

## Meeting of the Early Years Working Group

**Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2009**  
***(3.30 pm, Training Room 5, Building 2 at NLBP)***

<b><u>Attended</u></b>	Members:	Anthea Abery (Rosh Pinah, Maintained Nursery Class-Faith)
		Diana Rose (Kerem House, PVI Independent School)
		John Maxwell (Holly Park, Maintained Nursery Class)
		Liz Bartlett (Wingfield, Maintained Children's Centre)
		Perina Holness (Moss Hall, Maintained Nursery School)
		Sarah Vipond (Middlesex Uni, PVI Full Day Care)
		Sharon Lee (FRS, PVI Setting)
	LA Officers:	Sheila Abbott (Early Years and Extended Services Manager)
		Carol Beckman (School Funding Manager)
		Zahid Parvez (Business Manager)
		Jill Smith (Locality Development Officer, West Network)
	Clerk:	Claire Gray (School Resources Support Officer)
	Observer Status:	Elizabeth Pearson (Schools Forum member)
		Jodi Gurney (Schools Forum member)
		Sarah Lawlor (Substitute for Lisa Horne) (Barnet Pre-School Learning Alliance)

<b><u>Not Present</u></b>	Members:	Elaine Rosenthal (Playsafe, PVI Sessional)
		Christine Read (All Saints N20, Maintained Nursery Class)
		Pauline Congdon (PVI Sessional)
		Julie Paice (Senior Childminding Co-Ordinator, LBB)
		Marina Economides (Bright Sparks Nursery, PVI Sessional)

	LA Officers:	Martin Baker (Acting Director of Children's Service)
		Stuart Gray (Principal Inspector, Chair)
		Diane Lewis (Early Years Inspector)
		Akos Adu (Research & Management Information)

**1. Apologies for Absence.**

1.1	Stuart Gray, Diane Lewis, Pauline Congdon, Marina Economides and Julie Paice. Lisa Horne sent her apologies, but Sarah Lawlor attended on behalf of BPSLA.	
-----	--	--

**2. Minutes of previous meeting - 26<sup>th</sup> November 2008.**

2.1	Agreed.	
-----	---------	--

**3. Matters arising.**

3.1	It was agreed that matters arising will be covered within the agenda items for this meeting.	
-----	--	--

<b>4. Information from Pathfinders.</b>		
4.1	SA advised that research of options implemented in Pathfinder settings show that every setting seems to have selected a different model, and that these may not necessarily fit with parental need or offerings in Barnet.	
4.2	SA and JS have started holding meetings with those settings that are likely to be offering extension from 2009, as identified by deprivation indicators. Currently, these have mostly been within West Network, who are expected to become 'Barnet Pathfinders', but these discussions will now roll out to all localities. The meetings have been particularly productive and have brought providers together that have not previously worked in partnership. SA reminded members that although flexibility is the government aim, not every provider will be offering all flexible options, but they must remain aware of what offerings are available through other local providers.	
4.3	SA has also held initial meetings with Trades Union representatives (NAHT, Unison, NUT and NASUWT) and confirmed that there is no intention to make arrangements that would breach national contracts.	
4.4	SA/JS provided a project management report and summary of issues raised at initial locality meetings (Appendix I). In response to local questions, SA/JS will respond to the issues raised and will prepare an information/protocol sheet which will be circulated to all providers so that colleagues in all settings are aware of changes and developments. However, SA is pleased to note that future options are already being discussed in many settings. It seems that most schools are mainly considering implementing similar models, and planning to consult with parents to identify any further needs. Immediate changes to provide many different options may not necessarily be sustainable. However, JM commented that some settings are planning their mid- to long-term offering to ensure staff stability, rather than planning on a year-by-year basis.	<b>SA/ JS</b>
4.5	A publicity leaflet advising parents of the new arrangements will shortly be drafted and proofed, and will be available in March so that they can be sent out with nursery place offer letters. LB asked for assurance that any publicity materials reflect what is actually on offer in the locality areas. SA confirmed that this would be the case, and that materials would also include advice to parents on procedures for reporting a lack of availability of Free Entitlement places in their local area.	<b>ZP</b>
<b>5. Items for information.</b>		
5.1	CB tabled a document (Appendix II) summarising planned funding arrangements for 2009/10 [for information only], advising that funding for the 2.5 hours extension and flexibility options will be set aside until the 25% of settings offering these arrangements in 2009 have been agreed and finalised. Participants in this wave would be agreed and notified as soon as possible. SL noted that it might be financially advantageous to be in the Barnet Pathfinder tranche, but CB advised that 2009/10 must be viewed as a transitional arrangement, so any special funding for pathfinders in 2009/10 cannot be guaranteed in following years..	
<b>6. Items for agreement.</b>		

