

Report to the Minister for Education and Skills

on

The Impact in Terms of Posts of Budget Measures

in relation to

**The Withdrawal from DEIS Band 1 and Band 2 Urban Primary
Schools of Posts from Disadvantage Schemes pre-dating DEIS**

Contents

Purpose of Report	5
Introduction	5 - 6
Context	7
Rationale for Report	8
Net Impact of Measures on DEIS Band 1 & Band 2 Schools	9
Analysis	10
Analysis of Level of Disadvantage in Schools Involved	11
Analysis of Overall Pupil Teacher Ratios	12 - 13
Analysis of the Impact of the withdrawal of posts allocated under schemes that pre-dated DEIS	14
Analysis of the impact of Budget Measures: Legacy; Enrolment Changes; Staffing Schedule	15
Analysis of Impact on Individual Band 1 Schools	16 – 19
Analysis of Impact on Individual Band 2 Schools	20 – 22
Appendix A - Table 1	23
Appendix B - Table 2	24
Appendix C - Breakdown of Impact on Band 1 Schools	
Appendix D – Breakdown of Impact on Band 2 Schools	

Purpose of Report

To illustrate the net effect in terms of posts of Budget measures on DEIS Band 1 and Band 2 urban primary schools which still had additional posts allocated under disadvantage schemes, pre-dating DEIS.

Introduction:

Budget Measures 2012 – Primary Level

No increase of the mainstream staffing schedule general average of 28:1 for the allocation of classroom teachers at primary level

Phased increase in the pupil threshold for the allocation of classroom teachers in small primary schools

The overall number of Special Needs Assistants (SNAs) and resource teachers to be maintained at current levels

Reform of Teacher Allocation Process:

- DEIS Staffing Schedules

The development of dedicated DEIS Band 1 staffing schedules of 20:1 in junior schools, 24:1 in senior schools and 22:1 in vertical schools.

- This simplifies the whole teacher allocation process for DEIS Band 1 schools with favourable PTRs
- Pupils in special classes are now counted in the enrolment for the purposes of DEIS posts whereas they were excluded under the previous method
- the threshold for small DEIS Band 1 schools is more favourable compared to mainstream small schools

- General Allocation Model (GAM) & Language Support

The combined resources available for GAM and language support (currently 4,700 posts) to be used to create a single simplified allocation process to cover both the GAM and language support. The new single allocation for GAM and language support will be based on the number of classroom teaching posts in each school in the previous school year (i.e. the allocation for 2012/13 school year will be based on the number of mainstream classroom teaching posts in the 2011/12 school year).

- Resource Posts - allocations determined by the NCSE (National Council for Special Education)

As part of the reforms to the teacher allocation process existing posts will be used to put in place a network of about 2,450 full-time resource posts in over 1,600 base schools throughout the country that will be allocated on a permanent basis.

This approach builds on the interim arrangements that operated in 2011 but in a more structured and transparent manner. The annual changes in resource hours at individual school level will only affect where the teacher works on any one day – not whether the base school continues to host the full-time post. This approach will introduce a greater constancy in the context of the annual allocations and redeployment process.

Withdrawal of earlier disadvantage programmes/schemes

The phased withdrawal of 428 posts (estimate based on 2010 enrolment figures) from earlier disadvantage programmes/schemes in 270 primary schools and 163 post primary schools. A number of posts were to be held in reserve to alleviate the impact on schools with larger numbers of these posts who would potentially be most affected by this measure.

Budget Measures	No. of Schools		No. of Posts	
	DEIS	NON DEIS	DEIS	NON DEIS
Non DEIS Schools -Withdraw favourable PTRs of 20:1 and 27:1		15		38
Abolish the Support Teacher Project	46	2	41	2
Withdraw favourable PTRs in 32 Band 1 DEIS Schools previously in 'Breaking the Cycle'	32		45	
Withdraw Disadvantage Concessionary Posts (DAS) from DEIS schools				
Primary	59		64	
Post Primary	163		136	
Withdraw favourable PTRs from Band 2 schools	51		102	

Context

Comprehensive Expenditure Review (CER)

All Departments were required to prepare a Comprehensive Expenditure Review Report in respect of the Departments and their associated agencies, to identify expenditure programme savings, scope for savings arising from efficiency and other reforms, proposals for reducing and/or merging of agencies and associated reductions in staff numbers.

