Resourcing Partnership Schools

Proposal

1. This paper proposes a resourcing formula for Partnership Schools ("Partnership Schools") and asks Cabinet to agree to the release of an indicative budget to potential sponsors of Partnership Schools as part of the Request for Proposal process.

Executive summary

2. Partnership Schools will be fully-funded schools outside the state system, accountable to the Crown for raising student achievement through a contract to deliver a range of specified school-level targets.

3. A model for funding these schools should allow for flexibility for sponsors to manage all their resources; provide a broadly similar level of funding to that for schools and students in the state system; be transparent; and allow the Crown to manage fiscal risk.

4. The model that I propose to meet these criteria has the following funding streams:
   a) **an annual sum for property** that will allow the sponsor of a Partnership School to, for example, rent facilities for a school based on a formula already used in the school system for some schools
   b) **an annual salaries and operations sum** made up of base funding to ensure the viability of the school and per student funding that will depend on roll numbers
   c) **an annual per student amount** that is a proxy for centrally-funded support to state schools (with the exception of support for high and moderate special needs students who will continue to receive support from existing services).

5. The model is based on funding for state schools. Partnership Schools will also be eligible for entitlements that attach to individual students or schools such as transport assistance, Māori Language Programme Funding and an allowance for isolated schools.

6. A Request for Proposals to establish Partnership Schools will be put out in early March 2013 to meet the commitment to have the first Partnership Schools open in this term of Parliament. The model outlined above will allow the Ministry of
Education to calculate an indicative budget for potential sponsors to base their proposals on. The final funding any Partnership School will receive for 2014 will be determined as part of the contract negotiation process and will take into account more recent data as it becomes available.

7. One-off set-up funding
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will be provided on the same basis as state schools.

Background

8. The Confidence and Supply Agreement between the National Party and the ACT Party committed to implementing a small number of Partnership Schools during this Parliamentary term.

9. Cabinet subsequently agreed to the main policy parameters for Partnership Schools [CAB Min (12) 26/6 refers]. The decisions that have particular relevance to the development of a funding model are summarised below.

10. Partnership Schools will be fully-funded schools outside the state system, accountable to the Crown for raising student achievement through a contract to deliver a range of specified school-level targets. The contract will be between the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Crown, and a sponsor who can run the school not-for-profit or for-profit. Sponsors will have more freedom over how they run their school than Boards of Trustees. This includes greater flexibility over curriculum, qualifications, staff pay and conditions, hours of operation, and school leadership. Partnership Schools will have no tuition fees.

11. Cabinet agreed that a funding model would be developed as part of the work for Budget 2013. Because the optimum time for opening a new school is the beginning of the school year, the timetable for establishing the first Partnership Schools is predicated on a January 2014 opening to meet the Coalition Agreement commitment. Potential sponsors will need to know the details of funding arrangements by early March 2013 in order to develop viable proposals in order to open in January 2014.

Objectives of a resourcing model

12. A funding model should be able to be tested against a set of desired objectives. The six below have been selected because they directly support the essential characteristics of Partnership Schools. Although accountability is often included as an objective for a funding model, accountability for Partnership Schools will be managed through the contract with the sponsor.

13. The funding model should enable:

- **flexibility.** Partnership Schools should have flexibility over how they use their resources in order to enable innovation and maximise outcomes for students
- **neutrality (horizontal equity).** The level of funding given to a Partnership School is broadly equivalent to a similar school in the state system
- **equity (vertical equity).** All students are given an equal opportunity to achieve good educational outcomes. This is important for students from the Government’s priority groups (Māori, Pasifika, students with special education needs and students from low socio-economic areas)

- **transparency.** The model is able to be easily understood by potential sponsors, the education sector and the public. It should provide sponsors with some ability to predict future funding

- **management of risk.** The Government and the sponsor are able to manage any risks, especially to the outcomes for students.

**Components of the model**

14. The funding model for Partnership Schools should result in an amount, set out in the contract, that the school is free to use in any way it thinks fit to achieve the outcomes that it has agreed with the Crown.