6.1	The document proposed a number of formula funding factors to be discussed for implementation from 2010/11, and which will be included in the consultation with all settings to be carried out later in 2009 prior to implementation.	
6.2	Members unanimously agreed in principle that the following factors should be included in the 2010/11 NEF funding formula: Per Pupil Unit allocation (to replace current AWP/NEF rates) 2.5 hrs NEF extension allocation (20% uplift of PPU) Basic Entitlement (annual lump sum, with a minimum pupil number threshold)	
6.3	<b>AEN, Flexibility and Qualifications funding.</b> There were significant discussions as to the comparative importance of Additional Educational Need (AEN), Flexibility and Qualifications premiums, both as regards the quantum of funding to be 'top sliced' and the apportionment of the quantum across each of the factors. No conclusive agreement was reached as to the quantum/percentage to be 'top sliced' from the overall 2010/11 Early Years budget, or the weighting that should be apportioned between AEN/Flexibility/Qualifications within that quantum. Issues raised are as follows:	
6.4	<b>AEN:</b> The majority of members agreed that high incidence/low need AEN pupils do need to be recognised in any future formula, but there were differences as to how this should be identified. IDACI is proposed as a measure of relative need as free school meals entitlement is not reliable for nursery age children. IEPs were suggested as a measure of AEN need, but most members felt that this measure could vary between settings and might provide a perverse incentive. A number of members agreed that an AEN Contingency amount should be retained so that settings could apply for exceptional funding. Concern was also raised about funds currently allocated through the Pre-School Inclusion team, and whether this would a) double fund settings or b) be open to both PVI and the maintained sector in future.	
6.5	<b>Flexibility:</b> As the main government focus of providing the NEF extension and Early Years Formula Funding, it was acknowledged that a flexibility premium should be allocated to settings in future. However, concern was expressed about how the take up of flexible options could be objectively measured. PH expressed her concern that flexibility will affect quality of provision due to the difficulty in following a structured curriculum.	
6.6	<b>Qualifications:</b> Members agreed that there should be recognition of settings with higher qualified staff (Level 3 and above), to reflect higher staff costs, but discussed whether this formula factor should also reflect those establishments that are required to employ a supernumerary Head. Once again, there is concern as to how qualifications data can be obtained, validated and regularly updated.	

6.7	<p>CG tabled a spreadsheet (Appendix III) giving a broad outline of sample rates for the 2009/10 allocations and the new 2010/11 formula funding factors and how this is expected to affect funding levels in both the maintained and PVI sectors. This initial modelling allocates a total of £10.4m in 2009/10, which is the estimated Early Years overall budget plus the Standards Fund Grant available to cover the NEF extension. The overall quantum for 2010/11 is estimated to be £11.7m, again including the additional Standards Fund Grant allocation. This has been 'top sliced' by £1m to allow for modelling AEN (80%) and Flexibility (20%) but does not allocate a qualifications premium, as data is currently not available to model this option. Please note that this is a first model of a sample formula and any proposals must go to consultation and the quantum available, rates and pupil data are all subject to change.</p>	
-----	--	--

<b>7. Any other business.</b>		
7.1	It was noted that a number of members are unavailable for the next planned EYWG meeting, so this meeting has now been re-arranged for Wednesday, 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2009 at 3.00pm, NLBP.	