The objectives of the Expenditure Review process were to provide the Government with a comprehensive set of decision options:-

- to meet the overall fiscal consolidation objectives, both as regards spending and numbers reduction targets
- to re-align spending with the Programme for Government priorities
- to consider new ways of achieving Government objectives in the context of public sector reform.

Under the CER, Ministers and Departments had the responsibility to evaluate every budgetary programme for which they are responsible, within both Departments and Agencies.

Outcome of Comprehensive Expenditure Review:

The Department of Education and Skills sought to balance the requirement to remain within tight budgetary ceilings, at a time of significant increases in student numbers, with continuing to provide and develop education at all levels and ensuring the optimum focus for further education and training investment.

While the CER process assisted in the allocation of resources as effectively and efficiently as possible, it was necessary to implement a range of further savings measures relating to education and training expenditure, to take effect over the period 2012-2014.

The approach taken in the CER process endeavoured to spread the adjustment burden equitably across different parts of the education system. This would ensure that education and training priorities continued to be the focus of policy and allocations. DEIS schools in disadvantaged areas would continue to be provided with targeted supports including preferential Pupil Teacher Ratios (PTRs) over and above mainstream schools.

However, among the measures was the phased withdrawal, from 2012/13 school year of additional supports in some schools which had been allocated to them under earlier educational disadvantage programmes/schemes, pre-dating DEIS (Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools). Many of these schools, for historical reasons, enjoyed more favourable PTRs than DEIS schools generally, despite the fact that there were many other DEIS schools equally or more disadvantaged.

Rationale for Report:

Following the Budget 2012 announcement in relation to the withdrawal, on a phased basis, of posts in schools from previous educational disadvantage schemes the Minister:

- Personally met with school principals, teachers, parents and communities to hear their concerns and clarify the position in relation to changes announced under Budget 2012 to posts allocated to schools under previous schemes to tackle educational disadvantage.
- Held meetings with Government colleagues, who also met with schools, teachers, parents in their local communities.

Furthermore:

PQs and Representations raised concerns of schools in relation to the impact of the measure to withdraw posts from previous educational disadvantage schemes

Conflicting, and in some cases exaggerated, numbers of posts were being reported as potentially lost to schools and it was necessary to obtain clarity with regard to:

- The net effect of a range of factors on teacher allocations in these schools which were resulting in conflicting numbers being reported; for example increasing and decreasing enrolments and the reforms to the existing teacher allocations process, all of which will contribute to determining the staffing requirement for these schools for 2012/13 school year.
- The most up-to-date enrolment figures. Schools in most cases had up to date enrolment figures for September 2011 whereas the estimate of posts calculated by the Department at the time of the CER was based on 2010 enrolments.
- Demographics – impact of increasing and decreasing enrolments. For example, one school has reported losing 12 posts in total. However, 3 of these posts relate to a falling enrolment of 33 pupils compared to the previous year's enrolment.
- Reform of the Teacher Allocation Process which includes using existing resources to update the GAM allocation for all schools and also a move away from giving a 'top up' to the mainstream staffing schedule. Some schools will gain and some will lose as a result of the reform to the teacher allocations process.

Net Impact of Measures on DEIS Band 1 & Band 2 Schools

Having examined the staffing allocation for all DEIS schools in Band 1 and Band 2 it was seen that the impact of the Budget measures was confined to 140 of these schools which had retained posts from earlier schemes over and above their DEIS entitlement.

Appendix C (67 Band 1 Schools) and Appendix D (73 Band 2 schools) illustrate the impact of the budget measures on the 140 individual schools involved.

N.B. Staffing identified for individual schools for 2012/13 is provisional at this stage and is subject to change having regard to factors such as:

- Applications by schools for developing posts based on their projected enrolments for September 2012
- Appeals by schools to the Staffing Appeals Board, particularly for schools with high concentrations of pupils that require language support
- Clustering arrangements for GAM hours into full-time GAM posts based either in their own school or in neighbouring schools
- Resource hours approved by the NCSE for pupils with low incidence special needs (staffing for this will be mainly accessed from the network of pre-approved resource posts in base schools)

While this report and tables set out the provisional position at this stage of the allocation process, a fully accurate comparison between the staffing levels in schools in the current school year and the 2012/13 school year can only be made when the allocation process is fully completed later in 2012.