15. The three main components that this amount will be made up from are:

- property support
- operations and staffing resourcing
- centrally funded support to schools.

**Property Support**

16. Existing state sector schools (other than integrated schools) are mostly on land owned by the Crown and buildings and maintenance are fully funded by the Crown. Resourcing streams consist of:

- new buildings, both new schools and increased entitlement arising from factors such as roll growth or policy changes. This is funded through the property business case as part of the annual Budget cycle

- refurbishment and replacement of existing assets. Funding for refurbishment and modernisation is provided to Boards of Trustees through Five Year Agreement funding (5YA) in accordance with a Ten Year Planning programme (10YP). Separate funding streams exist for the replacement of buildings, including those subject to weather tightness issues or that are earthquake prone

- maintenance costs provided through the operations grant.

17. I propose that the Crown should not provide a capital funding stream sufficient to purchase land and build a new school. Since Partnership Schools will belong to the sponsor, this would be a significant cost for an asset that the Crown does not own.

18. It is assumed that many Partnership Schools will rent premises. The schools may be established in remodelled commercial or other premises, or possibly in existing educational buildings such as a closed state school or by a private
school converting to a Partnership School. The timeframe for the first Partnership Schools means that these are the most practical options.

19. I propose using the Cash for Buildings model as the basis for the property support funding stream for Partnership Schools. Cash for Buildings gives state schools the option of receiving annual cash payments instead of new buildings when they become entitled to additional space. It calculates an annual cash flow which, when discounted to today’s dollars, is equal to cash flows associated with construction and maintenance of new Ministry owned space. Boards are able to meet the needs of their students, whether that is through leasing additional property or purchasing equipment. The formula provides full property resourcing for a small number of schools where all of their property is leased.

20. The Cash for Buildings model includes three components:
   - site works costs and the cost of constructing the building(s), including a furniture and equipment grant (capital costs)
   - 40 years of Operations Grant property funding (maintenance costs)
   - 30 years of Five Year Agreement (5YA) funding (modernisation costs).

21. Funding Partnership Schools on the basis of Cash for Buildings provides equivalence with the property support for state schools where property is leased. It is a formula that is already known by the school sector and is explained on the Ministry of Education’s website. It provides sponsors with flexibility – if they wish, they can use this funding stream with other money to build their own school.

22. Cash for Buildings is based on average construction and maintenance costs and is not pegged to rental market rates.
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23. The Crown carries insurance for the state school buildings that it owns. Partnership Schools will have to take their own insurance and a contribution towards this should be included in the funding model.

24. 
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Operations and staffing

25. The funding formulae for staffing and operational grants for state schools are complex and have a large number of variables built up over the years. Salaries
for entitlement teachers are paid centrally and schools do not have the ability to
manage what is the largest part of their budget.

26. The key aim for the operations and staffing components of a funding model will
be to provide a simpler, more flexible cashed-up model where funding is broadly
equivalent to that provided to equivalent schools and students in the state
system.

27. The model should cash up the teacher salaries component.

28. There are four further considerations:
   - should the model take account of school size?
   - should there be a single per student rate or should the funding take age
     into account?
   - should some funding elements recognise low socio-economic status?
   - how should equivalence with funding in the state system be determined?

School size

29. In the state system, smaller schools receive more funding to ensure that they are
viable. This is provided through improved staffing entitlements and a base grant
that decreases as schools are able to manage economies of scale.

30. Partnership Schools are likely to begin with reasonably small roll numbers, partly
because of the timeframe but also dependent on how many parents subscribe to
the special characteristics of the school. Any funding formula should give them
the best possible chance of success. I therefore propose that the operations and
staffing model include weightings that allow small schools to be viable.

Variation in student rates by age (year level)

31. State school staffing and operations resourcing is not uniform at each year level.
The per student component is higher in the early years and in the senior
secondary years. Research supports the importance of higher funding in the
early years for improvements in student outcomes. There are curriculum-related
reasons for higher funding in the senior secondary years where it is important to
provide students with a range of more specialised subject options.

