

## **FUNDING PUPILS AND STUDENTS WITH HIGH NEEDS (SEN)**

1. Context
2. Future SEN and the Local Context
3. High Needs
4. High Needs Block
5. Inclusion Services from Special Schools
6. Future Funding in Specialist Settings: Place-Plus
7. Transitional Arrangements for 2014-2014: Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) for Specialist Provision.
8. Funding Numbers Over Roll in Specialist Provision
9. Reviewing the Number of Places in Specialist Provision
10. Exceptional Needs
11. Place Numbers for Specialist Provision 2013-14
12. Place Plus in Mainstream Schools
13. Notional SEN Budget

### **1. Context**

- 1.1 The Green Paper on special educational needs (SEN) and disability, *Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability* sets out a reform agenda for raising aspirations and improving attainment of pupils and students who require additional specialist, often costly, educational support that is currently usually provided through a statement of special educational needs. The Green Paper signals matters that need to be developed.
- 1.2 A new set of funding arrangements for pupils and students with high needs is proposed to help achieve the aspirations in the Green Paper. The new funding arrangements for SEN are a set of very detailed proposals set out in *School funding reform: Next steps towards a fairer system* that cover funding for all schools.
- 1.3 The funding proposals that are being made are due to come into effect for all schools from April 2013. There are some transitional arrangements for the years 2013-14 that offer some financial protection. They are outlined in section 5.
- 1.4 *School Funding Reform* sets out ten general principles that will underpin the new system. These are:
  1. The funding provided should meet the impartially assessed needs of the child or young person for whom it is provided.
  2. So far as practicable, the preferences of the parents or young person should be followed in placing the child or young person.
  3. The interests of the taxpayer require that funding and resources should be used efficiently and to best effect.
  4. The funding should not be seen as fixed, but subject to review, and may change as the child or young person's assessed needs change.
  5. Where children or young people have social care needs or health needs, appropriate contributions should be made from the budgets for those services.
  6. The commissioning body (usually the local authority) should meet the cost of the educational provision, in order that proper regard is given to financial considerations.

7. The commissioning body should have an open and transparent system for the allocation of high needs resources, which makes use of expert advice and is consistently applied.
8. The commissioning body should monitor the effectiveness of the provision, and that it achieves relevant and appropriate outcomes for the child or young person.
9. Because of the specialist nature and high cost of premises and staffing, funding systems need to provide some protection to institutions in which not all the places are filled. But this does not mean that indefinite protection should be given to unsuccessful institutions.
10. Pupil Premium and equivalent Post-16 disadvantage funding is additional to all other sums allocated.

1.5 The new funding system's approach will be one in which:

- i) **funding is genuinely responsive to individual pupils' and students' needs** in a way balances greater responsiveness of providers' funding to actual pupil or student numbers with an appropriate degree of funding stability for specialist providers;
- ii) **all providers are funded on an equivalent basis** so that the programme of education for a high needs pupil or student is funded in a comparable way whatever form of institution they attend;
- iii) **education funding for pre-16 and post-16 high needs provision is brought together** so as to support the development of the integrated approach to assessment and planning from birth to 25 proposed in the SEN and disability green paper, as well as ensuring that young people are able to make successful transitions at 16 and to adult life;
- iv) **there is clear information about available provision for high needs pupils and students** in the form of local offer that will set out clearly what providers will be expected to provide to high needs pupils and students.

**Q1: We must adopt the principles and approach to guide local policy development. Are there any additional principles or characteristics to add to the approaches outlined above that the LA should also consider adopting?**

Responses:

1. No comment
2. Agree principles, but would prefer place funding as it offers stability for sp schools.
3. No additional principles but stress a need for budget certainty stability and predictability.
4. Raised detailed query about concept of 'equal funding. No comments about principles.
5. Agree principles, emphasises potential changes to budgets must be minimised.
6. No comment
7. Needs to be further principles to reflect Hospital school provision – none suggested.
8. Agree, but think the proposal do not reflect them, calls for clearer and impartial assessments of pupils needs.
9. Suggests there is an opportunity to consider an alternative form of support for BESD pupils.
10. No comment
11. No additional principles

12. No comment
13. No comment
14. No additional ones
15. No comment
16. No additional ones
17. Where possible support should be provided in Wirral
18. No additional ones
19. No additional ones
20. No additional ones, strongly support number one and number five (health contributions)
21. Lots of comments about the importance of various elements of the principles, no additional ones proposed.

