

<b>MEETING</b>	SCHOOLS BUDGET FORUM
<b>DATE</b>	18 November 2015
<b>TITLE</b>	Schools Savings Target
<b>PURPOSE</b>	£4.3m Savings 2015/16 to 2017/18
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	Schools Budget Forum to deliberate over and recommend to the Cabinet the basis for implementing the remaining savings.
<b>REPORT BY</b>	Arwyn Lloyd Thomas, Head of Education
<b>CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION</b>	Cllr Gareth Thomas

## 1. Background

**1.1** At the Council meeting held on 5 March 2015, the council decided on the budget for 2015/16, including Schools savings of £952,000 out of the savings target of £4.3m.

**1.2** This leaves savings of £3,348,000 to be implemented.

## 2. The Working Group's Agreed Plans £1,028,000

**2.1** The Forum is asked to confirm the Working Group's recommendation to implement the plans listed under columns 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19 on **appendix 8.1**, total £1,028,000.

## 3. Remaining savings target £2,320,000

**3.1** The suggestion thus far is to implement the remaining savings target through weakening the pupil teacher ratio within the Primary and Secondary allocation formula.

**3.2** The various options for sharing the remaining savings target between the primary and secondary sector have already been highlighted and discussed, taking account of several factors including Gwynedd Council Strategic Plan 2013-17, Estyn feedback and national comparative statistics.

**3.3** You will also recall that the Forum received evidence from the Headteachers on the likely impact of the various options at an extraordinary meeting of the Forum held on 15 January 2015.

**3.4** The objective is now to move the discussion forward whilst taking into account the factors mentioned in 3.2 and 3.3 and the latest national comparative statistical evidence, see **appendix 8.2**.

**3.5** The options A,B,C and CH that were presented to the Schools Budget Forum on 15 January 2015 have been re-calculated using September 2015 actual pupil numbers, see **appendix 8.3, 8.4, 8.5 a 8.6**.

**3.6** The options are based on a implementing the £2,320,000 savings through :

- A : pro rata to both sector's quantum (55% Primary, 45% Secondary)
- B : based on option A and also weakening the worst pupil teacher ratio at an individual primary school by 0.5 pupil
- C : based on option A and also weakening the worst pupil teacher ratio at an individual primary school by 1 pupil
- CH : based on option A and also weakening the worst pupil teacher ratio at an individual primary school so that the primary sector funds the entire saving (equivalent to 1.5 pupils).

**3.7.a** The 2016/17 primary schools allocation formula contains an average pupil teacher ratio of 21.17:1, with the highest pupil teacher ratio being 25.08:1.

**3.7.b** Explanatory note – the primary allocation formula has been designed to provide a better teacher pupil ratio (i.e. less) to those classes that contain mixed age-group pupils, and the Schools who receive minimum staffing protection end up with the lowest pupil teacher ratio.

**3.8** The impact of the different options on the pupil teacher ratio through the primary allocation formula is as follows

- Current : average 21.17:1, highest 25.08:1
- A : average 22.29:1, highest 26.66:1
- B : average 22.64:1, highest 27.15:1
- C : average 22.99:1, highest 27.64:1
- CH : average 23.31:1, highest 28.11:1

## **4 Recommendation**

**4.1** Considering the latest evidence regarding the comparative funding position of primary and secondary sectors, it appears that there is a case for considering moving from Model B towards Model CH.

**4.2** Having considered all the evidence, I recommend implementing Model C.