

Consultation on changes to the University's Resource Allocation Model | Co-chomhairleachadh air atharrachaidhean air Modh Riarachadh Ghoireasan an Oilthigh

This paper seeks the views of academic partners on proposed changes to the way that the university allocates teaching funding to academic partners for further and higher education.

Rationale for change

The partnership assembly report, agreed by the partnership and the university, recommended that 'we review our financial allocation mechanism to ensure it is fit for purpose' and that we 'invest in a system that captures the cost and value of delivery'. Since those recommendations were made in late 2019 there have been two key developments. Firstly, the partnership agreed at the Regional Strategy Committee in May 2020 to undertake a fundamental review of the curriculum we offer and how we inform, plan and make decisions on what we offer. The second is the Covid-19 pandemic and its likely impact on future funding and on changing patterns of demand. This situation increases the urgency for a resource allocation method that supports the right provision for the region in as efficient a way as possible.

More recently, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) has signalled potential changes in the way that it funds both colleges and universities as part of its review of financial sustainability and coherent provision. While it is too early to say what the final shape of the SFC changes will be and when they will be implemented, the broad strategy – moving towards a more common tertiary approach, potentially including the ability for a tertiary institution to move funding between FE and HE – are consistent with the

Tha am pàipear seo a 'sireadh bheachdan chom-pàirtichean acadaimigeach air atharrachaidhean a chaidh a mholadh san dòigh sa bheil an t-oilthigh a' riarachadh maoineachadh teagaisg do chom-pàirtichean acadaimigeach airson foghlam adhartach agus àrd-ìre.

Feallsanachd airson atharrachadh

Mhol aithisg co-chruinneachadh com-pàirteachais, a chaidh aontachadh leis a 'chom-pàirteachas agus an t-oilthigh,' gum bi sinn ag ath-sgrùdadh ar uidheamachd riarachadh ionmhais agus dèanamh cinnteach gu bheil e iomchaidh airson adhbhar 'agus gum bi sinn' a 'tasgadh ann an siostam a ghlacas cosgais agus luach lìbhrigidh'. Bho chaidh na molaidhean sin a dhèanamh aig deireadh 2019 tha dà phrìomh leasachadh air a bhith ann. An toiseach, dh 'aontaich an com-pàirteachas aig a' Chomataidh Ro-innleachd Roinneil sa Chèitean 2020 sgrùdadh bunaiteach a dhèanamh air a 'churraicealam a tha sinn a' tabhann agus mar a bhios sinn a 'fiosrachadh, a' dealbhadh agus a 'dèanamh cho-dhùnaidhean air na tha sinn a' tabhann. Is e an dàrna fear galar lèir-sgaoilte Covid-19 agus a 'bhuidh a dh' fhaodadh a bhith aige air maoineachadh san àm ri teachd agus air pàtrain iarrtais caochlaideach. Tha an suidheachadh seo a 'meudachadh na h-èiginn airson modh riarachadh ghoireasan a bheir taic don t-solar cheart airson na sgìre, ann an dòigh cho èifeachdach sa ghabhas.

O chionn ghoirid, tha Comhairle Maoineachaidh na h-Alba (SFC) air comharrachadh atharrachaidhean a dh 'fhaodadh a bhith ann san dòigh sa bheil i a' maoineachadh gach cuid colaistean agus oilthighean mar phàirt den ath-bhreithneachadh aca air seasmhachd ionmhais agus solar ciallach. Ged a tha e ro thràth a ràdh dè an cumadh deireannach a bhios air na h-atharrachaidhean SFC agus cuin a thèid an cur an gnìomh, tha an ro-innleachd fharsaing - a 'glusad a dh' ionnsaigh dòigh-obrach treas-ìre nas cumanta, a 'toirt a-steach comas do stèidheachd treas ìre maoineachadh a ghluasad eadar FE agus HE - a rèir nàdar

broadly tertiary nature of the changes that we are proposing in this paper.

Scope of the review

This review covers both further and higher education. Currently the university allocates FE funding on the same basis that SFC allocates it to colleges, with a very small top slice to cover some of the cost of the university's FE-specific staff and activities. HE allocations are based primarily on teaching volume, with some additional allocations for academic leadership, after a top slice to cover university costs (management costs, core academic assurance as well as services for the academic partners such as information and communication technology, library, and digital subscriptions).

The purpose of our Resource Allocation Model

The university is a partnership that serves the people and economy of our region and its localities. It receives funding from the SFC to support education at both HE and FE level in the partners.