### **Recommendation 1**

**Wirral adopts the principles and approach outlined in School Funding Reform 2012 to underpin the new system of funding pupils with high needs.**

## **2. Future SEN and the Local Context**

2.1 Wirral has extensive and successful specialist provision. It comprises:

**i) Special Schools**

Foxfield, Meadowside, Hayfield, Clare Mount, Orrets Meadow, Elleray Park, Lyndale, Kilgarth, Observatory, Stanley, Gilbrook. (11)

**ii) Resourced Provisions**

These are locally known as Education Inclusion Bases or Units in primary schools. In total there are 17 mainstream schools with Resourced Provision

**iii) Alternative Provision (AP):**

St Michael's and Riverside Behaviour Bases, Wirral Hospital Schools, and Wirral Alternative Schools Programme (WASP).

2.2 The new national funding arrangements will apply to all of this provision. The same principles and approaches are to be adopted to improve clarity and transparency about funding. The same funding model will apply to all of this provision nationally.

2.3 Funding arrangements for AP are modelled the same way as the funding arrangements for specialist SEN provision. The only difference will be in the size of the national threshold of funding to Alternative Provision which will set at a lower level than to SEN provision. For SEN provision it will be £10,000 and for AP it will be £8,000.

2.3 The language and concepts in SEN are also changing. There will be only one school based category of SEN to replace School Action and School Action Plus. This school based category will cover pupils known as Low Needs-High Incidence. Pupils who needs are not normally met in mainstream provision will be referred to as High Needs/Low Incidence. It is funding for the latter with this consultation is largely concerned and the section headings of High Needs, High Needs Block, and Place-Plus will outline how they relate to funding.

- 2.4 The funding changes will not be neutral. A new system is being developed that provide us all with challenges and opportunities as historic and local arrangements will need to change in line with the principle and approaches set out above.

### **3. High Needs**

- 3.1 There is no precise definition of a high needs pupil or high needs student, but the government means those pupils or students who require provision that would not normally be available in mainstream settings. They have deliberately chosen to define a financial threshold as opposed to an assessment based threshold for defining high need, such as having a statement of special educational needs, since the latter could create perverse incentives if assessment was directly linked to additional funding. High needs are defined as those requiring provision costing around £10,000 or more per year.
- 3.2 Currently, in Wirral this would include all pupils with statements attending special schools, pupils with statements attending mainstream schools, pupils without statements attending primary language bases and Orrets Meadow, pupils who receive additional support in the form of Health Care Plans, Individual Pupil Funding Agreements, and direct support from Hearing and Vision Services. It will also include those pupils and students educated in non-maintained independent and non-maintained independent special schools.

### **4. High Needs Block**

- 4.1 The government intend to bring together all education revenue funding for high needs pupils and students across the SEN, 16+ Learning Difficulties/Disabilities (LDD), and Alternative Provision (AP) sectors, in the form of a clearly identified notional High Needs Block within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- 4.2 This will mean that local authorities will receive an identified amount of funding for high needs pupils and students aged from birth to 25, and for which the LA must commission provision and provide funding for providers. This funding is indicative and not ring fenced.

### **5. Inclusion Services from Special Schools**

- 5.1 Currently, special schools receive some monies that could remain in the High Needs Block so it is important to consult with you about these monies.
- 5.2 All Wirral's special schools, and including the Hospital School, each receive a sum of £33,470, making a total of £ 401,601 for them to promote inclusive activities for the benefit of special school's own pupils into mainstream schools, and inclusive activities for mainstream schools. This money was agreed by the Schools Forum in June 2005. A number of future options are possible about the use of this money.
- i. The money remains in the High Needs Block and special schools inclusion work is reviewed to re-commission successful projects and initiatives from special schools.
  - ii. The money is placed in the high needs block to fund provision for pupils' and students' special needs so that it disappears as a separate budget and is subsumed into the High Needs Block and then distributed for pupil funding.