32. I propose that a funding model for Partnership Schools reflects this distinction.
Current Government priorities are for a strong early start for children and for
students in the senior secondary school to be able to make subject choices that
will not close off possible careers options.

---

1 For example, "K-12 Class Size Reductions and Student Outcomes" Washington State Institute
for Public Policy January 2013.
Socio-economic status

33. Some operations grant components for state schools are weighted for socioeconomic status using the decile system. Partnership Schools will be focused on improving outcomes for the Government's priority groups of Māori, Pasifika, students with special education needs and students from those areas traditionally underserved by education.

34. I propose that the funding model for Partnership Schools include funding by decile. This maintains a parallel with the way state schools are funded and maintains equity of treatment for priority students.

Equivalence with the state system through a per student rate

35. A significant portion of funding for state schools comes through a per student rate. Two approaches to developing a per student rate were modeled. One built up a funding model, considering the inclusion of each element of the school operations, salaries and staffing formulae based on 2011 costs ("the component-based model"). The other was developed using averages drawn from actual state school expenditure in 2011 ("the average-based model"). Both models included decile weightings, a base grant as the mechanism to recognise small schools and took account of different payments for different age groups.

36. The component-based model has the advantage that it more closely parallels costs in the school system. It has the disadvantage of replicating the complexity of the state school funding system through the consideration of each element. It also potentially opens up argument over exact equivalence with state schools at each component level.

37. The averages-based model has the advantage of being a simpler model. It provides a level of funding similar to that of an equivalent state school, but not as precisely as the component-based model. It is not possible to disaggregate individual items for comparison because of the process of averaging.

38. I propose that the average-based model be used.

39. There are entitlements that attach to individual students or schools. These include funding for students who are English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL); transport assistance; an isolation allowance; and Māori Language Programme Funding. These will be added to the funding for Partnership Schools when the school or its students are eligible for them.

---

2 The component-based model has a per student rate for each year level. The averages model has single rates for each of primary, secondary and composite schools but because these are derived from actual school expenditure, they include in aggregated form the different rates for year levels in the school system.
Centrally provided funding

40. State schools receive a considerable amount of support that is centrally-funded. Much of it is provided on a targeted basis to individual students, teachers and schools. The main components are special education assistance; itinerant and in-school specialist teacher assistance; professional learning and development; transport assistance; curriculum resources; and student engagement initiatives to support disengaged students.

41. I propose that most of this support is provided on a cashed-up basis to Partnership Schools. This is consistent with allowing them the flexibility to achieve their agreed outcomes by using the resourcing available in the way that they think will best serve their students.

42. The only assistance that I propose should continue to be centrally provided is that for students with moderate and high special education needs. This is highly specialised and experts are not equitably available across the country on the open market. The cashed-up amount will not purchase the quantum and/or quality of support needed, especially for the higher needs students.
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43. Other centrally-funded support includes professional learning and development (PLD), curriculum support, student engagement initiatives and administrative assistance such as laptops for teachers and contingency pools for vandalism and relief teaching.

44. In any year, each state school receives a unique amount of support. This is because:

- the targeted nature of many initiatives means that not all schools are eligible for every item
- even if eligible, a school may not have priority to receive it, or may not choose to access it
- having accessed support once, a school may not receive it again – it is not ongoing.

45. These factors make it difficult to arrive at an annual formula-based allocation for Partnership Schools that allows close comparison with a state school of a similar size, type and socio-economic status. The per student amount proposed has had to trade off some transparency against the practicality of arriving at an annual per student amount. Centrally-funded support changes focus according to government priorities. At the moment, for instance, PLD funding is more heavily weighted towards the early years but this could change over time. In order to avoid revisiting the Partnership Schools’ formula every time there is a new PLD policy, a flat rate will be added equally to all year levels.

46. There are over 100 initiatives for centrally-funded support, some of which attract very small amounts. The modeling only includes items where the expenditure for
2013/14 is over $1 million as being materially relevant. This will partially offset the difficulties arising from state schools not accessing every initiative every year.

47. Modeling on current rates provides a rate of $276 per student per year across all year levels for cashed-up centrally-funded support other than transport.

