

WORCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM
SOCIAL DEPRIVATION SUB-GROUP NOTES OF MEETING 12th JUNE 2007

In Attendance

Andy McHale – Children’s Services Resources
 Trish Mallinson – Children’s Services Finance
 Bernard Roberts – Prince Henry’s High School
 June Longmuir – Worcestershire Association of Governors

Apologies

Cherrill Illingworth – Oakhill First School

DETAIL	ACTION
<p><u>1. Notes of the Previous meeting 24th April 2007</u></p> <p>Agreed</p>	
<p><u>2. Matters Arising</u></p> <p><u>Schools Forum User Group</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andy advised that he had recently attended a newly created user group for LA Schools Forum officers. Issues on the status of social deprivation reviews were discussed where it was apparent there was wide variation in the current position between LA’s. <p><u>DSG 2007/08</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trish advised on the recently announced final DSG position for 2007/08. A report would be taken on this to the next Schools Forum meeting. 	AMcH/TM
<p><u>3. DfES Research Papers</u></p> <p><u>Urban Density and Pupil Attainment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group felt the research was not particularly relevant but noted the comments on the findings of the effect of rural/urban environments on attainment. The group also commented on the potential of this to increase competition between schools. <p><u>FSM as a Proxy for Socio-Economic Status</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group again commented on the research not being particularly relevant. 	
<p><u>4. Updating the English Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2004</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group noted the proposals for the DCLG to produce options for updating the IMD 2004. The group felt there maybe potential issues if revised data 	

sets were to be used in the DSG allocation and the need to be aware of any impact on the local funding formula.

5. Modelling Update

The group noted that these were based upon 2006/07 resource levels and 2006 non-financial data.

Funding Per Pupil vs. ACORN Ranking

- Graphs had been produced comparing all schools funding per pupil against their ACORN ranking.
- They detailed on a per pupil basis: -
 - total funding (School Formula, Standards Fund and SSG);
 - total funding excluding LRC, PFI and reorganisation;
 - school formula funding only excluding LRC, PFI and reorganisation.
- The correlation score measured how much of the funding variation is attributable to the socio-economic (ACORN) variation.
- On primary the correlation was extremely low and not that significant in high schools. In middle schools it was higher. The issue of the potential impact of wider catchment was discussed.
- The group concluded the analysis did not necessarily provide any basis for significant change and changes to the targeting of resources.
- The group felt that there maybe a need to look at these comparisons using social deprivation per pupil funding but felt this needed a formal definition of budgets to be included.

Funding Per Pupil vs. Attainment Data

- Graphs had been produced comparing all schools total funding per pupil against their attainment scores.
- The attainment data included: -
 - KS1 – reading, writing and maths;
 - KS2 – english, maths and science L4+;
 - KS2 – english, maths and science L5+;
 - KS3 – english, maths and science L5+;
 - KS3 – english, maths and science L6+;
 - KS4 – % 5 A*-C GCSE including English and maths;
 - KS4 – GCSE CVA Scores.
 - There was a range of correlation scores between how much of the funding variation was attributable to the attainment variation.
- The group concluded in the main there being a range of outcomes with various combinations within the individual

sectors of low/high attainment and/or low/high funding per pupil.

- The group noted some underperformance, particularly at KS3 with the tests not being particularly robust.
- Particularly on KS4 it was recognised the FFT data gave a better indicator of an individual school's circumstances but the CVA measure did not necessarily benchmark on performance correctly.
- Again it was noted there maybe some merit in using social deprivation per pupil funding if it could be defined more rigorously.

Total SEN and Social Deprivation Funding

- This detailed resources in the school funding formula allocated via all social deprivation, AEN and SEN factors for: -
 - all of the formula components total resource of £22.4m;
 - all of the formula components excluding LRC's total resource of £20.2m.
- Non-financial data by school was also included on national IMD rank and SOA % together with local SAT's Quartile scores. It was noted that the national indicators were not robust enough in highlighting concentrated high level need.
- The group noted the wide variations and were concerned whether the amalgamation of any of these factors would be beneficial. It may help transparency but could create distributional change. Would it make it any easier to compare with attainment?

SEN and Social Deprivation Per Pupil

- This detailed all the above funding in rank per pupil order of for both the £22.4m and £20.2m.
- Again non-financial data issues as above were noted.
- The group felt that it was not possible to make a link with resource allocations and relevant non-financial issues.

ACORN Thresholds vs. FSM Social Deprivation

- A model was discussed on using the schools ACORN scores to allocate funding on a per pupil basis. These were based upon thresholds with the higher the score allocating more resources. Only ACORN scores of 1.75 and above were allocated funding.
- The model allocated approximately £1.86m and was also compared to the current allocations based on FSM thresholds of £1.48m.
- The group commented: -
 - A move to ACORN in place of FSM thresholds

<p>would cause significant turbulence for some schools with the need for school allocation protection;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no real evidence to support the use of any one factor against another; ➤ The potential robustness or not of the ACORN data; ➤ May need to rely on a number of formula factors in any allocation methodology; ➤ Any change would potentially need to be funded via any DSG headroom. <p><u>Super Output Areas (SOA's)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A model was discussed on using the schools SOA threshold scores to allocate funding on a per pupil basis. These were based upon groups of deprivation of most 10%, 10% to 20% and 20% to 30% with the lowest % score allocating more resources. SOA % of more than 30% was not allocated funding. • The model allocated approximately £0.14m. • The group made similar comments to the above modelling. • The SOA score is based upon where the school is located and not the characteristics of its intake. • There may be a need to try to reference individual pupil record post code data to schools attended but there are issues on data sets e.g. capacity for collection, robustness, availability, out County pupils in particular. 	
<p><u>6. Potential Consultation Issues/Schools Forum Report</u></p> <p>The group agreed to report back to the next meeting of the Schools Forum on the findings including the following issues: -</p> <p><u>Overall Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of a formal clear national definition for 'social deprivation' makes comparison difficult both within LA's and between LA's as all will use there own assumptions. • All LA local formulae are different and as such the associated formula factors are subject to local interpretation. • The DfES nominated amount for the % of deprivation in the DSG has no real basis being built upon the previous national allocation model. <p><u>Local Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research charts and other evidence do not readily provide a platform for significant change. • There is no real evidence to show which is the best mixture of funding and formula factors. • There seems to be no real strong imperative from schools 	<p>AMcH</p>

<p>to move significantly on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being such a low funded authority, any formula changes will totally depend upon the DSG quantum available. • There is a concern in any local formula changes the movement of existing resources on stability and the potential effect on base funding for all schools. • Any changes could only be afforded if there was sufficient headroom available. • Allocating into basic funding for the benefit of all schools may better use any headroom. • If changes were to be introduced then options include allocation via ACORN thresholds or SOA's. 	
---	--

Documents discussed at the meeting: -

DfES Research Papers.

LGIU Paper on IMD 2004.

Funding Per Pupil vs. ACORN Ranking – School comparison graphs.

Funding Per Pupil vs. Attainment Data – School comparison graphs.

Total SEN and Social Deprivation Funding – School by school analysis.

SEN and Social Deprivation Per Pupil – School by school analyses.

ACORN Thresholds vs. FSM Social Deprivation – School resource comparisons
on potential resource allocations.

Super Output Areas (SOA's) – School resource comparisons.