- iii. The money becomes available for the LA to commission new activity in priority areas of need such as social communication difficulties, early intervention, for targeted work on groups of pupils who have the lowest needs and the highest probability of being included in mainstream school full-time, etc.

**Q 2: What are your views about these alternatives?**

Responses:

1. Agree with methodology
2. Prefer option 5.2i. – money to remain in special sector as all initiatives driven by that sector
3. Prefer 5.2i. 5.2ii takes money out of special sector. 5.2iii puts money into LA hands and not schools – as it is special schools that have led these initiatives and not the LA.
4. Seemed to suggest option 5.2i preferred.
5. Prefers option 5.2i. Sp provision has spent developing innovative initiatives and money has been part of the budget for some years.
6. Supports either 5.2 i or ii
7. Prefers option 5.2i
8. Option 5.2ii – placed in high needs block but goes to specials schools and Hospital school.
9. Prefers money to remain with special schools.
10. Prefers option 5.2i creates stability and has worked well to-date
11. Option 5.2i
12. 5.2iii – seems to be shortage of support to schools
13. No comment
14. Should fall in line with national
15. No comment
16. Agree with methodology
17. 5.3iii would give opportunity for new focused work which is greatly needed
18. Stay the same as now
19. Inclusion services from special schools would be useful
20. 5.3ii most appropriate
21. 5.2 I is the preferred option.

**Recommendation 2**

**The current arrangements for inclusion monies are retained subject to a future review of current projects and initiatives.**

**6 Future Funding in Specialist Settings: Place-Plus**

- 6.1 One of the key planks of high needs funding reform is to move towards a more pupil-led funding system in which there remains an element of place-led funding. Under this Place-Plus system funding, in special schools and other specialist pre-16 SEN settings, such as resourced provision as units and bases, will be determined partly on the number of places, and partly on the number of pupils attending the special school or provision.
- 6.2 Currently, special schools are funded for a number of places and receive a budget based on the number of places whether or not places are filled. In the future all places in all specialist provision will receive a base level of funding at £10,000 per place.

- 6.3 Top-up funding in the new system is not provided on the basis of planned places, but on a per-pupil basis. It is matter for local determination how top-up rates are set and when they are paid, guidance suggests payment could be monthly or termly.
- 6.4 Like many authorities Wirral currently uses a banded framework to generate special schools budgets and guidance suggests that we build on such a framework. There will not be a national framework of top up funding.
- 6.5 Wirral's framework was designed eleven years ago. It was initially based on assessed need but over time it has largely become a financial tool not related to current assessed need except, that is, in the cases of Hayfield and Clare Mount where pupil are admitted on the basis of one of the two funding bands applicable to the school.
- 6.6 Guidance suggests that we review our local funding arrangements and consider a banded approach. Clearly, this will have implications for admissions because pupils needs and proposed funding will be at the centre of dialogue between the commissioner and provider and not historic models of funding and admissions.
- 6.7 The implication of the place-plus approach for specialist provision is that they will experience budget changes depending on the number and needs of pupils attending the provision as this will affect the amount of top-up funding they receive.
- 6.8 Resourced provision is funded from a mixture of a single lump amount and the AWPU for the pupil attending. Funding of Wirral's various resourced provisions is historic. Place-Plus funding will apply to these provisions in the future. In the future they will receive a base budget of £10,000 per place and a top-up that is determined locally.
- 6.9 Table A illustrates what a banding system may be like applied to Wirral's special schools and resourced provision from 2014-15. It is for illustration only. The tables shows the impact of three possible funding bands., Table A(i), funding where all the places are full and Table A (ii) funding based on current pupil numbers. The bands are built around the best fit from current budgets across all specialist provision, with this illustrative example showing only one possible band for each provision. What is clear is that implementing a top-up system based on banding may lead to some redistribution of funding.