The purpose of a resource allocation model is to use that funding as effectively as possible to ensure that our collective ambitions for the region are met and we are also funding the capacity for our academic partners to respond to local or specialist needs.

We will continue to recognise the difference between further and higher education in our funding as we are currently funded separately by SFC for the two types of education. However, we are a tertiary institution and so we want to make the most of synergies between further and higher education.

The review of the RAM is linked to several other change processes that are underway at the moment.

farsaing treas ìre nan atharrachaidhean a tha sinn a 'moladh sa phàipear seo.

Farsaingeachd an ath-bhreithneachaidh

Tha an lèirmheas seo a 'còmhach an dà chuid foghlam adhartach agus àrd-ìre. An-dràsta bidh an t-oilthigh a 'riarachadh maoineachadh FE air an aon bhunait a bhios SFC ga riarachadh gu colaistean eile, le pìos beag gu math beag airson cuid de chosgaisean luchd-obrach agus gnìomhan sònraichte FE an oilthigh a phàigheadh. Tha cuibhreannan HE stèidhichte sa mhòr-chuid air bunait tomhas teagaisg, le cuid de chuibhreannan a bharrachd airson ceannardas acadaimigeach, às deidh gearradh mòr gus cosgaisean oilthigh a chòmhdach (cosgaisean riaghlaidh, prìomh dhearbhadh acadaimigeach a bharrachd air seirbheisean dha na com-pàirtichean acadaimigeach leithid teicneòlas fiosrachaidh agus conaltraidh, leabharlann, agus fo-sgrìobhaidhean didseatach.

Adhbhar ar Modail Riarachadh Ghoireasan

Tha an t-oilthigh na chom-pàirteachas a tha a 'frithealadh dhaoine agus eaconamaidh na sgìre againn agus na sgìrean ionadail. Bidh e a 'faighinn maoineachadh bhon SFC gus taic a thoirt do fhoghlam aig ìre HE agus FE anns na com-pàirtichean.

Is e adhbhar dòigh riarachadh ghoireasan a bhith a 'cleachdadh a' mhaoineachaidh sin cho èifeachdach sa ghabhas gus dèanamh cinnteach gu bheil a 'coileanadh ar rùintean coitcheann airson na sgìre agus tha sinn cuideachd a' maoineachadh comas ar com-pàirtichean acadaimigeach freagairt ri feumalachdan ionadail no speisealta.

Leanaidh sinn oirnn ag aithneachadh an eadar-dhealachadh eadar foghlam adhartach agus àrd-ìre anns a 'mhaoineachadh againn oir tha sinn an-dràsta air ar maoineachadh air leth le SFC airson an dà sheòrsa foghlaim. Ach, tha sinn nar stèidheachd treas ìre agus mar sin tha sinn airson a 'chuid as fheàrr a dhèanamh de cho-obrachadh eadar foghlam adhartach agus àrd-ìre.

Tha an lèirmheas air an RAM ceangailte ri grunn phròiseasan atharrachaidh eile a tha a 'dol air adhart an-dràsta.

Link to curriculum review

There is currently a separate process underway within the partnership to review the way that the partnership makes decisions on curriculum. It is likely to group our provision in four categories: regional core, local, attractor and non-SFC.

With all provision we need strong mechanisms in place to inform our decisions on what to provide in future and we need sufficient resources to support changes. The way that we allocate funding – this review of the resource allocation method – should support the implementation of that curriculum review.

Link to review of FE credit allocation

The Regional Strategy Committee decided in principle at its November meeting to move to a system that better linked funding for FE activity to delivery of the credit target for a partner. It further agreed to explore periodically reallocating credit targets based on performance against previous credit targets and changing economic and demographic factors. We will discuss the ways of doing this over the next few months. In introducing any change we will need to consider carefully the evidence we use for change and the impact on institutional stability. There is an overlap between the review of the RAM and any changes to credit allocation. The changes proposed in this consultation – splitting funding between an ‘institutional element’ and volume payment for activity – may make it easier to move to a different way of allocating credits.

Ceangal gu lèirmheas a ’churraicealaim

Tha pròiseas air leth an-dràsta air tòiseachadh taobh a-staigh a ’chompàirteachais gus ath-sgrùdadh a dhèanamh air an dòigh sa bheil an com-pàirteachas a’ dèanamh cho-dhùnaidhean air a ’churraicealam. Tha e dualtach an solar againn a chuir còmhla ann an ceithir roinnean: cridhe roinneil, ionadail, tarraingeach agus neo-SFC.

