

**Minutes of High Needs Block Funding & Low Cost High Incidence SEN Meeting  
27<sup>th</sup> February 2017**

**In Attendance:**

Judith Stott  
Peter Brooks  
Amy Nield  
Wayne Hitchcock  
Bev Owens  
Alison Kelly  
Alison Milne  
Sally Smith  
Judith Nash  
Lynda Thompson  
Anne Davies  
Susan Denny  
Karen McCallum  
Michelle Perry (Clerk)

**1. Apologies**

Anne-Marie Steadman  
Graeme Bentley

**2. Minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

Resolved: That the minutes from 28<sup>th</sup> November 16 be amended to include the conversation around hours of support and the cost implication for PARIS and Non PARIS schools. Otherwise minutes recorded as being accurate.

**3. Matters arising**

Item 6 revise SEN banding is now on hold – Alison Milne informed the board that the SEN banding revision will not be going to the next funding forum as expected. Judith Stott advised September 2017 is the new timeline for the SEN banding revision.

Wayne Hitchcock asked that the conversation around hours of support be noted in the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2016 minutes against item 6 - SEN banding revision, regarding the cost implication for PARIS & Non Paris schools in line with managing parental expectation. Judith Stott acknowledged the difference in costs within the pay scales. The SEN team are moving away from 1:1 support and using terminology such as 'assistance' or 'resources' rather than specified hours.

**4. National Funding Formula - Consultation**

Amy Nield presented the Board with the DfE High Needs Stage 2 consultation document and the F40 collective response to the consultation. It was noted that the consultation closes 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017.

Judith Stott suggested to the board that the F40 responses be used as a starting point with a view to compiling a Trafford response. The Chair referred the board to the F40 document.

**Question 1 Overall Approach** – have the DfE struck the right balance?

Judith advised this could not be answered until all the consultation questions had been addressed.

**Question 2 Formula Factors**

**Historic Spend** – DfE to allocate 50% of planned spend is this this right proportion?

Amy confirmed that the historical spend is based on budgeted spend as per the re-basement line exercise. Historically Trafford have not had enough money – with this in mind the board thought the use of historical budget was not accurate nor does it reflect the increase in demand.

**Basic Entitlement** – to allocate £4,000 to each local authority per pupil is this right amount?

The Board questioned whether this is for special schools rather than the £10,000 currently in place. Further clarity was needed Amy to speak to Anne-Marie Steadman & feedback to the board

**Question 3 – Weightings.** The DfE propose the following weightings for each Formula Factor adding up to 100%

Do you agree?

Population – 50%

FSM - 10%

IDACI - 10%

KS2 Low Attainment - 7.5%

KS4 Low Attainment – 7.5%

Children in bad health – 7.5%

DLA – 7.5%

Wayne Hitchcock suggested that FSM brings additional funding in the form of PPG. Judith raised the issue as to whether FSM & Deprivation should be a combined weighting based on reality. It was noted that above percentages are proxy factors using a national overall average and are not specific to Trafford. The board agreed that the proportions and principal was ok. Alison Milne suggested looking at Trafford October 2016 Census information to see if there was parity between the DfE national weighting factor percentages and Trafford Census information. Susan Denny advised the board that DLA is ending and this would affect the Formula. Alison Milne asked the board if we would want to allocate more in population as Trafford would appear vulnerable in all other factors.

It was noted as a consideration that Trafford children enter the system much earlier than other LEA as the Early Years Section operate a good SEN system. It was suggested that the percentage of current Trafford SEN children be looked at.

**Action: It was agreed that October 2016 Census be looked at and it was expected that the Finance Team carry out this work and would feedback to the HNB with a view to answering the weightings consultation questions.**

**Question 4 – Funding Floor**

Do you agree with the principle of protecting local authorities from reductions?  
The board agreed with this principle.

**Question 5 – Funding Floor**

Do you agree with the proposal to set the funding floor such that no local authority will see a reduction in funding, compared to their spending baseline?  
The board agreed with this principle.