**Q 3: *What do you think about a banded top-up system and about the rates shown? Would you like to see a small working group from the School Forum tasked with developing a local banding system that applies to special schools and resourced provision and that reports before the end of this calendar year?***

**Responses**

1. Agree
2. Agree a form of banding necessary. But prefer LA to work with other LAs to develop a system and not a local group as they would not be impartial.
3. Agree with banding and strongly need for further work by a forum working group.
4. Agrees with a banded approach to top up and need for a task group to examine possibilities. Also respondent posed a series of questions that a banded system would have to take into account.
5. Some of the projections look alarming; would like to hear stories behind these changes to others before agreeing.
6. Agrees with banding and says illustration far too simplistic.
7. Agrees with top up and working group.
8. Suggests a small working group serviced by independent external advice
9. Working group needs to recognise BESD pupils should be in highest funding category

10. Needs to have flexibility built in. Does not agree small working group would have the expertise.
11. Support top up and working group
12. Supports top up
13. Yes to top up and yes to working group
14. Yes
15. Yes to both
16. Yes to both
17. Yes, clearly a working group is needed
18. Set up a working party
19. Yes
20. Agree with need for working group, especially given the inadequacy of current funding. Suggest someone with health based experience is included.
21. Agrees small working needs to develop this with school leaders and neighbouring LAs

### **Recommendation 3**

**A working group of the Schools Forum is established to develop a local banding model for top-up funding for pupils with high needs.**

## **7 Transitional Arrangements for 2013-2014: Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) for Specialist Provision**

- 7.1 The MFG for special schools and resourced provision applies to the place element of funding and represents the principal protection for these settings, and it will be the agreed number of places funded at £10,000 per planned place with top-up funding coming from each LA that places pupils in the school or setting. This protection is for one year only.
- 7.2 In addition, in the first year the government has set as condition of grant that the level of top-up funding should be such that, were all the high needs pupils in that setting placed by that LA, the school's total funding for 2013-14 would not be more than 1.5% below the funding that the school received in 2012-13.
- 7.3 The DfE has clarified that this means total budget funding will not be more than 1.5% below the funding received in 2012-13 if all the places were full as the MFG for special provision is attached to the pupil top-up funding rather than the places. This means that a school with empty places in its specialist provision can expect less funding if it does not fill its places.
- 7.4 Table B uses the DfE steps to produce a special school funding with the MFG to provide a budget for special schools and resourced provision using the 2012-13 budget with the January Census pupil count of 2012. This particular budget is constructed using a school specific single top-up as the current banding no longer applies to the majority of special schools.

**Q 4: Should Wirral use the MFG to construct budgets for the transitional year?**

Responses

1. Yes
2. Yes.

3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes- based on year end number.
7. Yes
8. Yes
9. Yes.
10. Yes, and beyond
11. Yes
12. No comment
13. No comment
14. Yes
15. What are the alternatives?
16. Yes
17. Yes –issue for the working group
18. Yes
19. Yes
20. Yes
21. Yes, and cautions that a ‘free market’ may create significant instability

#### **Recommendation 4**

**The Authority uses the MFG to construct budgets for specialist provision for the transitional year 2013-2014.**

**Q 5: *Should Wirral devise any local protection for special schools in addition to the MFG where budgets will reduce as a result budget changes and empty places whilst plans are developed and implemented to reconfigure provision? If so, what could they be and how would they be funded?***

#### Responses

1. Yes
2. Seems unnecessary.
3. See additional protection as unnecessary.
4. Yes – and comments on situation in CLD sector.
5. Asks for a clear view about patterns behind excess places.
6. See response to Q4 – if this is not possible then some form of protection will be important.
7. If significant changes could occur suggests working group to be formed
8. Yes
9. There is a need for local protection and reiterates need for BESD pupils to be in highest funding category.
10. Top slice for specialist school status
11. No comment
12. No comment
13. No comment
14. Depends on specific needs across Wirral
15. Some protection needed depending on time scales
16. No comment
17. Issue for the working group
18. Sp School should have their budgets protected – but not sure how
19. No



- 20 Want to see the MFG applying to total funding and not having a pupil element until banded funding is agreed. Without it school will be financially unviable.
- 21 Certainly for small special schools.