GAM Adjustment for Band 1 Schools

The GAM hours for all schools, including DEIS Band 1 schools, are in 5 hour blocks (0.2 of a post) to facilitate schools clustering their hours to create full-time shared GAM posts.

In addition to the standard GAM allocation that is given to all schools it is proposed from 2012/13 to give the following additional allocation to DEIS Band 1 schools:

0.2 of a post for Band 1 schools with an enrolment of less than 200 pupils and 0.4 of a post for Band 1 schools with enrolments of 200 or more.

Analysis:

There are 198 schools in DEIS Band 1 and 144 in DEIS Band 2. Of these 140 schools (67 Band 1 and 73 Band 2) are currently in receipt of posts over and above their DEIS entitlement which they were allowed to retain from four individual schemes which predated DEIS.

DEIS introduced a significant shift in emphasis from individual one-dimensional programmes, each addressing particular aspects of the underlying causes of educational disadvantage, to a multi-faceted integrated approach adopting a range of interventions to support schools based on a school's relative level of disadvantage.

The earlier four disadvantaged schemes are: Breaking the Cycle, Giving Children an Even Break, Disadvantaged Areas Scheme and the Primary Support Teacher Project.

Band 1

The 67 Band 1 schools are broken down as follows:

32 Schools previously in Breaking the Cycle which entitled them to :

- a PTR of 15:1 in junior & 24:1 in senior classes, as compared with DEIS norms of 20:1 and 24:1 respectively and a non-DEIS norm of 28:1.

In addition, these schools retained

- 7 over quota Disadvantage concessionary posts in 5 schools
- 12 Support Teacher Project posts in 12 schools

35 schools in Band 1 but not in Breaking the Cycle retained:

- 15 over quota Disadvantage concessionary posts in 13 schools
- 22 Support Teacher Project posts in 22 schools

Band 2

Band 2 schools do not benefit from more favourable PTRs under DEIS but are in receipt of a range of other supports. Of the 144 Band 2 schools, 93 operate the mainstream staffing schedule of 28:1 i.e. have the same PTR as non-DEIS schools.

73 Band 2 schools with legacy posts are broken down as follows:

51 Band 2 schools previously in Giving Children an Even Break (GCEB) retained teaching posts to implement

- 20:1 ptr in junior classes and 27:1 ptr in senior classes.

In addition, some of these schools also retained:

- 2 over quota Disadvantage concessionary posts in 2 schools
- 5 Support Teacher Project posts in 5 schools

22 of the 93 Band 2 schools which operate the mainstream staffing schedule of 28:1 also have the following legacy posts:

- 25 over quota Disadvantage concessionary posts in 22 schools
- 2 Support Teacher Project posts in 2 schools

Analysis of the level of Disadvantage in Schools involved

The process of identifying schools for participation in DEIS ranked schools according to their level of disadvantage relative to other schools. Of the 342 urban primary schools selected for inclusion in DEIS, Band 1 schools are ranked from 1 to 198 and Band 2 are ranked from 199 to 342.

Schools receive a range of supports under DEIS including both teaching and non-teaching resources in accordance with their level of disadvantage. This approach ensures that there is a closer match between the level of disadvantage and the level of resources being made available.

The table below is a breakdown of schools retaining teaching posts over and above their entitlements and their ranking under DEIS:

- 41% of the 32 Band 1 schools with PTRs of 15:1 and 24:1 are in the Top 50 of DEIS Band 1 - 59% are not
- 43% of the 51 Band 2 schools with PTRs of 20:1 and 27:1 are in the 199-250 range, i.e. in the top 50 most disadvantaged in Band 2 – 57% are not
- Therefore there is no correlation among these DEIS schools between their level of disadvantage and retention of supports under earlier schemes

Band 1	Top 50	51 – 100	101 – 150	151 – 198
32 BTC schools	13 (41%)	10 (31%)	6 (19%)	3 (9%)

Band 2	199 – 250	251 – 299	300 – 343
51 GCEB Schools	22 (43%)	17 (33%)	12 (24%)

Analysis of Overall Pupil Teacher Ratios

A. Prior to the implementation of budget measures

In the schools involved the overall Pupil Teacher Ratios in these schools range from 7.33:1 to 19.26:1.