Leis a h-uile solar feumaidh sinn dòighean làidir nan àite gus fiosrachadh a thoirt do ar co-dhùnaidhean air dè a bu chòir a thoirt seachad san àm ri teachd agus tha feum againn air goireasan gu leòr gus taic a thoirt do atharrachaidhean. Bu chòir don dòigh anns am bi sinn a ’riarachadh maoineachadh - an ath-bhreithneachadh seo air an dòigh riarachadh ghoireasan - taic a thoirt do bhuileachadh an ath-bhreithneachaidh curraicealaim sin.

Ceangal gu lèirmheas air riarachadh creideas FE

Cho-dhùin a ’Chomataidh Ro-innleachd Roinneil ann am prionnsapal aig a’ choinneimh aca san t-Samhain gluasad gu siostam a bha a ’ceangal maoineachadh nas fheàrr airson gnìomhachd FE ri libhrigeadh an targaid creideis airson com-pàirtiche. Dh'aontaich iad cuideachd sgrùdadh a dhèanamh air targaidean creideis ath-riarachadh bho àm gu àm stèidhichte air coileanadh mu choinneamh thargaidean creideis roimhe agus factaran eaconamach is deamografach ag atharrachadh. Bruidhnidh sinn mu na dòighean air seo a dhèanamh thairis air na mìosan a tha romhainn. Ann a bhith a ’toirt a-steach atharrachaidhean sam bith feumaidh sinn beachdachadh gu faiceallach air an fhianais a bhios sinn a’ cleachdadh airson atharrachadh agus a ’bhuaidh air seasmhachd stèidheachd. Tha tar-lùbadh eadar ath-bhreithneachadh an RAM agus atharrachaidhean sam bith ann an riarachadh creideas. Dh ’fhaodadh gum bi na h-atharrachaidhean a chaidh a mholadh sa cho-chomhairle seo - a’ roinneadh maoineachadh eadar ‘eileamaid stèidheachdail’ agus pàigheadh meud airson gnìomhachd ga dhèanamh nas fhasa gluasad gu dòigh eadar-dhealaichte airson creideas a riarachadh.

Aims of the RAM review

We can only serve the region if our constituent parts are operating effectively and efficiently. For that reason, we seek to both incentivise that the maximum amount of our funding is used to support directly student-facing activity while maintaining the financial viability of the academic partners. To do that we propose to fund in ways that incentivise common services and the most efficient structures both in the partners and the university centrally. We also want to encourage networking of courses in order to expand the curriculum offer available to students across the partnership.

The principles of the proposed model

The principles behind the model are that it is:

- Transparent – decisions on funding and the rationale for those decisions should be open and it should be clear what funding is going where for all of our funded provision in both partners and the university centrally.
- Simple – we should not have unnecessary differences between higher and further education funding methodology and it should be clear what will be delivered in return for funding.
- Equitable – recognising that to support equivalent levels of provision across our region we may need to fund partners differently.
- Student-focussed – its purpose should be to support provision that is high quality and which provides students with the educational outcomes they seek.
- Based on partnership and the needs of the region and its localities – our method should not incentivise intra-partner competition, but rather should support partnership working and the aims of the partnership in serving the region and its localities. It must ensure that decisions are taken at the right level - academic partners for local or specialist provision, regionally where necessary.
- Responsive – the method should not inhibit changes in provision which reflect changes in demand.
- Accountable – it should be one that supports clear accountability regarding what the funding is intended to provide, both for the academic partners and for central services.

Key elements of the proposed new model

We are proposing four main changes

- The introduction of an ‘institutional element’ into the funding model so that partners receive a payment for non-academic costs that is separate from the volume-based funding for activity (though in the initial years it will be partly related to volume).
- Spreading the funding retained for central costs (the top slice) across both HE and FE in a way that better reflects how the resource is used. (At the moment the top slice is almost entirely from the HE budget).
- Introducing an element of payment from non-SFC teaching income to the university. This would be used to cover essential central costs of validation and quality assurance and also create headroom for further investment in developing additional non-SFC income.
- Introduction an annual funding agreement between the university and each academic partner which would define the expectations on the partners in return for funding while also specifying the expectations on the university in support for the academic partner.

Institutional element

Our partnership contains partners of very different sizes and with different delivery models. Often the smallest partners measured by volume are the ones that have, by necessity, the greatest number of campuses. A simple resource allocation model that pays for volumes of activity, even with weighting for more remote/island partners, does not suit us well.