Transport

48. Transport assistance should also be provided on a cash basis using models that already exist in the state system. I propose using the eligibility criteria for integrated schools, which are also schools of choice. Students that meet the distance criteria receive assistance to travel to the school that they are enrolled at, except in areas that have public transport.

A summary of the model

49. The proposed funding model consists of:

- Property component. Cash for Buildings and a payment for insurance
- Operations and staffing funding which includes
  - Base funding and per student funding
    - Entitlements that attach to individual students or schools. These could include funding for students who are English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL); transport assistance; Māori Language Programme Funding
- Centrally provided services that are cashed-up and added to the per student rate. The exception is special education support for moderate and high needs students which will remain centrally funded.

50. On this model, a full decile 3 primary school with a roll of 120 would receive the following funding per annum:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>147,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base funding</td>
<td>145,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per student funding</td>
<td>560,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashed-up centralised funding</td>
<td>48,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$902,481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. This model meets the objectives for a funding model for Partnership Schools. The almost fully cashed-up nature of the model will allow sponsors the flexibility to manage their total resourcing to achieve the outcomes they are contracted to meet. The model is based on resourcing for the school system and retains those elements that support priority students. It maintains neutrality in relation to the state system and equity in relation to students that need extra support. The model is reasonably transparent, taking into account that funding schools is a multi-faceted process.

52. A table setting out the main differences between the funding model for state schools and the proposed model for Partnership Schools is set out as Appendix One.
53. The final funding any Partnership School will receive for 2014 will be determined as part of the contract negotiation process which will set agreed roll numbers and will take into account more recent data as it becomes available.

Initial support for establishing a Partnership School

54. A new state school receives support to set up. There is a property stream and an administration stream. The property funding covers furniture, equipments and IT and these amounts are factored into the Cash for Buildings payments. The administration stream covers a library and information centre, learning, teaching and administration resources.

55. I propose that Partnership Schools receive set-up costs on the same basis as a similar new state school. If an existing school converts to a Partnership School, this funding would need to be reviewed in the light of the actual circumstances and adjusted accordingly.
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Cost increases

58. A price increase mechanism will need to be addressed in the contract negotiations. The choice lies between:

a. mechanisms outside the contract such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and the Labour Market Index (LMI) or passing on the collective increases and annual operations grant adjustment for schools; and

b. a mechanism contained within the contract such as an agreed periodic price increase set with the contract or an agreed time period after which funding is renegotiated.

59. My preferred option would be to use the LMI on that proportion of the funding attributable to salaries and wages and the CPI on the balance. This is simple, publicly available and understood.

60. The other options carry risks.
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Outcomes-based contracting

61. Partnership Schools will have agreed outcomes that will be measured through performance-related targets. The high-level outcomes will be specified in the RFP and a more detailed performance measurement framework (PMF) will be ready for the contracts to be negotiated in June. The PMF will include the measures and state which objective data will be used to verify whether the measures have been met.

62. Contracts sometimes contain payments to incentivise performance or have a part of their funding at risk if they do not meet their targets. While it is important that Partnership Schools have some stability while they get established, it will also be important to set up expectations that this is an outcomes-based purchasing model. To balance these two issues, I propose that a small percentage of funding (for example 1-2 percent) is at risk in the first few years of the contract, rising in later years.

Budget 2013

63. Withheld under section 9(2)(f)(iv)
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Next Steps

65. In order to have the first schools open by January 2014, the Authorisation Board will have to put out a Request for Proposals for Partnership Schools by the beginning of March 2013. Potential sponsors will need to have a ball-park figure for government funding to base their proposals on. The model outlined above will allow the Ministry of Education to calculate an indicative budget as a basis for proposals.

66. The model may need some minor refinements: for example, if the chosen proposals have school configurations that differ from state school types and new data becomes available.

67. I propose that Cabinet delegate the power to make such changes to the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Education and the Associate Minister of Education (Hon Banks).

Quality assurance

68. The assumptions and calculations underpinning the modelling that sits behind this paper have been externally quality assured by Independent Quality Assurance New Zealand and their comments have been taken into account in developing the model.