<b>Dates of future meetings</b>			
	3.00pm	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2009	(Conference Room 3)
	3.00pm	6 <sup>th</sup> May 2009	(Training Room 5)
	3.00pm	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2009	(Training Room 5)

## APPENDIX I



### PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT JANUARY 2009

#### FREE ENTITLEMENT EXTENSION

40 providers have been identified as providing the NEF to 25% of most deprived children in Barnet. These are mostly based in the West and South Networks.

During January four meetings were arranged and carried out in the West Network. These small ward/neighbourhood meetings were an opportunity for providers to air their views about the implementation of the free entitlement extension, considering local issues.

A total of 12 schools, 2 Children's Centres and 9 PVI providers were invited to attend these meetings. A vast amount of information was gained, from those attending and the main points are highlighted on the attached sheet.

Feedback will inform planning, but setting a timetable that fits in with the admission processes will be a priority and it is clear that publicity for parents around the extended free entitlement must be available before schools offer places for September.

We will also draft an information sheet for Head Teachers to discuss with staff whilst they consider any possible models.

We are preparing a Question and Answer schedule to respond to questions that have come up through consultation.

I have attended meetings with all relevant unions and their comments and suggestions will of course be incorporated into any models we consider.

We will have further consultation with providers in South and East Networks in February but have used West as an indicator at this stage.

**Sheila Abbott**  
**28.1.09**

## APPENDIX I

### MAIN ISSUES RAISED AT NEF MEETINGS AT LOCALITIES IN WEST NETWORK

*Some schools are looking at 3 hour am and 3 hour pm sessions. Expressed concerns about the flexible offer and the many practicalities around this.*

***Schools expressed their concerns around the amount of time there is available to implement this before September.***

Pre-schools are highlighting level of funding main concern, especially if “top ups” are not allowed to be used.

***Some schools are concerned about different drop-off and collection times and how this will affect siblings at the school.***

Both PVI and schools needed confirmation about the no. of weeks per year that the entitlement referred to.

**It was established that breakfast clubs/after school clubs could be utilised but it appears that most schools only allow Year 1+ children to access these facilities, because of ratios, environment/resources not deemed suitable.**

*The issue of making entitlement clear to parents was stressed at all meetings. Some feared problems arising from first phase, where parents will not appreciate the “phasing in” of the entitlement.*

***Some schools expressed the need for leaflet to parents to be very simple, so easily translated.***

One meeting agreed that there must be a firm timetable put in place by the LA whereby clear deadlines have to be met with regards information to providers/information to parents. Providers must be informed of this timetable. Providers felt clear directions and answers to all queries must be in place before the start of the Summer term.

***One school said that LBB admissions must be kept informed and that offers were going out to parents in March based on 2 ½ hours and that information about the changes should go out to parents with offer from LA.(At a later***

**meeting it was confirmed that Nursery School places are offered by schools and not admissions).**

*Questionnaires to parents in schools could be a problem if schools are not able to deliver what the parents want in terms of flexibility. What if parents tell us what they want and we provide, then they change their mind?*

*If a parent is currently using two providers and they choose to put the funding with the PVI provider, will the school have to charge? If so, who will be responsible for collecting monies/debts? Who will advise on rates to charge? Who will provide the Admin?*

**A school was concerned that if parents fail to pay, are we going to turn them away?**

## **APPENDIX I**

Schools felt that they had to have a minimum of two staff, so even if numbers are low will still have the same salary overheads, so important to know what direction to go in now in order to maximise numbers.

