutions receive enough money to cover their vulnerable groups and still have sufficient funds to make meaningful discretionary awards based on their own criteria.
- (b) we will be able to review and adjust the guidance and rules of the scheme more globally as a result of the independent evaluation of the scheme. The full benefits of the evaluation can only be realised if complete data on the award of bursaries is collected.

As a result of (a) and (b) above we can expect that the data collection will lead to an increase in the number of students achieving A-level or equivalent qualifications. We cannot know in advance of collecting the information what the data will tell us and so are unable to predict the precise number of students who may benefit. However, we know that the benefits of raising A-level attainment are substantial: DfE internal analysis of the Labour Force Survey shows that the discounted productivity benefits of achieving 2 or more A-levels equal, on average, £95,000 over a lifetime. We assume that sufficient information would be available to facilitate better targeting of bursaries by the time the evaluation of the Bursary Fund is due to report in October 2014, and that the impact on A-level attainment would occur by 2016, when students starting their courses in 2014 would be due to complete them. This benefit would be an ongoing one i.e. in each subsequent year there would be some students achieving A-level or equivalent qualifications who otherwise would not have.

**Option Two:** 66% of schools with sixth forms returned information on a voluntary basis on the number of bursaries awarded for 2011/12. Given the more detailed information required for the bursary data collection proposed in this IA, we would expect the response rate to be substantially less than this. We think it is possible that the information collected from partial data might allow some better targeting of bursaries and improvement in A-level attainment, although much less than would be achieved than by the full data collection in Option 1. However, there is a risk that no improvement in attainment might occur with this option if response rates were very poor or incomplete data had a greatly disproportionate effect on our ability to draw robust conclusions.

**Option Three:** None. This is the status quo and so the baseline for assessment of other options.

### (b) Costs

**Option One:** The business case that was approved by the Department's Star Chamber Scrutiny Board for the collection of this data estimated the compliance costs to be equivalent to one school administrative or student support staff member working approximately two hours, drawing on the school's established internal financial processes to input 16-19 bursary fund information.

Estimated annual cost per school to return the data:  $2 \times \text{£}12.78 = \text{£}25.56$

Estimated annual cost for all schools to return data:  $2,500 \times \text{£}25.56 = \text{£}63,900$

Over 10 years the present value of these costs would be  $\text{£}531,000$ .

Within this the estimated cost for NMSSs to return the data:  $49 \times \text{£}25.56 = \text{£}1,252$ . Over 10 years the present value of these costs to business are around  $\text{£}10,400$  – a very small equivalent annualised net cost to business of  $\text{£}1,200$ .

If we assume that the better targeting of bursaries attracts additional students from 2014 onwards then there would also be costs to government in funding these places. We cannot predict how many additional places would be required but we know that a 16-19 year old student in publicly funded full time education attracts a funding rate of a minimum of  $\text{£}2,920$  per year – a much smaller sum than the  $\text{£}95,000$  benefit of such students achieving 2 or more A-levels.

If the data were collected the planned independent evaluation of the scheme could be carried out. With precise data returns about the number of awards schools are making in each category we will be able to make accurate allocations and schools should find themselves with sufficient funds to cover both elements of the scheme. Although the overall numbers of potentially eligible young people in NMSSs are low (just under 1,000 according to Autumn 2011 School Census returns) we do believe that one very specific group of bursary recipients will be over-represented in them. Certain categories of learners with learning difficulties and disabilities automatically qualify for a guaranteed bursary of  $\text{£}1,200$  under the 'vulnerable group' element of the scheme and it is these learners who are likely to be over-represented in NMSSs. For this reason we feel that any subsequent data we gathered would be highly misleading with regard to these young people if it did not include returns from NMSSs.

**Option Two:** Those schools that voluntarily return the data would need to seek their own legal advice to ensure they comply with the Data Protection Act in supplying the data to the Department on a voluntary basis. Estimated cost: half an hour of school clerical officer plus half an hour of local authority legal adviser: estimated at  $0.5 \times \text{£}12.78$  plus  $0.5 \times \text{£}60.46 = \text{£}36.62$ . They would either need to seek pupil/parental consent for the provision of the data or satisfy themselves that one of the other conditions in Schedule 2 of the DPA 1998 applied which would allow them to process the data. If consent was needed, this would involve identifying the pupils/parents concerned, writing to them, processing the responses, and identifying a way in systems of excluding the data from the Census return for those students for whom they did not have parental consent to provide the data to the Department. The less clear the *vires* are for the release of information, the more vulnerable schools are to Information Commissioner's Office complaints and legal challenge. This could lead to schools spending substantial amounts of time and costs in defending such complaints or challenges. We estimate that this work would take on average across schools a further two hours of school clerical officer time (some will have no students with the fund and others several).