Risks

69. A cashed-up model with only a few components involves averaging costs in the state school system. Some costs that the Crown pays on behalf of state schools
(e.g. ACC and superannuation contributions) have been added into costs for Partnership Schools. Other costs that state schools receive are not relevant to Partnership Schools and have been removed. Although these factors mean that attempts at detailed comparisons between resourcing of Partnership Schools and similar state schools will not be valid, some commentators may make such comparisons and draw conclusions.

70. This risk can be partly mitigated by explaining how the funding formula has been derived.
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72. Withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i) There will be ongoing monitoring both through the contract and by the Education Review Office that should pick up any indication that student outcomes are at risk. The contract must set out interventions that can be applied if the school shows signs of poor performance and the legislation gives the Secretary for Education step-in rights if the education or welfare of the students is seriously at risk.

Consultation

73. The Treasury was consulted on this paper. The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet was informed.

Financial implications

74. The financial implications of this paper are being addressed through Budget 2013.

Human rights

75. There are no human rights implications in this paper.

Legislative implications and regulatory impact analysis

76. There are no legislative implications in this paper and therefore no regulatory impact analysis is required.

Gender implications and disability perspective

77. There are no gender implications in this paper. Care has been taken in developing the formula to ensure that disabled students keep the same level of support as their counterparts in the state sector.

Publicity

78. I will issue a press statement when the Request for Proposals is released.
Recommendations

79. The Minister of Education recommends that the Committee:

1. note that Cabinet agreed that a funding model for Partnership Schools would be developed as part of the work for Budget 2013 [CAB Min (12) 26/6 refers]

2. note that potential sponsors of Partnership Schools will need to have an indicative budget by early March 2013 in order to develop viable proposals to be able to open in January 2014

3. note that the funding model has been developed to meet the objectives listed below which support the essential characteristics of Partnership Schools:

   a. flexibility over the use of resources in order to enable innovation and maximise outcomes for students

   b. neutrality (horizontal equity) so that the level of funding given to a Partnership School is broadly equivalent to a similar school in the state system

   c. equity (vertical equity) that supports every student to have the same opportunity to achieve good educational outcomes

   d. fiscal control over future costs

   e. transparency so that the model is able to be easily understood and provides sponsors with some ability to predict future funding

   f. management of risk by both the Government and the sponsors

Property

4. agree that the Crown should not provide Partnership Schools with a capital funding stream sufficient to purchase land and build a new school

5. note that the most practical options for the first Partnership Schools are renting premises, including existing educational buildings such as a closed state school, or by a private school converting to a Partnership School

6. note that Cash for Buildings is an existing initiative in the school sector that calculates an annual cash flow to cover capital costs, maintenance costs and modernisation costs and is often used for schools where property is leased

7. agree that Cash for Buildings is used as the basis for the property support funding stream for Partnership Schools

8. Withheld under section 9(2)(i)

9. agree that there is a Crown contribution for insurance

Operations and Staffing

10. note that the key aim for the operations and staffing components of a funding model will be to provide a simpler, more flexible cashed-up model where
funding is broadly equivalent to that provided to equivalent schools and students in the state system

11. agree that, since Partnership Schools are likely to start with small numbers, an operations and staffing model should include a weighting (through base funding) that ensures that small schools are viable.

12. agree that the model take account of age (year level) in order to provide more support in the vital early years and an appropriate range of subject options in the senior secondary school.

13. agree that the funding model for Partnership Schools include funding by decile to maintain equity of treatment for priority students.

14. note that two approaches to developing a per student rate were modeled, the first considering the inclusion of each element of the school operations, salaries and staffing formulae ("the component-based model") and the second using averages drawn from actual state school expenditure in 2011 ("the average-based model").

15. note that the average-based model has the advantage of being a simpler model, while providing a level of funding similar to that of an equivalent state school.

16. agree that the average-based model be used to determine a per student rate.

Centrally-funded support

17. note that state schools receive a considerable amount of support that is centrally funded, much of it provided on a targeted basis to individual students, teachers and schools.