While there are many ways that the funding could be allocated (including weighted premia, commissioning from partners, or using funding to incentivise particular provision) many of these methods could create instability in the academic partners and might not be effective ways of ensuring a coherent curriculum is available across the region. Institutional sustainability for the academic partners, including predictability of funding, were key factors in the preliminary discussion of new models. We are proposing a model that contains an 'institutional element' – in effect a block grant to cover some costs – as a way of acknowledging the different circumstances of the partners within a relatively simple system. This allows some separation between decisions on volume of activity and considerations on financial stability.

In the most minimal model this could simply be a way of funding the necessary additional costs of operating smaller or more remote partners. At the other end of the spectrum the institutional block grant could cover all the non-academic costs at all academic partners and also an element of the academic provision. While a larger institutional element would mean an apparently smaller unit of resource for academic provision, as some of the other costs currently covered by the unit of resource would be covered by the institutional element, this should not mean a smaller proportion of our funding ultimately supporting teaching. On the contrary, one of the attractions of an institutional element that covered a substantial element of the support costs in all partners is that it would make the proportions of funding being used for professional/support services (as opposed to teaching costs) more transparent. Setting these proportions correctly could incentivise sharing of professional services and maximising spend on teaching. Setting it incorrectly could have the opposite effect. Making the system work most effectively will therefore require effective implementation of the related Assembly recommendation to invest in a system that captures the cost and value of delivery. Given the importance of using our resources most efficiently, the view of the steering group was that models which had a relatively large institutional element were more likely to enable the partnership to target its funding most effectively. In the modelling for this consultation we have based part of the initial institutional element on a proportion of the current teaching funding. Over time, and as we developed better information on costs and more aligned services, this would change and would become a payment that was not directly related to changes in the volume of activity that we funded at the academic partner.

As well as the institutional element, there would be a volume-based payment for delivery of academic activity. Our view is that this needs to be done in a way that is as simple as possible and which encourages networking of teaching (that is different parts of courses being delivered by different academic partners, to a range of students enrolled in more than one academic partner). To do this we propose that in most cases we simply pay each partner directly for the proportion of a course they will provide. This is currently done for HE funding by a process (the microRAM) that re-allocates money within the academic year and which can lead to uncertainty in either funding level or the availability of networked courses. We propose that in future we allocate funding with a planned level of networked provision and adjust the level each year in a way that is informed by the actual figure for the previous year.

Funding for partnership services

Currently, for SFC teaching funding, the university retains a proportion of the SFC allocation to support central functions. These include essential regulatory and quality functions, services for the whole partnership and some funds that allocated back to partners.

The total budgets received from SFC for teaching activity in 2019/20 was £90,480,252, which was made up of £34,442,237 for HE, £9,185,714 from tuition fees and £43,685,301 for FE. This meant FE generated approximately 52% of 'teaching' income from SFC to the university and HE 48%. For 2018/19 the percentages were similar. While the income from teaching is broadly the same for the two types of education, the contribution to university services is not. The top slice of the budgets in 2019/20 totalled £15,615,988, with £346,205 coming from FE and £15,269,783 from HE budgets. This equates to 97.8% coming from HE and 2.2% from FE.

As some of the services provided by the university centrally are either tertiary in that they apply to the whole of what an academic partners does, whether HE or FE (the support for ICT is an example of this), or are provided to both HE and FE students (such as the student records system and reporting), it is not transparent or appropriate to fund this almost entirely from the HE budget. We are therefore proposing that the top slice for HE is reduced and the top slice for FE increased, to better reflect the balance of university services. We propose that the initial split between the two sectors would be 85% from HE and 15% from FE. This would mean that the HE top slice would be reduced from 35% of the SFC and SAAS teaching income to 30% and the FE top slice would increase from 0.7% to 5%.

These figures are modelled on keeping the total raised by the top slice at the current level. The amount of the top slice is contentious. However, amending the total amount of funding that is spent centrally as opposed to by partner is not the object of this review of the RAM. Clearly, other reviews and projects currently being undertaken as part of the Assembly/change management work may affect the amount of the top slice. Discussions regarding the amount will take place as part of the work on the overall financial strategy of the university partnership. In future, as we develop more precise information on the split of services, or the services themselves change, we would reconsider both the proportions applied to the HE/FE split and the overall amount of the top slice itself.

Even where services are funded from the top slice, we should not presume that they will be delivered by staff based in Inverness. Currently many staff funded from this source are based in partners across our region. The experience of the pandemic has show us that we could go further in locating staff elsewhere.