Of the 140 schools:

- 82 (59 %) have staffing complements which give the schools overall PTRs of less than 13:1
- 124 (89 %) have staffing complements which give the schools overall PTRs of less than 15:1

Breakdown in each category is as follows:

Category	PTR within Category		Comment
	From	To	
Band 1 – 32 BTC	7.33:1	14.16:1	29 of the 32 schools with PTR less than 13:1
			32 of the 32 schools with PTR less than 15:1
Band 1 – 35 with DAS and/or Support Teacher post only	8.38:1	14.73:1	25 of the 35 schools with PTR less than 13:1
			35 of the 35 schools with PTR less than 15:1
Band 2 – 51 GCEB	9:1	16.80:1	25 of the 51 schools with PTR less than 13:1
			47 of the 51 schools with PTR less than 15:1
Band 2 – 22 with DAS and or support teacher post only	10.79:1	19.26:1	3 of the 22 schools with PTR less than 13:1
			10 of the 22 schools with PTR less than 15:1

B. Following the implementation of budget measures

If the Budget measures are fully implemented in the 140 schools involved, including changes in staffing schedule process, demographics and withdrawal of posts under previous disadvantaged schemes, the overall provisional Pupil Teacher Ratios in these schools will range from 8.48:1 to 22.26:1.

Of the 140 schools:

- 72 (51%) would still have staffing complements which give the schools overall PTRs of less than 15:1
- 137 (98%) would still have staffing complements which give the schools overall PTRs of less than 20:1

Breakdown in each category is as follows:

Category	PTR within Category		Comment
	From	To	
Band 1 – 32 BTC	8.48:1	15.41:1	30 of the 32 schools with PTR less than 15:1 32 of the 32 schools with PTR less than 20:1
Band 1 – 35 with DAS and/or Support Teacher post only	8.52:1	17.09:1	31 of the 35 schools with PTR less than 15:1 35 of the 35 schools with PTR less than 20:1
Band 2 – 51 GCEB	8.08:1	22.26:1	10 of the 51 schools with PTR less than 15:1 49 of the 51 schools with PTR less than 20:1
Band 2 – 22 with DAS and or support teacher post only	13.33:1	21.54:1	1 of the 22 schools with PTR less than 15:1 21 of the 22 schools with PTR less than 20:1

Analysis of the Impact of the Number of Posts Lost by the Withdrawal of Posts from Previous Disadvantage Schemes Only

The table below gives an analysis of the projected losses in the 140 schools involved – see Appendix A - Table 1 ‘Estimated impact of Budget Savings Measures on DEIS Band 1 and Band 2 Schools’.

This excludes any changes in respect of enrolment between 2010 and 2011, the application of the staffing schedule and changes under GAM.

The impact in terms of legacy posts on these schools would be as follows:

- 3 schools losing more than 5 posts
- 22 schools losing 3 – 4 posts
- 8 schools - no posts are lost
- The majority of schools, 107 are losing 0.5 – 2 posts

Summary of Table 1 – Appendix A: Summary of Number of Posts Lost by the Withdrawal of Posts from Previous Disadvantage Schemes Only

Table 1 (Appendix A) No of Schools – Impact of withdrawal of Posts from previous disadvantage Schemes only	No. of Posts to be withdrawn per School	Total Number of Posts to be Withdrawn
1	9	9
2	6	12
6	4	24
16	3	48
36	2	72
69	1	69
2	0.5	1
8	0	0
140		235

Analysis of the impact of the Number of Posts Gained/Lost due to Budget Measures: Legacy Posts, the Application of the Staffing Schedule and Falling/Increased Enrolment Only¹

Table 2 below gives an analysis of the losses in the 140 schools, including changes in enrolment and the application of the new staffing schedule – see Appendix B - Table 2 ‘Summary of Number of Posts Gained/Lost due to Budget Measures’.

For example, the school losing 12 posts in this table is the same school losing 9 posts in the table above. The difference is due to falling enrolment and the application of the staffing schedule. Because of falling enrolments, this school will lose 3 posts, regardless of the budget decision regarding posts under previous educational disadvantage schemes.

Summary of Table 2 – Appendix B: Summary of Number of Posts Gained/Lost due to Budget Measures: Legacy Posts, the Application of the Staffing Schedule and Falling/Increased Enrolment Only

Table 2 (Appendix B)	Number of posts to be withdrawn per school	Total Number of Posts to be Withdrawn
No of Schools		
1	12	12
1	8	8
1	6	6
4	5	20
7	4	28
29	3	87
39	2	78
38	1	38
2	0.5	1
18	0	0
140		278

¹ (excludes GAM, Resource, Language support and special classes)

Analysis of Impact on Individual Band 1 Schools

Examples of Band 1 Schools

School A:

Band 1 Junior school was in Breaking the Cycle and retained 15:1 and the Support Teacher Project post when DEIS was introduced.

