

Formula Funding for SEND

1. What formula factors are most important in providing schools with enough money to ensure they meet the needs of their pupils with SEN? Please rank the following factors in order of importance with 1 as the most important.

AWPU

Low Prior Attainment

IDACI

FSM

Mobility

Lump Sum Other

2. Would allocating more funding towards lower attainers within the low prior attainment factor help to better target funding towards the schools that have to make more SEN provision for their pupils?

3. What positive distributional impact would this change in approach (e.g. creating tiers of low prior attainment) create for mainstream primary and secondary schools?

4. Would such a change in approach introduce any negative impact for mainstream primary and secondary schools?

SEND Funding Floor / additional funding arrangements

5. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements below, and in the comments box give the advantages and disadvantages of your preferred approach.

Local authorities should retain the flexibility to develop, in consultation with their schools, their own method of targeting extra SEN funding to schools that need it.

Central government should provide more guidance for local authorities on how they should target extra SEN funding to schools, but local authorities should remain responsible for determining the amounts in consultation with their schools.

Central government should prescribe a consistent national approach to the targeting of additional funding to schools that have a higher proportion of pupils with SEN and/or those with more complex needs.

Notional SEND

6. Is it helpful for local authorities to continue to calculate a notional SEN budget for each school, and for this information to be published, as now?

7. For those responding from a school, who in your school(s) is involved in decisions about spending from the school's notional SEN budget?

- Governors
- Head teacher / principal
- Senior leadership team
- SENCO
- Teachers

8. Should the national funding formula for schools include a notional SEN budget, or a way of calculating how much of each school's funding is intended to meet the costs of special provision for pupils with SEN?

The £6,000 Threshold

9. Please indicate whether or not you agree with the following statements.

The level of the threshold makes little or no difference to the system for making special provision: it is the level of funding available to schools and local authorities that is crucial.

The £6,000 threshold should be lower, so that schools do not have to make as much provision for pupils with SEN from their annual budgets, before they access top-up funding from the local authority.

__deselected__rov

The £6,000 threshold should be higher, so that schools have to make more provision for pupils with SEN from their annual budgets, before they access top-up funding from the local authority.

The operation of the £6,000 threshold should take account of particular circumstances.

10. If you have agreed with the final statement in question 9, please indicate below which circumstances you think would be relevant for a modified threshold or different funding arrangement.

Schools that are relatively small.

Schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs† or EHC plans.

When pupils with EHC plans are admitted to a school during the year, which may create unintended consequences.

Other (please specify below)

Understanding / Communication

11. If you are responding on behalf of a school, do you have a clear understanding about what provision is “ordinarily available” to meet pupils’ special educational needs in your school?

12. How is this determined?

__deselected__ra On a school-by-school basis

- As part of a multi-academy trust
- Part of a whole-local authority approach
- Part of a cluster of schools

13. How is this offer communicated to parents?

- School's published SEN information report
- Published local offer,
- Discussions between teacher(s) and parents
- Discussions between SENCO and parents
- Other (please specify)

14. Does your local authority make it clear when a child or young person requires an education, health and care (EHC) plan?

15. How is this articulated?

- Published local offer,
- School's published SEN information report
- Other publicly available document
- Unpublished local authority policy

Funding Alternative Provision

16 Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

The current funding arrangements help schools, local authorities and AP to work together and to intervene early where such action may avoid the need for permanent exclusion later

The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate

17. How could we encourage more collaboration between local authorities, schools and providers to plan and fund local AP and early intervention support?

18. What changes could be made to improve the way that the AP budget is spent, to better enable local authorities, schools and providers to use the local AP budget to provide high quality AP, intervene early to support children at risk of exclusion from school, or reintegrate pupils in AP back into mainstream where appropriate?

19. Please use the box below to share any examples of existing good practice where local authorities, schools and AP settings have worked together effectively to use the AP budget to provide high quality AP, intervene early to support children at risk of exclusion from school, or reintegrate pupils in AP back into mainstream where appropriate.

Students with SEND in Further Education

20. Are there aspects of the operation of the funding system that prevent young people from accessing the support they need to prepare them for adult life?

21. Notwithstanding your views about the sufficiency of funding, please describe any other aspects of the financial and funding arrangements that you think could be amended to improve the delivery of provision for young people with SEN.

22. If you are able to provide any examples where local authorities and colleges have worked together effectively to plan provision to meet the needs for SEN support and high needs, please describe these below.

Early Intervention

23. Are the current funding or financial arrangements making early intervention and prevention more difficult to deliver, causing costs to escalate?

24. If you can you provide examples of invest-to-save approaches with evidence that they can provide value for money by reducing the costs of SEN support, SEN provision or other support costs (e.g. health or social care) later, please describe these below.

25. If you think there are particular transition points at which it would be more effective to access resources, please indicate below those you believe would be most effective to focus on.

<input type="checkbox"/>	The transition from early years provision to reception class in primary school
<input type="checkbox"/>	The transition from Year 6 in primary school to Year 7 in secondary school
<input type="checkbox"/>	The transition from secondary school to further or other tertiary education

Effective Partnership Working

26. Please describe as briefly as possible below changes that you think could be made to the funding system nationally and/or locally that would foster more effective collaborative approaches and partnership arrangements.

Other

27. Are there any aspects of the funding and financial arrangements, not covered in your previous responses, that are creating perverse incentives?

28. What aspects of the funding and financial arrangements are helping the right decisions to be made, both in securing good provision for children and young people with additional needs, and in providing good value for money?