#### **Recommendation 5**

**Local protection for may be considered for individual special schools affected by significant turbulence because of funding changes due to empty places.**

### **8 Funding Number Over Roll in Specialist Provision**

- 8.1 Wirral currently has a locally agreed mechanism that gives extra money to special schools that take pupils over their place number. The mechanism is triggered when a school has more than five pupils above its place number.
- 8.2 The DfE propose that it is up to school and commissioner to agree the amount of top-up funding if a school has a significantly higher number of pupils on roll than the number of places for which it is funded.
- 8.3 We think it fair, and in the spirit of the reforms, to use the top-up to fund each pupil over numbers.

#### ***Q 6: Do you have any comments on funding excess places?***

##### Responses

1. Should use top up to fund.
2. Fund at the same level as the other pupils, ideally on a half-term basis.
3. Seems preferable to current trigger to use top up to fund each pupil over numbers.
4. Agree top up would be fair but suggest LA should better manage numbers to avoid excess and surplus places.
5. Seems preferable to current trigger
6. Seems fair.
7. Good idea
8. Yes, agree
9. Amount should include place and top up.
10. Excess places should not be funded
11. Use top up
12. Yes, fund with top up
13. Yes, use top up
14. If place is needed it should be provided
15. No comment
16. Use top up
17. Need to work harder to match pupils and places in all provision
18. Agree –use top up
19. Agree – top up
20. Agree
21. Excess places should be funded as full places.

#### **Recommendation 6**

**Excess places in specialist provision is funded on the basis of the high need pupil top-up.**

## **9. Reviewing the Number of Places in Specialist Provision**

- 9.1 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) is proposing a two year reviewing cycle to determine future changes to the number of planned places in special schools and specialist provision. The new reviewing arrangements for LAs to plan places with the EFA regularly produce a reviewing cycle for the number of specialist places needed.
- 9.2 Since the Autumn Term 2010 the LA has been involved with the Schools Forum, governing bodies and headteachers of all Wirral special schools in developing a process of managing surplus places in special schools that involves reducing surplus places or using the money to re-commission the school with surplus places to provide something different.

**Q 7: *Should the work developing a reviewing cycle of the number of surplus places be amended to include considerations about excess demand and thus trends in either direction to integrate with the EFA arrangements?***

### Responses

1. Yes
2. On an annual basis as per the current agreement.
3. Timing of budget adjustment needs careful consideration; could be chaotic and destabilising to change monthly or each half –term. Regular adjustments to staffing will make recruitment and retention of specialists difficult.
4. Two year trends important.
5. Yes. Makes similar points at to 3 above and cites Salt’s Review of PMLD training and need to retain specialist staff.
6. Yes, should be explored.
7. Yes
8. Yes, underpinned by clearer strategic direction
9. No comment
10. Yes
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Biggest needs must be identified and monies allocated
15. No comment
16. Yes
17. Yes, makes sense
18. Yes
19. Yes
20. Hope that the new arrangements and realistic place numbers then future adjustments will be minimal.
21. Argues more work needs doing to be clear how this would work.

### **Recommendation 7**

**The current local arrangements for reviewing surplus places are amended to keep all places under review and integrated with EFA arrangements.**

## 10 Exceptional Needs

- 10.1 Currently, there is a local agreement that maintained special schools can access a centrally held budget of £480,000 for pupils who have exceptional needs - and/or are at risk of exclusion - and/or may need an out-of-borough place. The budget has been stretched for a number of years. It is proposed to place this money in top-up funding where it can honour existing exceptional needs commitments.
- 10.2 In line with the underpinning principles funding should not be seen as fixed, but subject to review if a pupils' or students needs' change. In the future any change to funding would occur as a result of a review. For instance, using the illustrative banding model a review could mean funding at the higher adjacent band. In the illustrative example of 'low' 'medium' and 'high' needs banding then a review would mean moving to the next banding so a pupil in 'low' moves to 'medium'; a pupil in 'medium' moves to 'high'; and pupils in access 'high plus' that is currently only accessed by non-maintained independent placements.