18. note that centrally-funded support covers areas such as special education assistance; itinerant and in-school specialist teacher assistance; professional learning and development; transport assistance; curriculum resources; and student engagement initiatives to support disengaged students.

19. agree that, with the exception of moderate and high special education needs support, all centrally-funded support is provided on a cashed-up basis to Partnership Schools to provide resourcing flexibility to achieve their agreed outcomes.

20. note that support for moderate and high special needs students is highly specialised and experts are not equitably available across the country on the open market.

21. agree that support for moderate and high special needs students that is currently centrally-provided remain so for students in Partnership Schools.

22. agree that entitlement to transport assistance is on the same basis as integrated schools.

Summary of the funding model

23. note that the proposed funding model consists of:

Property component. Cash for buildings and a payment for insurance.

Operations and staffing funding. These cover operations and staffing costs and include:

- Base funding and per student funding.
• Base funding and per student funding

• Entitlements that attach to individual students or schools. These could include funding for students who are English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL); transport assistance; Māori Language Programme Funding

• Centrally provided services that are cashed-up and added to the per student rate. The exception is special education support for moderate and high needs students which will remain centrally funded

Initial support for establishing a Partnership School

24. note that a new state school receives support to set up for furniture, equipment, IT, stocking a library and information centre, and learning, teaching and administration resources

25. agree that Partnership Schools receive the same set-up costs as state schools

26. Withheld under section 9(2)(i)

27. Withheld under section 9(2)(i)

Determining future cost increases

28. note that a number of options were considered for a price increase mechanism

29. note that the preferred option is a combined use of the LMI on that proportion of the funding equivalent to salaries and wages and the CPI on the balance because this is simple to understand and administer

30. agree that cost increases are managed through a combined use of the LMI on that proportion of the funding equivalent to salaries and wages and the CPI on the balance

Performance-based outcomes

31. note that, although Partnership Schools will need stability to get established, it is important to establish that delivery is through an outcomes-based purchasing model contract

32. agree that a small percentage of the contract price be at risk in the first years of the contract, rising in later years

Power to make minor changes

33. note that minor changes to the model may be required once the successful proposals are chosen

34. agree to delegate the power to make such changes to the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Education and the Associate Minister of Education (Hon John Banks).
Publicity

35. note that, at the time Request for Proposals are called for, I intend to make a press statement including information about the funding model in order to make the basis of the funding for Partnership Schools transparent.

Hon Hekia Parata
Minister of Education

13.2.13
### APPENDIX ONE

Comparisons between the funding model for state schools and Partnership Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding element</th>
<th>State Schools</th>
<th>Partnership Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>Non integrated schools. Crown provides land and buildings.</td>
<td>Funding stream sufficient to enable leasing of premises and insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of trustees receives funding for maintenance, refurbishment and replacement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated schools. Proprietor provides land and buildings but receives funding from the Crown for minor maintenance, capital maintenance and modernisation. The Crown may also provide funding for roll growth classrooms if it would otherwise have to fund space in state schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>Schools receive an annual staffing entitlement in Full Time Teacher Equivalents. This funds the employment of teachers in teaching and management positions.</td>
<td>Will receive cashed-up funding based on the state staffing entitlements but can use it for any purpose related to the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td>Actual salaries for teacher entitlement staff are paid by the Crown. Non entitlement teachers and other staff are paid from the school's operations grant.</td>
<td>Partnership Schools will receive an amount based on average salaries in the school system. They will pay salaries out of their contract funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations grant</strong></td>
<td>State schools receive a cash grant for operational funding. This has a large number of components, some of which relate to the characteristics of individual schools or students. Boards have discretion over how they use this funding.</td>
<td>Partnership Schools will receive funding based on an average of operations grant funding in the state system. They will also be eligible for payments which relate to the characteristics of individual schools or students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centrally provided support</strong></td>
<td>Many services are provided free to state schools, often through centrally managed contracts with providers.</td>
<td>A cashed-up per student amount will be included in the contract. Special education services for students with high and moderate special education needs will continue to be provided centrally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>