**Question 6 – Local Budget Flexibility**

Do you agree with limited flexibility between schools and High Needs budgets in 2018/19?

F40 response is 'NO', Judith Stott agrees with limiting flexibility. Alison Milne does not agree to limited flexibility. It was noted that the 'Hard' formula would be in place in 2019/20 and that the limited flexibility would be for 2018/19 only.

**Question 7 – Local Budget Flexibility**

Do you have any suggestions about the level of flexibility between schools and high needs budgets in 2018/19 and beyond?

The board agreed with the F40 response in that future increases in LA High Needs blocks should reflect inflationary and pupil growth.

**Question 8 – Further Consideration**

Are there further considerations we should take in to account about the proposed HN NFF?

The F40 response stated the transfer from the HNB to the Schools block of the pupils in the Specialist Resource Provision be based on actual numbers rather than place numbers.

Judith did not agree with this – wants place funding rather than actual otherwise staffing would be affected and that the SRP should stay within HNB. It was noted that the PRU is funded at SEN level whilst not all pupils are SEN children.

**Question 9 – Equalities**

Is there any evidence relating to the 8 characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010 that is not included in the equalities impact assessment and that we should take in to account?

F40 response – none that we are aware of.

Anne Davies thought there may be around Autism.

**Action: Anne Davies to look at the Equalities issue and feedback to the Board.**

The Chair referred the board back to question 1 – do you agree with the DFE overall approach to striking the right balance in the principles of fairness and stability?

The board discussed the Special Schools attainment information – the current information held is nonsense with various factors not providing stability. The issue of border cross over was discussed and the funding implications as SEN children from other LA's would have to be funded without any funding provision within the national

formula for border cross over. The board agreed that the consultation responses would need re-drafting to include the Finance Team and Anne Davies's feedback then sending out to board members. Peter Brooks suggested the High Needs consultation responses be taken to the next funding forum to be held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

## **5. Exclusions**

Karen McCallum advised the Board of the funding issue with the PRU's due to the increase in permanent exclusions, current number being 59 (all secondary) and this being over PAN. The LA has a statutory obligation and duty to educate these children. It has become an impossible situation in terms of funding and there being a shortfall. As an interim measure, a top up basis will be paid for the pupils above PAN at the PRU's – the cost implication is £30k for Autumn 2016 term and £70k Spring 2017 term. These costs are to be funded from exclusion monies. Contributing factors to the rise in permanent exclusions is the reduction of interventions services such as the Youth Service and following a good Ofsted report for the PRU's pupils have moved into the Borough. Linda Thompson advised that the excluded pupils are staying permanently at the PRU with only 10 pupils maybe moving on to Egerton. KS3 i.e. Years 7 & 8 can only go to Egerton.

Karen confirmed that the Primary PRU had no such issues and was manageable.

## **6. Small Specialist Class Review**

Sally Smith informed the Board that there will be a small specialist class review undertaken. Currently, there is no secondary small specialist class provision. Sally advised that the SSC review would take in to consideration:

- The drivers
- Empty places
- Movement (infant/juniors)
- Where the children are on roll (Ofsted not supportive of virtual school)

Sally acknowledged that generally the classes were 'bursting at the seams' and that she does not want the provision to end.

The Chair advised the board that she is happy for the school to fund step out at Longford and would be happy to have the same type of arrangement with the SSC provision and suggested this be explored. Wayne Hitchcock added his support to this suggestion as he thought it to be a more cost effective arrangement.

Alison Kelly asked for timeline for the SSC review – Sally confirmed September 2017.

## **7. AOB**

Alison Milne informed the board that the SEND local area inspection had been completed and a draft letter issued with the official report being publicised around the 22/23 March 2017. The 2 week inspection included schools, Trafford College and Early Years settings.

.

## **9. Date of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at 10am at Old Trafford Community Academy School.