

# **High Needs - Special School Funding for 2017/18**

**7<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

## **1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1 To report the outcome of the work undertaken by the High Needs working group tasked with reviewing the current value of resource bands used to fund special schools as part of the council's high needs funding arrangements.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Schools Forum note and feedback their views on the proposed adjustments to banded units of resource within the special schools funding matrix following the exercise to up-date the cost base.

## **3. Background**

- 3.1 Following the implementation of the DfE's new High Needs funding arrangements, in March 2013, Forum agreed the recommendations made by the SEN working group which included a full review of special schools funding, to be implemented in April 2014.
- 3.2 The option approved by School Forum in March 2014 was a 5 band matrix, which differentiates between the differing designation of each school and between primary and secondary phase. Each of the matrix bands has 2 resource bands/levels.
- 3.3 Appendix 1 summarizes the staffing ratios used as the basis for the banding values, which were costed using 2014 pay scales. Other costs included reflected the type and level of expenditure being incurred following analysis of outturn statements for the individual special schools.
- 3.4 Appendix 2, section 1 shows the resources values attached to the new banding matrix, however, the band values were below, and in some cases considerably lower than the 2013/14 special schools funding formula.
- 3.5 The special schools MFG, minimum funding guarantee, has a similar effect as in mainstream schools in that the amount per pupil cannot reduce by more than -1.5% year. It was evident that due to the differential between existing and the new funding values there would be several years of transition before special schools would be funded under the new model.
- 3.6 Section 2a of appendix 2 details the 2016-17 resource values and, with the exception of Band 1 of the matrix for Phoenix School, all other resource bands are still attracting MFG funding. Section 2b confirms the value of additional MFG funding being attracted to each band in 2016/17.

#### **4. 2017/18 Specials Schools Funding Model**

- 4.1 It was reported to the Forum meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016, that the Council's recommendation was, pending the planned start of a move to a national funding formula in April 2018, the only changes to be made to the 2017/18 local High Needs Funding Formula would be to rebase and update the current banding values for special schools and it was agreed to establish a working group to achieving this.
- 4.2 A meeting of the working group took place on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and the basis of the current matrix banding was discussed in some detail.
- 4.3 It was agreed with the working group that staffing costs would be uprated to include expected pay increases for 2017/18 and also that the level of funding included for fixed and operational costs would be reviewed, using more recent outturn data for individual schools.
- 4.4 The result of the rebase exercise on the individual resource bands is detailed in Section 3 of appendix 2, with most bands seeing an increase in the level of funding allocated compared the 2014 model. The only other amendment made was a change to the teaching ratio for MLD Band 2 from 1:10 to 1:9.
- 4.5 It should be noted, that as was the case in 2014, the rebased resource values remain below the current 2016/17 resource values, in most cases, with MFG therefore being paid to special schools.
- 4.6 Therefore, with the exception of Band 1 funding for Elmwood School who will attract the revised Band 1 value from April 2017, it is anticipated that all other bands will attract MFG funding and therefore continue to be paid at a higher than the 2017/18 Special Schools Funding model.
- 4.6 Should the existing approach to special schools funding be continued beyond 2017/18, the application of the MFG will result in an ongoing period of transition which will see most band values continue to reduce each year as their value moves towards the rebased 2017/18 funding model presented.

#### **5. Financial implications / Value for Money**

- 5.1 The exact financial impact on individual schools cannot be predicted at this time as this will be dependent on the actual number of places commissioned and filled at each special school during 2017/18.
- 5.2 However current financial modelling indicates that the proposed financial arrangements would be affordable within the High Needs Block funding provided within the Dedicated Schools Grant for 2017/18.

## **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1 The report ensures that the special school funding formula complies with school funding regulations.

## **7. School Improvement**

- 7.1 As part of feeding back any views regarding possible changes to the special schools funding formula factor values, Schools Forum should consider the potential impact on the desired outcomes of the Walsall school improvement programme.

## **8. Members eligible to vote**

- 8.1 The intention of the report is to inform Schools Forum of the work that has been undertaken with regard to the Special Schools Funding Formula and seek its views in relation to the proposed financial arrangements for 2017/18. As such no vote is required.

## Appendix 1

**High Needs Review - Special Schools Funding 2013 funding Review - staffing ratios agreed following review & used as basis of funding since April 2014**

Elmwood		Phoenix		Castle		Jane Lane		Old Hall		Oakwood		Mary Elliot	
SEMH Band 1	SEMH Band 2	SEMH Band 1	SEMH Band 2	MLD Band 1	MLD Band 2	MLD Band 1	MLD Band 2	SLD Band 1	SLD Band 2	SLD Band 1	SLD Band 2	SLD Band 1	SLD Band 2

***Class-based:***

Teaching ratio:	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6
Non-Teaching support (1):	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.10	1.7	1.10	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.5
Non-Teaching support (2):	1.14	1.10	1.14	1.10	na	1.15	na	1.15	1.14	1.10	1.14	1.10	1.14	1.10

***Additional Staff:***

Care Staff	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lunchtime Support	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6

<b><i>Adult : Pupil Class ratios</i></b>	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2
	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio	Equates to Adult : Pupil ratio
	1 : 2.8	1 : 2.3	1 : 2.8	1 : 2.3	1 : 5	1 : 3.1	1 : 5	1 : 3.1	1 : 2.8	1 : 2.1	1 : 2.8	1 : 2.1	1 : 2.8	1 : 2.1

***In addition to the "class based" & "additional" staffing, the resource model funds for the following fixed and operational costs:***

- Head teacher
- Deputy Headteacher
- Non classed based HLTA
- Finance & Admin Staff
- Other staff costs - cover teaching & non teaching
- Professional Development & PPA cover
- Administration/Office Costs
- Free School Meals
- Learning Resources
- Professional Services - typical expected
- Cleaning & Caretaking
- Routine Maintenance - site & grounds & other premise type costs
- Utilities
- New Delegations - Contingency, Library, Behaviour support, FSM, Staff Cover, Insurance
- Swimming Pool - SLD only

## High Needs Review - Special Schools Funding model - resource values from 2013 Special Schools Funding Review; Current 2016-17

### Resource values; 2017-18 Rebased Matrix

[illegible]