

## **APPENDIX B**

### **TECHNICAL FUNDING SUB-GROUP OF SCHOOLS FORUM**

**28<sup>th</sup> Sept 2009 – Notes & Further Action**

#### **Members Present**

Neil Bramwell (Upper School)  
Ian Greenley (Diocese)  
Shirley-Anne Crosbie (Special School)

#### **Apologies**

Jim Smart (Lower School)

#### **Officers Present**

Dawn Hill  
Gezim Leka

### **BACKGROUND**

It was resolved at the School Forum meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2009 to establish a Technical Funding Sub Group

The initial remit of the group was to look at 3 particular issues:

- Deprivation – thresholds and tapering (current “cliff-edge” funding)
- “Ghost Funding” tapering (current “cliff-edge” funding)
- Significant mobility outside of natural transition stages for children of services personnel

This is the second meeting of the group, following on from discussions held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

### **SOCIAL DEPRIVATION (SD)**

A Deprivation Review paper was presented to the group with a detailed explanation of the current methodology for calculating SD along with the advantages and disadvantages.

Modelling had taken place over the Summer break and a further 6 options were presented to the group. The Indicative 10/11 Deprivation figures had been recalculated using the ACORN Data for January 2009. (The Indicative Budgets issued to schools were based on ACORN data for January 2008).

A Summary was provided detailing the implications of each option compared to the recalculated Indicatives for 2010/11.

The 6 Options presented:

1. Partial Tapering (15% - 25%)– re-distributing ‘Headroom’

## APPENDIX B

2. Full Tapering (15% - 25%) – Total 'Funding Pot'
3. Combined Category 4 and 5 with an increase of threshold to 25%
4. Current methodology for 75% of Total 'Funding Pot' with remainder (=Headroom) redistributed following the child.
5. Current methodology for 50% of Total 'Funding Pot' with remainder redistributed following the child.
6. Funding following the child with category 5 weighted 1:3

Each option focused on category 4 (Moderate means) and Category 5 (Hard Pressed) pupil numbers.

The group agreed that the tapering methodology provides a smoother “cliff – edge” as this allows for school with a threshold from 25% to 16% receiving funding.

However, the group felt that Category 5 weighting of 1:3 did not necessarily reflect the 'need' in schools. Where schools have a higher total role, the number of children in Category 4 and 5 were diluted in the % of the school total role. Lower Schools may receive funding which does not necessarily follow the child through to Middle and Upper school.

The Sub-Group requested additional modelling to take place:

1. Increasing the thresholds but no tapering :-
  - Current method (Category 5 weighted 3:1 of Category 4 and a 20% individual threshold applied to both categories) but changing the threshold % to 30% for Category 4 and 10% Category 5. The group felt this would give further priority to Category 5 children.
  - As above with 25% for Category 4 and 10% Category 5
  - As above with 20% for Category 4 and 10% Category 5
2. A combination of tapering and adding the two categories together, but applying a differential factor for phase before calculating % of school role.
  - Factor Lower 1.0, Middle 1.25 and Uppers 1.5
3. Full tapering as in Option 2 with an increased taper to 15% for Lower, 13% Middles and 11% for Upper.

### **“GHOST” FUNDING and CHILDREN OF SERVICE PERSONNEL**

The Sub-Group did not discuss these two issues due to time constraints. These will be brought back to the next meeting of the group, at a convenient time early October.