**One school expressed concerns about staffing levels and whether more staff would need to be employed.**

*One meeting agreed that a generic questionnaire to assess parental need might be useful for all schools to access.*

***If schools consider the five hour model, it may be necessary to have nursery classes remeasured in order to confirm that increased nos. of children can be accommodated.***

One school are considering the five hour model for say, 30 out of 52 children, then to build other places around this time.

*It was considered at one meeting that we need a "good model" for schools to observe and for schools to have instruction on offering the EYFS over the flexible day.*

**An admission policy ref. priorities would be useful, ie, working parents, those on training.**

*One group said that they felt able to offer the 3 hour am/pm in Sept., with a view to consulting with parents and gaining more guidance about implementation, during the following year with a view to providing the flexible offer in Sept. 10.*

It was felt that the leaflet being produced for parents should not raise parents expectations of the offer, putting undue pressure on providers.

i. **APPENDIX II**

**5. Items for information**

1. EY Funding 2009/10 and overall budget

- **Overall budget available**

It is anticipated that the government Standards Fund grant together with funds released by the partial transition to participation-led funding in maintained schools will provide sufficient funding to cover the additional needed by designated providers offering the 2.5 hour extension in the most deprived areas of the borough from September 2009.

- **AWPU/NEF increases for 2009/10**

The intention for 2009/10 is to uplift 2008/09 AWPU rates to schools by around 3.5%, and to ensure parity between the maintained sector and PVI providers, the 2008/09 NEF rate will be increased by the same percentage. This would make the funding per session about £8.96.

Maintained schools will be funded in the same way as 2008/9 except that the number of places funded will be half way between maximum places and the number filled on school census day. Supplements for full time places will be halved.

PVIs will be funded in the same way as 2008/9.

- **2.5hrs NEF extension funding and increased flexibility**

About 40 settings will be offering the 2.5hrs extension from September and will receive an additional allocation per pupil of 20% of the relevant AWPU or NEF rate, depending on sector. Any extension funding will be shown as a separate item on the funding allocation reports.

We have been pleased at the number of schools and settings that have wanted to be the first to offer the extra hours, however the final list has not yet been agreed and may not be finalised before school budgets are sent out. We will hold the money in contingency until we are able to make funding allocations to the schools and settings in question. However we will try to do this as soon as possible to allow heads and managers to plan ahead.

We would also like to provide funding based on the level of flexibility provided by those extending their offer. We recognise that flexibility is likely to incur additional staff and management costs. We propose three levels of flexibility:

Level 0	No change (i.e. 5x2½hr sessions) – No flexibility premium
Level 1	5 x 3hour sessions to include breakfast/lunch – 50% premium
Level 2	3 x 5hour sessions or any other more flexible option – 100% premium

## APPENDIX II

- **Application of the Minimum Funding Guarantee to Schools**  
Maintained schools are protected by the government Minimum Funding Guarantee which ensures that the year on year funding per pupil rises by a minimum amount.

For 2009/10 and 2010/11, it is essential that any funding for 'protected' places in 2008/9 is not 'locked' into the baseline per pupil amount for the MFG as it would give artificially high nursery funding.

We will therefore be asking the Schools Forum to allow us to exclude the nursery AWPU and the nursery full time pupil allowance from the 2008/09 baseline figure for calculation of the 2009/10 Minimum Funding Level for Primary Schools.

## **APPENDIX II**

### **6. Items for agreement**

#### *ii.* EY Proposed formula 2010/11

From **2010/11**, all providers will be funded by participation using a universally consistent funding formula. This does not mean that all settings will be funded the same amount. The new funding formula is currently in the development phase and will take into account the extension to the free entitlement from 12.5 to 15 hours per week. We are proposing 6 elements:

- Per Pupil Amount
- Free Entitlement Extension
- Basic Entitlement
- Additional Educational Need
- Flexibility
- Qualifications

## **Distribution**

There will be a fixed sum of money to distribute to early years providers and therefore the amounts distributed by each element of the funding formula must add to the total. If one element is increased it will impact negatively on all the others.