Enrolment 2010:	466
Enrolment 2011:	433
Decrease:	33

School A	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	50.58	8.56:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 if Budget Measures implemented in full	40.08	10.80:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 10.50 posts as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (Resource Hours not included):

School A	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 425)	+ 1.5
Falling enrolment	- 3
BTC posts	- 8
Support teacher	- 1
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	17.8%

- This school will lose 3 posts as a result of falling enrolment, regardless of whether the budget measures or any form of alleviation are put in place
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts from previous schemes of educational disadvantage in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- This school will clearly be in line for alleviation measures from the posts reserved in Budget 2012 to deal with schools particularly adversely affected.
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio in this school may still be less than 11:1 following budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

School B:

Band 1 senior school, included in Breaking the Cycle and the Disadvantaged Areas Scheme but not in Support Teacher Project.

Enrolment 2010:	235
Enrolment 2011:	240
Increase:	5

School B	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	18.17	13.21:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 if Budget Measures implemented in full	16.08	14.92:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 2.09 posts as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (Resource Hours not included):

School B	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept'03 – 295)	- 1.09
Enrolment	0
Legacy teaching posts	- 1
Support teacher	0
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	5.5%

- This school is due to lose 1 legacy post under DAS
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- The school has no language support provision
- The school's overall Pupil Teacher Ratio may be less than 15:1 following Budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

School C:

Band 1 vertical school, not in Breaking the Cycle but in the Support Teacher Project.

Enrolment 2010:	223
Enrolment 2011:	221
Decrease:	2

School C	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	23.32	9.56:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 of Budget Measures implemented in full	23.82	9.27:1

This school is provisionally due to gain 0.50 post as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (resource hours not included):

School C	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 151)	+ 0.51
Enrolment	+ 1
Legacy teaching posts	- 0
Support teacher	- 1
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	4.29%

- This school is due to lose 1 Support Teacher post
- School is gaining 1 Mainstream class teacher
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- The school has no language support provision
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio in the school may still be below 10:1 following budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

School D:

Band 1 vertical school, not in Breaking the Cycle but with Support Teacher Project.

Enrolment 2010:	215
Enrolment 2011:	223
Increase:	8

School D	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	15.74	13.66:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 of Budget Measures implemented in full	15.73	14.18:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 0.01 post as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (resource hours not included):

School D	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 193)	- 0.01
Enrolment	+ 1
Legacy posts	0
Support teacher	- 1
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	6.35%

- This school is due to lose 1 support teacher legacy post
- School is gaining 1 Mainstream class teacher
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. The GAM allocations were based on 2003 school enrolments and changes in enrolment, has not been taken into consideration since then
- The school has no language support provision
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio in the school may still be below 15:1 following the budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this allocations and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

Analysis of Impact on Individual Band 2 Schools

Examples of Band 2 Schools

School E:

Band 2 vertical school, in Giving Children an Even Break but with no Support Teacher Project. (While this school is in Giving Children an Even Break, it does not require additional staffing to meet enhanced PTRs of 20:1 at Junior and 27:1 at senior cycles).

Enrolment 2010: 398

Enrolment 2011: 400

Increase: 2

School E	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	28.82	13.81:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 of Budget Measures implemented in full	27.07	14.78:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 1.75 posts as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (Resource hours not included):

School E	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 380)	- 1.75
Enrolment	0
Legacy posts	0
Support teacher	0
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	0%

- This school is not due to lose any legacy post
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- The school currently has no language support post but this is combined with GAM
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio in the school may be less than 15:1 following budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

School F:

Band 2 vertical school, in Giving Children an Even Break with Support Teacher Project.

Enrolment 2010:	717
Enrolment 2011:	685
Decrease:	32

School F	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	54.19	13.23:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 of Budget Measures implemented in full	44.04	15.55:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 10.15 posts as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (resource hours not included):

School F	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 668)	- 2.15
Enrolment	- 2
Legacy posts	- 5
Support teacher	- 1
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	11.07%

- This school is due to lose 5 teaching legacy posts, 1 support teacher legacy post
- The school will lose 2 posts due to falling enrolment regardless of the budget measures
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- The school still retains 2 language support posts
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio of the school may still be below 16:1 following budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE.