Non-SFC income

Our resource allocation model and the current arrangements for paying for central services do not apply to external income. We cannot (and should not) include external income in the RAM. It is often (though not always) generated by academic partners themselves and varies from year to year. However, we do propose applying a small contribution for central services from this income for two reasons: to recognise that – as with other provision – there will be an element of central cost in recruitment/student information and curriculum validation, as well as creating the resource to better develop and promote external income. In order to balance incentivisation of this income with central support, we propose that this contribution is smaller than the central contribution on SFC-funded provision. We propose to set this at 10%.

This new contribution would apply only to students who are not fundable by SFC and are charged a fee. It will not apply to income generated from non-academic activities. The group includes all taught HE students who do not have "SC" or "EU" fee statuses, as well as any commercial courses or students who are funded by, for example, SDS at a full cost recovery rate. The effect of this, based on the current income, is shown in the table below. Because of the

timing of this paper, for RUK and INT fee income, figures from 2018/19 have had to be used in the example, and not all full cost recovery course income may have been included.

The amounts affected by this proposal are shown below and are included in the modelling of the three options at the end of this document. This is for illustrative purposes. We recognise that there will be categories of teaching/training income that are not included in this table.

Academic Partner	18/19	18/19	19/20		10%
	RUK fees	INT fees	SDS funded	Total	
<u>Incorporated Colleges</u>					
Inverness College UHI	£212,947	£33,938	£1,285,957	£1,532,842	£153,284
Lews Castle College UHI	£20,160	£6,320	£53,259	£79,739	£7,974
Moray College UHI	£9,000	£0	£420,386	£429,386	£42,939
North Highland College UHI	£31,220	£11,120	£280,708	£323,048	£32,305
Perth College UHI	£95,689	£625,925	£627,468	£1,349,083	£134,908
<u>Assigned Colleges</u>					
Orkney College UHI	£71,420	£65,270	£170,030	£306,720	£30,672
Shetland College UHI	£9,300	£10,820	£37,988	£58,108	£5,811
West Highland College UHI	£69,820	£8,563	£181,178	£259,561	£25,956
Argyll College UHI	£0	£0	£130,569	£130,569	£13,057
<u>Other</u>					
Highland Theological College UHI	£43,420	£0	£0	£43,420	£4,342
NAFC Marine Centre UHI	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sabhal Mor Ostaig UHI	£15,395	£52,200	£71,520	£139,115	£13,911
S.A.M.S. UHI	£54,000	£0	£0	£54,000	£5,400
UHI EO (UG optometry, PGT nursing and PGT history)	£55,000	£0	£0	£55,000	£5,500
	£687,371	£814,156	£3,259,062	£4,760,590	£476,059

The three modelled options

We have modelled three options in the tables at the end of this paper. They are all based the principles above.

Models 1 and 2 contain many elements in common. In both models we have set the initial institutional element at 25% of current funding. This is something that may change over time as we get better evidence on costs, reduce non-academic costs and perhaps move to a banded model for institutional elements. The use of a percentage at this stage is intended to provide a smooth transition. In both models we have also included a rurality element for HE provision that would cost £2M. This is something that does not exist at the moment.

In model 1 we have included a payment for academic leadership and provision that is set at 10% of current activity allocated pro rata to current academic leadership payments.

Model 2 is essentially the same as model 1, but in this case the payment for academic leadership and provision is capped at £2M and allocated across the partners pro rata to current academic leadership payments.

Model 3 is the 'smoothed option'. This option is intended to introduce the new model with as little initial turbulence for partners as possible. We have adjusted the parameters in the model of reduce significant variation between the existing funding and the proposed model. To do this we have started to merge some of the funding for the additional costs of national bargaining into the volume payment (about £2.6m of the £11.6m) and reduced the new HE rurality to £1M (as opposed to £2M for this new payment in the other options). As we will need to begin to move from a funding model based on the current cost of national bargaining at some point in the near future anyway, there are argument for this option that go beyond reducing turbulence . Once the new model is in place we would be able to adjust the parameters over a period of years in a way that might lead to eventual change in funding levels but there would be no significant immediate impact and therefore not need for a transition period.

Funding agreements

Currently there is a partnership agreement between the university and the academic partners that defines the relationship between the two. In order to make the system we propose work more effectively, we propose that there should also be an annual funding agreement between the university and each academic partner. The agreement would specify the expectations of the university for the institutional element, the volume-related funding, and the service and benefits the university would deliver from the new contribution from non-SFC income. This would assist us in being able to eliminate the in-year changes through the microRAM and would also enable us to include elements such as payments for programme leadership in the institutional element. It would also allow a framework for adjusting funding and – where targets had not been met – recovering funding, which would normally be taken back the following academic session. Most importantly, it should be an important tool for delivering the outcome of the curriculum review. The agreements could also specify expectations of the partner on the university, in particular in those areas where the university is providing a service on behalf of the partnership.