In setting the formula we have the following aims:

- Fairness and transparency to all providers
- Predictable and consistent levels of funding
- To allow settings to respond to parental preferences
- To provide sufficient funds for the service offered
- To meet government requirements on delivery of the free entitlement

PVI settings currently receive funding based on individual pupils. From 2010/11 PVI funding allocations will still be pupil-led but will not be linked to an individual child, and rather should be used for the benefit of all children taking up the free entitlement at the setting. There will be adjustments based on the termly census but these will not be applied mid-term at individual pupil level.

## **Formula factors for 2010/11**

### **Per Pupil Rate**

- iii. The AWPU rate in maintained schools and nurseries and the NEF rate per eligible pupil in the PVI sector will be merged. We hope to have one basic rate for all settings.

### **2.5hrs NEF extension funding**

All settings will be offering the 2.5hrs extension from September 2010 and will receive an additional allocation per pupil of 20% of the Per Pupil Rate, from the term that they start to operate the extension. This extension funding will be shown as a separate item on the funding allocation reports.

## **APPENDIX II**

### **Basic entitlement allocation**

- iv. There will continue to be a Basic entitlement lump sum for maintained nursery classes and nursery schools. This is currently £2915.

This basic entitlement lump sum will be extended to PVIs with more than 10 eligible NEF pupils.

This is offered to offset the costs of handling admissions and administration.

There will be no additional payment to schools for full-time nursery pupils.

### **Additional Educational Need (AEN)**

The total funding for all maintained schools in Barnet is 'top sliced' by 10% to provide Additional Educational Need funding to maintained schools. It is distributed on a formula based mainly on deprivation in order to support pupils with additional need, but not statements.

A 10% top-slice of the early years budget would provide about £1m which would be distributed to all settings based on the deprivation score (IDACI) of the children in the setting.

#### **For discussion:**

Should the Early Years budget be 'top sliced' by an agreed percentage to provide AEN funding to all Early Years providers?

### **Flexibility premium**

Flexibility in the new funding formula would also be from a top-slice of the total funding available.

#### **For discussion:**

What proportion should be set aside for flexibility?

How can we objectively assess and record the level of flexibility at each setting?

### **Qualifications premium**

Whilst there is government funding to support early years workers to improve their qualifications, settings that employ more highly qualified staff will have higher costs.

#### **For discussion:**

Should there be financial recognition of those providers that offer a higher proportion of childcare staff that have Level 2 qualifications?

What percentage of the Early Years budget should be set aside to cover this?

How can we collect robust data on the level of qualifications of staff in each setting?

### **Children with statements**

The method of funding these children will be discussed at a later date, but any setting with children with a written statement will remain eligible for additional funding to provide support for that child.

## **APPENDIX III**

EYWG  
Early Years Budget overview

Pupil-Led allocations		(Incl 2.5 extension for 25% of pupils)	Incl 2.5 extension to all
<b>Reconciliation</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>Revised 2009/10</b>	<b>Forecast 2010/11</b>
Maintained sector	6,294,706	6,565,885	6,765,508
PVI (2 terms paid/1 term forecast)	3,263,789	3,826,506	4,916,474
	<u>9,558,494</u>	<u>10,392,391</u>	<u>11,681,982</u>
Central Management		100,000	100,000
TOTAL ALLOCATIONS		<u>10,492,391</u>	<u>11,781,982</u>

	ISB reconciliation 2009/10	2010/11
Maintained sector	5,936,962	5,454,346
PVI sector	4,071,393	4,173,178
EXPECTED EARLY YEARS TOTAL	<u>10,008,355</u>	<u>9,627,524</u>
Add'l Standards Fund Grant	484,036	2,154,458
TOTAL BUDGET AVAILABLE	<u>10,492,391</u>	<u>11,781,982</u>

