

APPENDIX C

TECHNICAL FUNDING SUB-GROUP OF SCHOOLS FORUM

22nd Oct 2009 – Notes & Further Action

Members Present

Neil Bramwell (Upper School)

Jim Smart (Lower School)

Apologies

Ian Greenley (Diocese)

Shirley-Anne Crosbie (Special School)

Officers Present

Dawn Hill

Gezim Leka

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The group agreed to the minutes of the 28th September 2009.

SOCIAL DEPRIVATION (SD)

Options 1-6 previously presented were revisited by the group for an over view. It was decided that only Option 6 held some merit and would be held to compare with further modelling of options.

Option 6 – funding follows the child on all category 4 & 5 pupils weighted 1:3

The Group agreed that options 1-5 did not meet the needs of the schools:

Option 1 – The funding does not follow the child and the value of 'Headroom' is unknown for 11/12 – 13/14.

Option 2 – Again the funding does not follow the child and for schools where the % threshold falls below 16% of school population, would not receive any funding.

Option 3 – Fewer schools receive funding and create a cliff-edge for schools with % threshold below 25%. This does not reflect a fair distribution of funding.

Option 4 – As per current methodology applied to approx 75% of the available funds. As per Option 1 the value of 'Headroom' is not known for the funding period 11/12-13/14.

Option 5 – As per current methodology applied to 50% of the available funds. It was felt that funding is too diluted and there are schools that loose considerable allocation.

APPENDIX C

The group looked at option 7a, 7b, 7c:

Option 7a – as current method but the threshold for category 5 is 10% and for category 4 is 30% weighted 1:3.

Option 7b – as option 7a but the threshold for category 4 is now 25% and for category 5 remains same at 10%

Option 7c – as option 7a but the threshold for category 4 is now 20% and for category 5 remains same at 10%

It was agreed that option 7a, b and c would not be consideration any further. These options still would be regarded as 'cliff-edge' funding. Although schools with high numbers in category 4 would be funded more, it was agreed that 10% threshold for category 5 is still high proportion of very needy children.

Option 8 and 9 were considered as the best options for further discussion.

Option 8 – tapering of total funding pot but applying different factors for each phase: 1 for lowers, 1.25 for middles, and 1.50 for uppers.

Option 9 – tapering of total funding pot using a threshold ranging from 25% to 15% for lowers, 25% to 13% for middles and 25% to 11% for uppers.

It was agreed that Option 6, 8 and 9 would go forward to the next meeting to be compared with further modelling of options. It was requested that a summary be produced by phase for comparison to the current distribution of funds per sector.

The group requested the modelling of only category 5 pupils receiving funding. This option will use a tapering methodology with different % threshold being applied.

“GHOST” FUNDING

The group decided that the proposed 40% protection based on the value of allocation did not reflect the need for additional classes. i.e. A school receiving protection for 29 ghost pupils (KS1 classes total pupils 31) to be able to have 2 classes were not impacted if the ghost pupils reduced to 20 (KS 1 classes total pupils 40) as this also needed two classes. Protection would not be required for the drop in funding from 29 ghosts to 20.

It was agreed that further modelling would take place taking this factor into account.

APPENDIX C

CHILDREN OF SERVICE PERSONNEL

The group felt that the mobility issue is not unique to schools receiving service personnel children and therefore should not be introduced as a specific factor in the Individual Schools Budgets

The present formula funding allows all schools to receive additional funding if pupil number increases more than 4% comparing the January and September census data.