

# 2020 Funding Reform Options *For Consideration*



# Process

- Purpose of consultation is to determine if there is a consensus position on future policy change from key stakeholders
- Any position by stakeholders will be considered by the Department; however whether to adopt proposed changes, alternative changes or no change is decision of government.

# Guiding Principles

- **Educational Considerations** – ie does the policy support school improvement?
- **Transparency** – can staff and parents at schools clearly understand the basis for funding their school?
- **Equity** – is funding provided to a student based on their needs irrespective of where they attend school?
- **Efficiency** – is funding allocated effectively to meet the needs of the students?
- **Simplicity** – does the method of funding avoid unnecessary complexity?



# Policy Areas for Review

Tuesday 5/3: Rural and Isolated Schools

Tuesday 5/3: Curriculum Specific Funding

Wed 6/3: Student Centered Funding Model.

Wed 6/3: Students with Disabilities

Fri 8/3: Funding for Low-SES students

Fri 8/3: Aboriginal Students

Tue 12/3: Comprehensive Reforms

# Rural & Isolated Schools

## **Stakeholders considered the following options for change:**

- Allocating all Rural Funding as a single budget line in the RES, based differential pricing per student in each ARIA zone.
- Allocating all Rural Funding as a single budget line in the RES, based on KM from Adelaide.
- Allocating all Rural Funding as a single budget line in the RES, based on ARIA zones and on KM from Adelaide

## **Stakeholders support reform of current policy as follows:**

- No Change to open access funding – but rename to reflect broader curriculum purpose
- Combine Behaviour and Rural Isolated funding lines (provided inclusion funding is supporting students in rural areas)
- Allocate combined funding via distance based on cost to travelling to Adelaide.
- Establish a distance threshold for funding based on likelihood of students already regularly visiting Adelaide(outside of school)

# Rural & Isolated Schools

## Stakeholders asked for more information:

- An analysis of high achievers in rural areas compared to metro
- An analysis of whether there is a correlation between distance and unfilled TRT days
- Spending patterns of rural schools

# Curriculum Specific Funding

## Stakeholders considered the following 3 options for change:

1. Creation of three broad categories of curriculum grants with 9 subcategories to mimic current allocations. This approach would support transparency and consistency in funding principles and move funding allocation away from RAAP. It would result in relatively small shifts in funding between schools which would require “grandfathering” or a transition arrangement to give schools time to prepare for small funding shifts.  
This approach would convert current VET in school funding provided to specific schools by counting of students at more than 1.0FTE into a transparent grant amount.
2. Allocate any new funding based on strategic public education or geographic equity of access.
3. Reallocation of existing funding through a strategic public education policy designed to encourage participation within public schools or via equity grounds.

## Stakeholders support moving to option 1 as a first step towards longer-term systemic change as well as independent regular evaluation of existing funding for specialist curriculum offerings.

### Stakeholders provided feedback/comments that:

- There is 2 tiered education system (75% of schools have no access to specialist curriculum funding), which may be encouraging competition between government schools.
- Curriculum specific funding may not be necessary if strict zoning rules are put in place.
- The system should be responsive and not lock funding into specialist curriculum, potentially for decades, without evaluation.
- Some schools do not have adequate facilities to support extra curriculum.
- The Department should explore the regional accommodation (hostel) model that exists in WA as an alternative to funding curriculum breadth in small remote schools. (This suggestions overlaps with the discussion on rural funding).

# Student Centred Funding Model

## Stakeholders support reform of current policy as follows:

- Supportive of incorporating 0.1FTE admin, Primary Principal Supplementation, ICT grant and area R-12 supplementation within the SCFM base and per capita amounts as long as specific items especially lines that target leadership workload are enshrined in documentation (i.e RES notes)
- Supportive of including other RAAP supplementation into the SCFM (i.e large primary schools, additional leadership for some R-12 schools)
- Supportive of reducing per capita rates from 4 categories to 2 categories (Primary/Secondary), provided that Pt Lincoln Junior Primary (R-2) and Pt Lincoln Primary (3-7) will need to be adjusted using existing RES funding categories.
- Supportive of a trial in country partnership of allocating TRT supplementation at the beginning of the year to enable country schools to manage teacher absence locally potentially with a longer term contract.

# Student Centred Funding Model

## Stakeholders suggested:

- A partnership being selected for TRT supplementation trial that was:
  - In a country location, and
  - Had an average TRT utilisation similar to the State average (to ensure a cost neutral outcome for the trial)

# Students with Disabilities

**Stakeholders considered four potential models for funding students with disabilities in special schools, units and classes as follows:**

1. Special schools funded via the SCFM, plus an additional base grant, plus mainstream inclusion funding categories 1-9, plus RAAP
2. Existing Tier 1 staffing formula, plus mainstream inclusion funding categories 1-9, less an adjustment for additional funding factored into the staffing formula, plus RAAP
3. Existing Tier 1 staffing formula, plus additional inclusion funding categories 1-9 with different pricing for students in each category of disability depending on their educational setting, plus RAAP.
4. Existing Tier 1 staffing formula, plus additional inclusion funding categories 1-9 with same pricing for students in each category of disability irrespective of their educational setting, plus RAAP.