<b>Modelling rates used</b>		<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
<b>Maintained sector</b>			
Nursery pupil AWPU	FTE	3320.44	Per pupil
Nursery f/t pupil addition		257.97	1751.10
Basic entitlement		2976.01	0
2.5 hrs extension		664.09	2976.01
Deprivation		0.00	350.22
Flexibility		651.57	849.10
<b>PVIs</b>			
NEF rate		1702.58	212.28
Basic entitlement		0.00	1751.10
2.5 hrs extension		340.52	2976.01
Deprivation		0.00	350.22
Flexibility		334.10	849.10

Prepared by Claire Gray  
28/01/2009

## **APPENDIX III**

Schools	Original 08/09 N Pupil led funding	Revised N 09/10 alloc	Difference % from 08/09	Revised N 10/11 alloc	Difference % from 09/10	Change in pupil numbers from 08/09 to 10/11
1	255,317	229,573	-0.10	216,166	-5.84	-28
2	120,632	158,316	0.31	191,782	21.14	0
3	255,317	262,777	0.03	271,329	3.25	-15
4	253,963	315,442	0.24	317,441	0.63	-13
12	85,453	77,686	-0.09	83,469	7.44	0
14	85,453	108,048	0.26	129,428	19.79	-39
16	85,453	109,262	0.28	155,356	42.19	0
17	97,970	96,014	-0.02	57,538	-40.07	-2
18	85,453	85,987	0.01	104,395	21.41	0
19	44,184	56,119	0.27	81,770	45.71	-8
20	130,573	134,537	0.03	133,704	-0.62	0
22	85,453	89,307	0.05	111,549	24.90	-12
23	85,453	71,875	-0.16	64,226	-10.64	0
25	85,453	121,682	0.42	142,521	17.13	-24
26	85,453	93,458	0.09	67,650	-27.61	0
28	93,156	108,534	0.17	119,797	10.38	-2
29	85,453	85,987	0.01	105,700	22.93	-8
30	85,453	89,840	0.05	91,113	1.42	0
35	126,722	119,191	-0.06	134,673	12.99	0
37	85,453	89,307	0.05	115,840	29.71	0
39	126,722	129,983	0.03	166,256	27.91	0
42	167,991	190,056	0.13	203,335	6.99	0
45	126,722	153,907	0.21	138,456	-10.04	0
47	97,970	96,014	-0.02	57,172	-40.46	-10
48	85,453	84,985	-0.01	81,572	-4.02	-12
49	167,991	156,546	-0.07	175,417	12.05	-7
50	85,453	92,268	0.08	94,218	2.11	-10
51	167,991	197,339	0.17	209,573	6.20	0
52	97,970	96,014	-0.02	57,366	-40.25	-13
53	85,453	67,725	-0.21	58,853	-13.10	-1
54	85,453	87,647	0.03	110,465	26.03	0
55	167,991	175,639	0.05	203,121	15.65	0
56	94,314	92,436	-0.02	55,615	-39.83	0
57	161,642	168,998	0.05	107,874	-36.17	-13
58	97,970	115,969	0.18	64,522	-44.36	0
63	85,453	83,497	-0.02	98,753	18.27	-11
64	126,722	136,914	0.08	154,553	12.88	0
66	85,453	88,626	0.04	86,516	-2.38	0
68	85,453	89,307	0.05	112,108	25.53	0
70	126,722	129,983	0.03	160,117	23.18	0
71	145,498	102,589	-0.29	66,354	-35.32	0
73	85,453	106,834	0.25	125,991	17.93	0
75	85,453	76,026	-0.11	78,355	3.06	-9
76	85,453	75,195	-0.12	77,559	3.14	-10
77	85,453	72,705	-0.15	70,982	-2.37	0
79	85,453	85,157	-0.00	101,869	19.63	-1
80	85,453	87,647	0.03	108,293	23.56	-18
81	167,991	146,585	-0.13	147,212	0.43	0
83	85,453	71,045	-0.17	67,393	-5.14	0
87	85,453	95,909	0.12	103,160	7.56	-7
88	85,453	93,482	0.09	96,302	3.02	0
90	85,453	81,836	-0.04	93,739	14.54	0
93	126,722	132,473	0.05	143,597	8.40	0
94	139,239	159,401	0.14	118,061	-25.93	-1
95	85,453	108,048	0.26	130,417	20.70	0
<b>MAINTAINED SECTOR TOTAL</b>	<b>6,294,706</b>	<b>6,565,885</b>		<b>6,765,508</b>		<b>-308</b>