This system would require a new agreement each year to reflect the agreed activity for that year. However, our expectation would be that the content of the agreement would be similar in each year, which would mean the annual discussion and the resulting process would be focussed and avoid unnecessary bureaucracy.

Timing of implementation and next steps

Our intention is to introduce the new system for the 2021-22 academic year. In order to do that we will finalise arrangements in the light of this consultation and consider whether we need transitional arrangements.

Following consideration of the responses to this consultation by the partnership council in February, the finalised proposal will be considered by the Regional Strategy Committee and the Finance and General Purposes Committee in February, and a recommendation made to the university court in March. Subject to agreement at those bodies we would then intend to use the new model in making funding allocations in the spring of 2021 for academic year 2021-22.

Consultation questions for academic partners | Ceistean co-chomhairleachaidh airson com-pàirtichean acadaimigeach

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do you agree with our proposal to introduce an institutional element to our funding model?• Do you have views on which of the models of institutional element better meets the needs of the partnership?• Do you agree with the proposal to spread the cost of the central university service more equitably and transparently across further and higher education funding?• Do you agree with the principle of a proportion of external income being contributed to the partnership centrally and if so, do you agree with the proposal that it initially be set at 10% of teaching income?• Do you agree with the proposal for an annual funding agreement between the university and each partner to provide clarity of expectation on both sides?• Do you have any other comments on the issues covered by this consultation? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A bheil thu ag aontachadh ris a 'mholadh againn feart bunaiteach a thoirt a-steach don mhodail maoinachaidh againn?• A bheil beachdan agad air dè na modailean de eileamaid stèidheachd a choinnicheas nas fheàrr ri feumalachdan a 'chompàirteachais?• A bheil thu ag aontachadh ris a 'mholadh gus cosgais prìomh sheirbheis an oilthigh a sgaoileadh ann an dòigh nas cothromaiche agus nas soilleire thar maoinachadh foghlam adhartach is àrd-ìre?• A bheil thu ag aontachadh ris a 'phrionnsapal gum bi cuibhreann de theachd-a-steach taobh a-muigh air a chuir ris a' chompàirteachas gu meadhanach agus ma tha, a bheil thu ag aontachadh ris a 'mholadh gum biodh e air a shuidheachadh an toiseach aig 10% den teachd-a-steach teagaisg?• A bheil thu ag aontachadh ris a 'mholadh airson aonta maoinachaidh bliadhna eadar an t-oilthigh agus gach com-pàirtiche gus soilleireachd dùil a thoirt seachad air gach taobh?• A bheil beachdan sam bith eile agad air na cùisean a tha air an còmhach leis a 'cho-chomhairle seo? |
|--|--|

Deadline for responses | Ceann-latha airson freagairtean

Responses should be sent to John Kemp (john.kemp@uhi.ac.uk) by Friday 18 December. | Bu chòir freagairtean a chuir gu John Kemp (john.kemp@uhi.ac.uk) ro Dihaoine 18 Dùbhlachd.