**Q 8: Do you agree with this suggestion? If not, what are your views about the future use of this budget?**

### Responses

1. Should be opened to bases with reps on the panel
2. Budget with a ceiling and stringent reviewing.
3. Seems sensible but would need very clear criteria. OoB should be avoided unless absolutely necessary.
4. Accepts logic of the suggestion but stresses any system must be transparent controlled.
5. Suggests need to look at triggers, especially at home, for OoB placement and see whether things like shared care can help manage this.
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Current budget insufficient; independent review of processes needed.
9. Does not agree as the adjacent band may not meet pupil's needs. Suggest new provision opened to save pupils going OoB.
10. It helps to stabilise budgets, we have needed this trigger in the past
11. Yes
12. No comment
13. Yes, I agree.
14. Yes
15. No comment
16. Should be opened up to bases with representation on panel
17. Yes
18. Yes
19. Yes, include mainstream bases on panel
20. Yes, it fits with principle 3.
21. Access to high plus for all C&YP in CLD sector needed as the high band of £8 for the sector is not realistic.

### **Recommendation 8**

**The exceptional needs budget is placed in the high needs block to honour existing agreements, and in future the monies will be used to fund top-ups.**

- 11.2 As part of authorities' work with the EFA on calculating the baseline for the high needs block we will need to determine the number of places in maintained specials schools and in resourced provision or units in maintained schools for 2013-2014.
- 11.3 Table C shows the number of current places. Any amendments to this must be discussed with the EFA in July 2012.
- 11.4 In keeping with our statutory duty to keep provision constantly under review we are currently in varying stages of discussion and planning with a number of providers about place numbers, therefore we need to consult with you about whether or not to continue with our plans and discuss amendments to the 2013 baseline with EFA shortly.
- i) This means that measures have been put in place for The Lyndale Primary Special School and Foxfield Secondary Special School to have their budgets reduced in September 2012 and the number of their places reduced by five in April 2013.

**Q 9: *Should we move ahead with the locally planned changes to Lyndale and Foxfield's number of places or not? What are your views?***

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes, Foxfield with 125-130 would be preferable.
4. Yes, but also refers to primary CLD position.
5. Yes, but only if we have a clear view of pattern of places over the next few years.
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Inappropriate to comment.
9. Yes
10. Yes
11. Do not agree with places and budgets being reduced
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Yes
15. No comment
16. Yes
17. Strong argument number should be further reduced. Continuous review needed
18. Not sure – may need the places in the future
19. Yes
20. Inappropriate to comment on Foxfield. In Lyndale's case 28-30 places is realistic but only viable if top up is increased to say £20,000 per pupils
21. Yes.

**Recommendation 9**

**The Authority move ahead with the locally planned changes to reduce the number of places by five each at Foxfield Secondary Special School and The Lyndale Primary Special School.**

- ii) The LA had intended to present a paper to the Schools Forum in July 2012 proposing an increase in the number of places at Gilbrook Primary Special School from 50 to 55. This is because the number of pupils on roll has been regularly above this number over recent years and a clear trend in the need for provision has been established.

**Q 10: What are your views about the Gilbrook proposal? Should the LA proceed?**

Responses

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Inappropriate to comment.
9. Yes
10. Yes
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Yes
15. No comment
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes
19. Yes
20. Not appropriate to comment.
21. Yes

**Recommendation 10**

**The Authority move ahead with the increase to the number of places at Gilbrook Primary Special School from 50 to 55 April 2013.**

- iii) Preliminary discussions have also been undertaken with Rock Ferry Primary School about the future of the base commissioned for pupils with moderate learning difficulties and whether it would like to consider changing its designation to another type of SEN. This is because there is a clear downward trend in the numbers of pupils attending the base.

**Q 11: Should the LA propose closure of this provision for the end of the academic year 2013?**

Responses

1. No
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Raises a question about decrease in MLD elsewhere possibly affecting need to retain this provision.
5. Yes.
6. Yes

7. Yes
8. Unable to comment
9. Yes
10. Yes
11. Yes
12. Yes
13. No comment
14. Yes – money should fund needs e.g. Soc Comm
15. No comment
16. Suggests alternatives use such as Orrets pilot or likelihood of pupils not getting into Hayfield
17. yes
18. Yes – use money for a KS2 behaviour base
19. No – provision still needed
20. Not appropriate to comment.
21. Yes

**Recommendation 11**

**The Authority move ahead with the proposal to close the Education Inclusion Base at Rock Ferry Primary School at the end of the academic year 2013.**

- iv) Elleray Park School has been over its place number for the last three years. In the January census for 2012 it had 84 pupils, in 2011 78 and in 2010 76 pupils.