Prepared by Claire Gray  
28/01/2009

## **APPENDIX III**

PVIs	Original 08/09 N Pupil led funding	Revised N 09/10 alloc	Difference % from 08/09	Revised N 10/11 alloc	Difference % from 09/10	Change in pupil numbers from 08/09 to 10/11
1	32,752	41,713	0.27	54,429	30.48	0
2	57,488	64,698	0.13	83,224	28.63	0
3	21,252	33,538	0.58	41,358	23.32	0
4	42,018	45,118	0.07	58,795	30.31	0
5	13,163	17,026	0.29	21,061	23.70	0
6	102,188	116,626	0.14	145,829	25.04	0
7	117,913	126,842	0.08	158,062	24.61	0
8	47,145	50,226	0.07	65,265	29.94	0
9	60,447	57,888	-0.04	73,810	27.51	0
10	29,072	39,159	0.35	51,659	31.92	0
11	38,736	43,416	0.12	56,165	29.37	0
12	12,644	14,673	0.16	17,726	20.81	0
13	37,325	45,118	0.21	58,127	28.83	0
14	31,176	34,903	0.12	47,340	35.64	0
15	68,587	108,114	0.58	136,409	26.17	0
16	28,465	33,200	0.17	43,652	31.48	0
17	54,904	65,549	0.19	85,356	30.22	0
18	16,821	20,431	0.21	28,737	40.65	0
19	28,370	30,646	0.08	40,478	32.08	0
20	28,405	36,605	0.29	48,123	31.47	0
21	38,321	40,011	0.04	52,667	31.63	0
22	15,704	21,282	0.36	29,113	36.80	0
23	40,208	42,564	0.06	56,371	32.44	0
24	33,999	40,011	0.18	52,127	30.28	0
25	24,213	28,944	0.20	38,400	32.67	0
26	16,487	17,877	0.08	24,890	39.23	0
27	19,390	24,687	0.27	33,207	34.51	0
28	109,367	127,693	0.17	159,092	24.59	0
29	13,077	16,174	0.24	19,925	23.19	0
30	11,951	14,472	0.21	17,972	24.18	0
31	27,504	38,778	0.41	47,131	21.54	0
32	26,148	44,018	0.68	54,037	22.76	0
33	13,458	17,817	0.32	20,503	15.08	0
34	120,876	116,626	-0.04	145,613	24.85	0
35	9,058	11,067	0.22	13,817	24.85	0
36	10,808	15,721	0.45	17,904	13.89	0
37	25,374	29,795	0.17	39,848	33.74	0
38	6,689	29,795	3.45	39,485	32.52	0
39	20,438	39,826	0.95	47,666	19.69	0
40	29,369	34,903	0.19	46,500	33.23	0
41	23,243	29,345	0.26	36,734	25.18	0
42	53,302	57,036	0.07	73,345	28.59	0
43	71,719	77,467	0.08	99,092	27.92	0
44	19,714	22,985	0.17	31,164	35.59	0
45	31,338	38,308	0.22	50,087	30.75	0
46	15,926	26,201	0.65	33,666	28.49	0
47	32,553	33,200	0.02	44,202	33.14	0
48	46,011	53,631	0.17	68,881	28.43	0
49	106,431	107,262	0.01	134,349	25.25	0
50	24,750	34,586	0.40	43,125	24.69	0
51	15,001	20,431	0.36	28,274	38.39	0
52	25,022	34,903	0.39	45,857	31.39	0
53	7,707	3,405	-0.56	4,215	23.78	0
54	50,687	77,556	0.53	98,001	26.36	0
55	17,320	8,513	-0.51	10,482	23.13	0