Model 1	Volume	National Pay Bargaining	SMO	Sub - Total	HE Rurality £2M (added to existing FE rurality)	Non - academic costs – 25% of current activity	Academic leadership set at 10% of current activity	Cash Distribution				EO Topslice	Total Funding
								Revised	Budget	Variance (£)	Variance (%)		
<u>Incorporated Colleges</u>													
Inverness College UHI	£9,431,562	£1,939,576	£0	£11,371,138	£0	£3,629,108	£1,430,023	£16,430,269	£16,662,704	£(232,435)	-1.4%	£4,055,194	£20,485,464
Lews Castle College UHI	£1,614,458	£659,910	£0	£2,274,368	£1,224,893	£613,597	£536,786	£4,649,643	£4,517,615	£132,028	2.9%	£641,562	£5,291,205
Moray College UHI	£5,905,810	£1,209,174	£0	£7,114,984	£324,055	£2,288,678	£486,082	£10,213,799	£10,765,703	£(551,904)	-5.1%	£2,502,487	£12,716,286
North Highland College UHI	£3,187,504	£834,547	£0	£4,022,051	£1,389,672	£1,224,266	£436,962	£7,072,951	£7,116,396	£(43,445)	-0.6%	£1,120,280	£8,193,231
Perth College UHI	£9,722,947	£1,831,200	£0	£11,554,147	£0	£3,715,506	£1,551,021	£16,820,675	£17,199,137	£(378,462)	-2.2%	£4,722,743	£21,543,418
<u>Assigned Colleges</u>													
Orkney College UHI	£983,241	£923,002	£0	£1,906,243	£1,109,631	£380,953	£421,097	£3,817,924	£3,145,088	£672,836	21.4%	£371,180	£4,189,104
Shetland College UHI	£1,021,420	£524,149	£0	£1,545,569	£1,155,576	£392,941	£89,946	£3,184,033	£2,864,098	£319,935	11.2%	£325,973	£3,510,006
West Highland College UHI	£1,818,833	£1,864,167	£0	£3,683,000	£1,066,266	£703,055	£105,843	£5,558,164	£5,584,165	£(26,002)	-0.5%	£667,873	£6,226,036
Argyll College UHI	£1,657,826	£1,839,947	£0	£3,497,773	£1,118,424	£638,402	£5,258	£5,259,856	£5,393,308	£(133,452)	-2.5%	£569,794	£5,829,651
<u>Other</u>													
Highland Theological College UHI	£186,710	£0	£0	£186,710	£0	£81,282	£87,934	£355,927	£286,390	£69,537	24.3%	£152,993	£508,920
North Atlantic Fisheries College UHI	£83,414	£0	£0	£83,414	£0	£29,070	£6,243	£118,727	£143,737	£(25,010)	-17.4%	£54,717	£173,444
Sabhal Mor Ostaig UHI	£268,247	£0	£146,305	£414,552	£0	£115,654	£131,482	£661,688	£586,195	£75,493	12.9%	£217,688	£879,376
S.A.M.S. UHI	£325,477	£0	£0	£325,477	£0	£113,431	£64,357	£503,265	£494,280	£8,985	1.8%	£213,504	£716,768
UHI EO	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£217,343	£217,343	£65,446	£151,897	232.1%	£0	£217,343
Buffer	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£40,000	£(40,000)	-100.0%	£0	£0
	£36,207,450	£11,625,672	£146,305	£47,979,427	£7,388,517	£13,925,942	£5,570,377	£74,864,264	£74,864,262	£2		£15,615,988	£90,480,252

Model 2	Volume	National Pay Bargaining	SMO	Sub - Total	HE Rurality £2M (added to existing FE rurality)	Non - academic costs – 25% of current activity	Academic leadership set at £2M allocated pro rata to volume	Cash Distribution				EO Topslice	Total Funding
								Revised	Budget	Variance (£)	Variance (%)		
<u>Incorporated Colleges</u>													
Inverness College UHI	£10,363,337	£1,939,576	£0	£12,302,913	£0	£3,629,108	£478,527	£16,410,548	£16,662,704	£(252,157)	-1.5%	£4,055,194	£20,465,742
Lews Castle College UHI	£1,780,069	£659,910	£0	£2,439,979	£1,224,893	£613,597	£179,624	£4,458,093	£4,517,615	£(59,522)	-1.3%	£641,562	£5,099,656
Moray College UHI	£6,495,296	£1,209,174	£0	£7,704,470	£324,055	£2,288,678	£162,657	£10,479,860	£10,765,703	£(285,842)	-2.7%	£2,502,487	£12,982,347
North Highland College UHI	£3,534,272	£834,547	£0	£4,368,819	£1,389,672	£1,224,266	£146,220	£7,128,977	£7,116,396	£12,582	0.2%	£1,120,280	£8,249,257
Perth College UHI	£10,611,962	£1,831,200	£0	£12,443,162	£0	£3,715,506	£519,017	£16,677,685	£17,199,137	£(521,452)	-3.0%	£4,722,743	£21,400,428
<u>Assigned Colleges</u>													
Orkney College UHI	£1,087,198	£923,002	£0	£2,010,200	£1,109,631	£380,953	£140,911	£3,641,695	£3,145,088	£496,607	15.8%	£371,180	£4,012,874
Shetland College UHI	£1,136,821	£524,149	£0	£1,660,970	£1,155,576	£392,941	£30,099	£3,239,586	£2,864,098	£375,488	13.1%	£325,973	£3,565,558
West Highland College UHI	£2,013,402	£1,864,167	£0	£3,877,569	£1,066,266	£703,055	£35,418	£5,682,308	£5,584,165	£98,143	1.8%	£667,873	£6,350,181
Argyll College UHI	£1,839,963	£1,839,947	£0	£3,679,910	£1,118,424	£638,402	£1,759	£5,438,496	£5,393,308	£45,187	0.8%	£569,794	£6,008,290
<u>Other</u>													
Highland Theological College UHI	£196,612	£0	£0	£196,612	£0	£81,282	£52,995	£330,889	£286,390	£44,499	15.5%	£152,993	£483,883
North Atlantic Fisheries College UHI	£88,993	£0	£0	£88,993	£0	£29,070	£3,763	£121,826	£143,737	£(21,911)	-15.2%	£54,717	£176,543
Sabhal Mor Ostaig UHI	£282,653	£0	£146,305	£428,958	£0	£115,654	£79,240	£623,851	£586,195	£37,656	6.4%	£217,688	£841,539
S.A.M.S. UHI	£347,249	£0	£0	£347,249	£0	£113,431	£38,786	£499,465	£494,280	£5,185	1.0%	£213,504	£712,969
UHI EO	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£130,985	£130,985	£65,446	£65,539	100.1%	£0	£130,985
Buffer	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£40,000	£(40,000)	-100.0%	£0	£0
	£39,777,827	£11,625,672	£146,305	£51,549,804	£7,388,517	£13,925,942	£2,000,000	£74,864,264	£74,864,262	£2		£15,615,988	£90,480,252