Total estimated cost per school to return the data on a voluntary basis:  $\text{£}36.62 + (\text{£}12.78 \times 2) = \text{£}49.40$

66% of schools with sixth forms returned information on a voluntary basis on the number of bursaries awarded for 2011/12 and given the more detailed information required we would expect the response rate to be much lower. In the absence of evidence we have estimated the response rate as half of this (33%) in the costing.

Total estimated cost for 33% of schools returning the data on a voluntary basis =  $33/100 \times 2,500 \times \text{£}49.40 = \text{£}40,755$ .

Over 10 years the total present value of these costs would be  $\text{£}339,000$ . We have not conducted detailed sensitivity analysis around this figure. However, if we were to assume a higher response rate from schools than 33%, then the costs of Option 2 would be closer to, or even greater than, Option 1 without delivering anything approaching an equivalent benefit. If the response rate were substantially lower than 33% then it is unlikely Option 2 would deliver any benefits.

Assuming the same percentage of NMSSs return the data on a voluntary basis, the total estimated cost for NMSSs to return the data on a voluntary basis =  $33/100 \times 49 \times \text{£}49.40 = \text{£}800$ . Over 10 years, the



present value of these costs to business are £6,650 – a very small equivalent annualised net cost to business of £800, although slightly higher than the costs to business of option 1.

If we assume that better targeting of bursaries attracts additional students then there would also be an annual cost to government of £2,920 to fund each additional place. However, the economic cost this represents would be likely to be outweighed many times over by the economic benefit the education would provide.

**Option Three:** None. This is the status quo and so the baseline for assessment of other options.

**Summary and justification for preferred option:** The preferred option (option 1) is likely to have a higher cost than the non-regulatory option (option 2), but we expect this will be more than outweighed by the substantial economic benefits of a greater number of additional students achieving A-level or equivalent qualifications (£95,000 per student). Overall costs to business are also slightly lower in option 1 than option 2. The do-nothing option (option 3) has no economic benefits.

### **Rationale and evidence that justify the level of analysis used in the IA (proportionality approach)**

The estimated cost for each school for the preferred option is £25.56 and the total cost to the civil sector society is estimated at less than £1,500. Given these relatively small sums, the IA, and associated analysis, have been kept short.

### **6) Assumptions**

Hourly rates used in calculations provided by the Office for National Statistics for use in estimating compliance costs for survey completion:

School clerical officer: gross pay of £10.56 per hour, uplifted by 21% for non-wage labour costs (Labour Cost Survey, 2004) to £12.78 per hour

Local authority legal adviser: gross pay of £49.97 per hour, uplifted by 21% to £60.46

Based on the following number of schools with sixth forms, data source Autumn 2011 School Census and 2011 PRU Census:

797 Academies

1,609 maintained secondary and special schools

49 non-maintained special schools

45 PRUs

Total: 2,500

### **7) Consultation**

Careful consideration is always given to the additional burden that would be placed on schools through the collection of new data items in the School Census and PRU Census collections. Consultations have been held with the Star Chamber Scrutiny Board (SCSB), a range of other stakeholders within the Department, the Young People's Learning Agency and the commercial suppliers of school management information systems. These consultations have ensured that the proposed changes meet the data needs of the Department and at the same time minimise the burdens on schools.

The SCSB has approved the inclusion of the additional data item in the School Census and PRU Census collections in 2013.

### **8) Summary and preferred option with description of implementation plan**

Option One is the preferred option and the implementation plan is as follows:

End May 2012: confirm specification for the 2013 School Census and PRU Census collections with software suppliers to allow them to develop their systems to hold the new data item and extract routines for its inclusion in the collections

Summer 2012: lay regulations before parliament so that they come into force for January 2013

Summer 2012: guidance for schools on how to populate the new data items in their systems published

Summer 2012: software suppliers test their systems and release upgrades to schools to include the new data item

Autumn 2012: schools start populating their systems for students awarded the bursaries in the academic year 2012/13

Spring 2013: first collection of the new data item