Prepared by Claire Gray  
28/01/2009

## **APPENDIX III**

PVIs	Original 08/09 N Pupil led funding	Revised N 09/10 alloc	Difference % from 08/09	Revised N 10/11 alloc	Difference % from 09/10	Change in pupil numbers from 08/09 to 10/11
56	36,269	53,451	0.47	65,191	21.97	0
57	24,612	30,646	0.25	40,785	33.08	0
58	4,884	8,513	0.74	10,518	23.55	0
59	10,392	11,529	0.11	13,348	15.79	0
60	40,962	34,903	-0.15	46,093	32.06	0
61	74,996	71,508	-0.05	91,836	28.43	0
62	25,460	25,539	0.00	34,554	35.30	0
63	18,065	21,282	0.18	29,274	37.55	0
64	57,935	59,590	0.03	76,231	27.93	0
65	9,569	13,621	0.42	16,743	22.92	0
66	16,705	22,133	0.32	30,326	37.02	0
67	13,345	13,621	0.02	16,936	24.34	0
68	14,475	22,009	0.52	29,587	34.43	0
69	24,984	28,944	0.16	38,450	32.84	0
70	27,513	34,903	0.27	47,264	35.42	0
71	22,468	23,836	0.06	32,709	37.22	0
72	9,917	13,621	0.37	16,794	23.30	0
73	38,970	13,621	-0.65	16,800	23.34	0
74	21,618	25,539	0.18	34,426	34.80	0
75	26,023	30,646	0.18	40,501	32.15	0
76	18,605	19,580	0.05	27,224	39.04	0
77	22,880	37,730	0.65	45,889	21.63	0
78	36,020	45,118	0.25	59,292	31.41	0
79	7,153	8,513	0.19	10,545	23.87	0
80	12,645	14,472	0.14	17,836	23.25	0
81	28,578	26,390	-0.08	35,352	33.96	0
82	22,733	26,390	0.16	35,292	33.73	0
83	21,082	31,441	0.49	39,273	24.91	0
84	17,485	51,077	1.92	65,647	28.52	0
85	5,283	7,336	0.39	8,599	17.22	0
86	2,407	1,703	-0.29	2,087	22.60	0
87	9,604	11,067	0.15	13,731	24.08	0
88	14,202	10,480	-0.26	12,063	15.10	0
89	4,157	3,405	-0.18	4,183	22.85	0
90	727	1,703	1.34	2,084	22.40	0
91	4,702	11,529	1.45	14,049	21.86	0
92	4,053	3,405	-0.16	4,183	22.85	0
93	26,933	28,944	0.07	38,695	33.69	0
94	13,347	17,026	0.28	20,924	22.90	0
95	22,516	25,539	0.13	34,647	35.67	0
96	17,147	22,133	0.29	30,648	38.47	0
97	37,974	41,713	0.10	54,010	29.48	0
98	28,838	32,349	0.12	43,516	34.52	0
99	13,284	17,877	0.35	25,136	40.61	0
100	91,406	98,749	0.08	123,721	25.29	0
101	43,776	47,672	0.09	61,546	29.10	0
102	15,155	17,877	0.18	25,020	39.95	0
103	60,667	68,103	0.12	86,524	27.05	0
104	29,864	33,200	0.11	43,994	32.51	0
105	89,371	102,155	0.14	129,049	26.33	0
<b>PVI SECTOR SUBTOTALS</b>	<b>3,263,789</b>	<b>3,826,506</b>		<b>4,916,474</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9,558,494 0</b>	<b>10,392,391</b>		<b>11,681,982</b>		<b>0</b>

Prepared by Claire Gray  
28/01/2009