Model 3	National Pay Bargaining			Sub - Total	HE Rurality £1M (added to existing FE rurality)	Non - academic costs – 25% of current activity	Academic leadership set at £2M allocated pro rata to volume	Cash Distribution				EO Topslice	Total Funding
	Volume	SMO						Revised	Budget	Variance (£)	Variance (%)		
<u>Incorporated Colleges</u>													
Inverness College UHI	£11,071,128	£1,501,520	£0	£12,572,648	£0	£3,600,000	£514,088	£16,686,736	£16,662,704	£24,032	0.1%	£4,055,194	£20,741,931
Lews Castle College UHI	£1,902,279	£510,869	£0	£2,413,147	£1,059,110	£925,000	£192,973	£4,590,230	£4,517,615	£72,615	1.6%	£641,562	£5,231,792
Moray College UHI	£6,934,234	£936,081	£0	£7,870,314	£280,196	£2,450,000	£174,745	£10,775,255	£10,765,703	£9,552	0.1%	£2,502,487	£13,277,742
North Highland College UHI	£3,770,593	£646,064	£0	£4,416,656	£1,201,586	£1,317,360	£157,086	£7,092,689	£7,116,396	£(23,707)	-0.3%	£1,120,280	£8,212,969
Perth College UHI	£11,354,965	£1,417,621	£0	£12,772,586	£0	£3,875,000	£557,587	£17,205,173	£17,199,137	£6,036	0.0%	£4,722,743	£21,927,916
<u>Assigned Colleges</u>													
Orkney College UHI	£1,159,676	£714,541	£0	£1,874,217	£959,448	£140,000	£151,383	£3,125,047	£3,145,088	£(20,040)	-0.6%	£371,180	£3,496,227
Shetland College UHI	£1,211,953	£405,769	£0	£1,617,722	£999,174	£215,000	£32,335	£2,864,232	£2,864,098	£134	0.0%	£325,973	£3,190,205
West Highland College UHI	£2,147,602	£1,443,143	£0	£3,590,744	£921,952	£1,025,000	£38,050	£5,575,746	£5,584,165	£(8,419)	-0.2%	£667,873	£6,243,619
Argyll College UHI	£1,962,314	£1,424,393	£0	£3,386,707	£967,051	£1,025,000	£1,890	£5,380,648	£5,393,308	£(12,660)	-0.2%	£569,794	£5,950,442
<u>Other</u>													
Highland Theological College UHI	£209,423	£0	£0	£209,423	£0	£50,000	£31,173	£290,596	£286,390	£4,206	1.5%	£152,993	£443,589
North Atlantic Fisheries College UHI	£96,212	£0	£0	£96,212	£0	£50,000	£2,213	£148,425	£143,737	£4,688	3.3%	£54,717	£203,142
Sabhal Mor Ostaig UHI	£301,290	£0	£146,305	£447,595	£0	£80,000	£46,612	£574,207	£586,195	£(11,989)	-2.0%	£217,688	£791,895
S.A.M.S. UHI	£375,415	£0	£0	£375,415	£0	£80,000	£22,815	£478,230	£494,280	£(16,051)	-3.2%	£213,504	£691,733
UHI EO	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£77,050	£77,050	£65,446	£11,604	17.7%	£0	£77,050
Buffer	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£40,000	£(40,000)	-100.0%	£0	£0
	£42,497,081	£9,000,000	£146,305	£51,643,386	£6,388,517	£14,832,360	£2,000,000	£74,864,264	£74,864,262	£1		£15,615,988	£90,480,252