***Q 12: Should the LA consider approaching the EFA to increase its place number to 80?***

**Responses**

1. Yes
2. Not sufficient, should be higher.
3. Yes
4. Asks about overall plan for CLD and asks LA to more actively manage numbers.
5. Yes, but only if we have a clear view of pattern of places over the next few years.
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Unable to comment
9. Yes
10. Surely LA can see what the place number will be over time.
11. No comment
12. Yes
13. Yes
14. Yes
15. No comment
16. Yes
17. yes
18. Yes
19. Yes
20. Not appropriate to comment
21. Yes

**Recommendation 12**

**The Authority move ahead to increase the place number at Elleray Park from 75 to 80 in April 2013.**

## 12. Place-Plus in Mainstream Schools

Under a place-plus approach high needs funding will comprise three elements, which can be applied across all provision for high needs pupils and students.

- i) Element 1 or “core education funding, this is the basic unit of per pupil funding - the age weighted pupil unit or AWPU (post 16 this is the national funding per student). The amount is deemed to be around £4,000.
- ii) Element 2 or “additional support funding”. Schools receive funding for additional SEN support in the form of units of resource. The first 5 units are included in the delegated budget. From 2013-14 the sum that schools will be expected to contribute as a national minimum will be £6,000 (Post 16 this is directed through National Formula Funding for Additional Learner Support – ALS).
- iii) The total of Element 1 and 2 therefore is £10,000 and matches the proposed place funding within special schools. Element 3 or “top-up funding” above £10,000 to meet the total cost of provision will be paid by the LA (commissioner).

## 13. Notional SEN Budget

For pupils with statements and to align Wirral with the nationally suggested figure for element 2 we propose to delegate a further £250,000 so that the additional support schools are deemed to contribute from their delegated budget is £6,000. That means Wirral’s five units of support will be increased in value from £5,665 to £6,000. It will also result in a corresponding reduction in the value of support in excess of £6,000.

### ***Q 13: Do you agree with increased value of the individually assigned pupil units?***

#### Responses

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Yes
9. Yes
10. Not when 50% of special schools are losing budgets.
11. Yes
12. Yes, but increase needs to be bigger
13. Yes
14. Challenging consultation but hope new system equitable, fair and right for all children
15. No comment
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. Yes
19. Yes
20. Agree
21. Yes

#### **Recommendation 13**

**The sum of £250, 000 is delegated to mainstream schools so that Wirral's five units of individually assigned support is increased in value form £5,665 to £6,000.**

**Q 14: Are there are any other comments you wish to add?**

Responses

- 1.
2. Want a fair and equitable system that encourages forward planning.
3. Certainty and predictability of funding is necessary for schools to make effective provision, but schools do not control admissions. There is a danger of developing funding that is reactive and fails to recognise the longer term needs of each school and impact negatively on current high standards. LA must do more to discourage mainstream moving pupils into special.
4. Proposal would not support current school population or support needs to avoid exclusion.
5. Disagrees that the proposals will bring stability and predictability as Gov suggest. Envisages chaos.
6. Points out AWPU is less than £4k in many schools. Also points out that special school do not have a lump as is the case with mainstream schools.
7. No
8. Additional numbers should not prejudice the education of existing pupils.
9. No comments here but letter submitted arguing need for BESD to be in highest top up band.
10. Letter attached by HT expressing concern about loss of specialist schools funding. Also appended are the last Specialist Reports showing the impact of the specialism locally and nationally.
11. No
12. No comment
13. No comment
14. No comment
15. No comment
16. Points out budget and adjustment for RF EIB do not agree
17. Numbers in Orrets needs review
18. No comment
19. No comment
20. Disappointed that national definitions of need and funding bands not addressed. Dismayed by recent experience with the Health Authorities rejections to contribution to the needs of pupils as it is contrary to principle five.
21. Argues that the school needs capital funding to modernise its provision.

**There are no recommendations arising from this question.**