**Stakeholders support reform of current policy as follows**

- Support moving to a consistent funding model in special settings that is transparent with mainstream funding.
- Support a model with different pricing for students in each category of disability depending on their educational setting.
- Noted that such a model would cost an additional \$1.6m.
- Agreed that additional funds should not come from a reduction in other policy areas, however if additional funding became available for public education, additional support for students in special setting would be a priority use for these funds.
- Support funding policy to recognise Leadership density for complex sites (ie special settings)

# Aboriginal Education

## Stakeholders support reform of current policy as follows

- Supportive of all Aboriginal education funding being transparently shown in the RES
- Supportive of SAASTA being included in the RES as a separate curriculum-specific funding line.
- Supportive of all other Aboriginal education funding lines being aggregated as a single RES allocation
- Supportive of separating funding policy into a funding formula and an accountability document that identified which student outcomes the funding was intended to improve
- Supportive of current and historic funding allocations to be documented in future RES Notes (with links to relevant policy documents).
- Not supportive of an accountability document that sets out requirements on how resources should be deployed
- Supportive of increasing employment of Aboriginal people
- Supportive of increasing longer-term and ongoing contracts for staff and reducing contracts for small fractions of time (ie 0.1 – 0.2 FTE etc .)

# Aboriginal Education

## Stakeholders provided feedback/comments:

- Interested in further discussions regarding what are successful pedagogies and interventions that support the Aboriginal Education Strategy and improve outcomes for Aboriginal students and how these can be case-managed (this may require fundamental strategy review which funding policy should enable).
- Wanting to explore whether funding should be weighted more heavily to the early years of schooling and to early childhood programs.
- Noted that the Youth Education Centre currently receive \$174,000 via APAS funding which is used to support homework centre – this explains variance in modelling
- Supportive of strategies for specialist staff to work across schools within a partnership, which would improve employment conditions, provided that safeguards were in place to stop staff burn-out.
- Stakeholders requested further analysis of outcomes for Aboriginal students in schools with high concentrations of Aboriginal students.
- Should weigh-up benefits and risks of aggregating all funding into a single RES line
- Investigate Adult learning at SACE level in specific subjects aimed at good parenting (ie teach your children to read, cook healthy food, etc.)
- Consideration should be given to higher weightings for students in Anangu schools

# Low-SES Students

## Stakeholders support reform of current policy as follows:

- Supportive of a move from the IoED to a measure based solely on Parental Education and Occupation using data recorded in EDSAS.
- Supportive of a move away from all funding being allocated only to schools with high concentrations of low-SES students – to one more consistent with how the Commonwealth and State governments funds the department.
- Supportive of a move away from schools being funded based 7 discrete categories of disadvantage to a continuous measure
- Supportive of funding the two bottom quintiles (40%) of disadvantage (rather than the bottom two quartiles (50%))
- Supportive of some low-SES funding being allocated based on an explicit measure of complexity, defined as high percentages of complex students for example Aboriginal, children under guardianship, New arrivals program, in receipt of inclusion funding, bottom quintile of SES, transient, parents in goal, domestic violence background (if data available).
- Requested that a school's fee-raising capacity be considered when determining funding for low-SES students.
- Supportive of funding policy that does not create a financial incentive for schools to exclude complex students.
- Supportive of a longer-term transition pathway from current policy to a new policy, noting the potentially large shifts in funding at some schools.

# Low-SES Students

## Stakeholders provided feedback/comment:

- Uncertain whether funding currently allocated universally to reduce class size in years R-2 should be targeted only to disadvantaged students or included within tier 1 section of the RES?
- Requested that a school's fee-raising capacity be considered when determining funding for low-SES students, subject to analysis of variation in fee revenue compared to low-SES funding.
- Concerned that reform would have large impact on schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged students.
- Noted anomalies in individual schools which could relate to data issues and seek more investigation into "outlier" schools
- Supportive of existing departmental accountability mechanisms on funding for low-SES students to ensure they are outcomes focussed
- Supportive of staffing policy that ensures the most capable teachers (and support staff) are teaching in low-SES schools. Supportive of differentiating other policies and procedures to improve the way our system addresses equity issues, alignment of all policies.
- Supportive of moving to world class system in terms of equity

# Funding Policy 2020 – Comprehensive Reform

## Next Steps

- Students with Disabilities – Officers in Funding Directorate to finalise model with South Australian Special Education Principals and Leaders Association.
- Funding for Low-SES students and Aboriginal Students – Officers in Funding Directorate to finalise model with Presidents of Australian Education Union, SAPPA and SASSPA.
- Once all models are finalized – Officers in Funding Directorate combine into a comprehensive reform proposal for further consultation, with the aim of advising schools of the 2020 funding arrangements by August 2019.