School G

Band 2 vertical school, in Giving Children an Even Break but no Support Teacher Project.

Enrolment 2010:	226
Enrolment 2011:	221
Decrease:	5

School G	No. of Teachers	Overall Ratio
Total Teacher Staffing Complement 2011/12	18.74	12.06:1
Provisional total Teacher Staffing Complement 2012/13 of Budget Measures implemented in full	18.04	12.25:1

This school is provisionally due to lose 0.7 post as a result of the combined measures under Budget 2012, breakdown as follows (resource hours not included):

School G	Posts
GAM (Enrol Sept '03 – 121)	+ 0.30
Enrolment/Staffing Schedule	- 1
Legacy posts	0
Support teacher	0
Legacy posts as a % of current staffing complement	0%

- This school is due to lose no legacy posts
- The school will lose 1 post due to falling enrolment regardless of the budget measures
- It is important to make the distinction between GAM and legacy posts in this instance
- The staffing allocation for many schools under the General Allocation Model (GAM) has not been updated since it was first introduced in 2005. At that time it used an enrolment base of September 2003 and this GAM allocation has remained unchanged for many schools notwithstanding subsequent changes to their enrolments.
- The overall Pupil Teacher Ratio of the school is still below 13:1 following budget measures
- The final staffing for the 2012/2013 school year will only be known on completion of the teacher allocation process in full, including any appeals in relation to this and approval of Resource hours by the NCSE

Appendix A - TABLE 1 – Impact of Budget Measures

Summary of Number of Posts Lost by the Withdrawal of Posts from Previous Disadvantage Schemes Only

DEIS Band 1 – 32 Breaking the Cycle Schools and 35 Band 1 Schools	Retaining the same amount of Posts	Losing 0.5 Posts	Losing 1 Post	Losing 2 Posts	Losing 3 Posts	Losing 4 Posts	Losing 5 Posts	Losing 6 Posts	Losing 7 Posts	Losing 8 Posts	Losing 9 Posts
No of Schools – 67	4	2	40	12	6	2	0	0	0	0	1
DEIS Band 2 51 Schools previously in GCEB & 22 Band 2 Schools	Retaining the same amount of Posts	Losing 0.5 Posts	Losing 1 Post	Losing 2 Posts	Losing 3 Posts	Losing 4 Posts	Losing 5 Posts	Losing 6 Posts	Losing 7 Posts	Losing 8 Posts	Losing 9 Posts
No of Schools – 73	4	0	29	24	10	4	0	2	0	0	0
Total No of Schools – 140	8	2	69	36	16	6	0	2	0	0	1
Total No of Posts Lost 235	-----	1	69	72	48	24	0	12	0	0	9

Appendix B - TABLE 2 IMPACT of Budget Measures

Summary of Number of Posts Gained/Lost due to Budget Measures : Legacy Posts, the Application of the Staffing Schedule and Falling/Increased Enrolment Only²

DEIS Band 1 – 32 Breaking the Cycle Schools and 35 Band 1 Schools	Retaining the same amount of Posts	Losing 0.5 Posts	Losing 1 Post	Losing 2 Posts	Losing 3 Posts	Losing 4 Posts	Losing 5 Posts	Losing 6 Posts	Losing 7 Posts	Losing 8 Posts	Losing 9 Posts	Losing 10 Posts	Losing 11 Posts	Losing 12 Posts
No of Schools 67	14	2	23	11	11	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
DEIS Band 2 51 Schools in GCEB & 22 Band 2 Schools	Retaining the same amount of Posts	Losing 0.5 Posts	Losing 1 Posts	Losing 2 Posts	Losing 3 Posts	Losing 4 Posts	Losing 5 Posts	Losing 6 Posts	Losing 7 Posts	Losing 8 Posts	Losing 9 Posts	Losing 10 Posts	Losing 11 Posts	Losing 12 Posts
No of Schools 73	4	0	15	28	18	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total No of Schools - 140	18	2	38	39	29	7	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total No of Posts Lost (278)	-----	1	38	78	87	28	20	6	0	8	0	0	0	12

² Excludes Gam, Resource, language support and special classes