

SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM

SUBJECT:	2017-18 Dedicated Schools Grant
AUTHORS:	Simon Pleace, Revenue Finance Manager
DATE:	9 December 2016
SUMMARY OF REPORT: To provide Forum members with update / details of the 2017-18 Schools Budget setting process and general funding arrangements; and To seek Forum views on the options available to the Local Authority (LA) in relation to constructing the 2017-18 Schools' Budget and balancing to the available financial resources.	
FOR:	Approval, Comment and Information

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In July 2016, the Secretary of State announced a delay to the introduction of the National Funding Formula until 2018-19 at the earliest. This means that in 2017-18 financial year schools will continue to be funded through the local formula set by their local authority, and LAs will continue to receive their Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Schools Block allocations based on the current methodology (no. of pupils x guaranteed unit of funding rate).
- 1.2 The DSG will therefore continue to be allocated on a 0% cash settlement basis and 2017-18 will be the seventh consecutive year of flat cash. In addition the following measures/controls have been confirmed:
- DSG allocated in three notional blocks (Early Years, Schools and High Needs);
 - A new early years national funding formula (EYNFF) to be implemented from 1 April 2017 (subject to consultation outcomes due shortly);
 - 2017-18 allocations re-aligned to 2016-17 baseline exercise figures as reported to the Forum on 16 September;
 - No reduction to the 2016-17 adjusted baseline figures for schools (per pupil funding) and high needs (cash amount) in 2017-18; and
 - Minimum funding guarantee (MFG) protection will continue to be applied to schools delegated budgets ensuring no school will face a funding reduction of more than 1.5% per pupil next year in funding levels distributed via the local funding formula model.

2. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) blocks

- 2.1 The 2017-18 DSG allocations will be confirmed later this month. At this stage the LA is estimating to receive the following allocations:

Table 1

	Schools £m	High Needs £m	Early Years £m	Total £m
2016-17 Baseline	825.0	186.1	60.2	1,071.3
Pupil growth	14.8	3.0		17.8
Transfer in of former ESG	3.4			3.4
Revised Total	843.2	189.1	60.2	1,092.5

Note: Early Years totals exclude 2 year olds and 30 hours for 3&4 year olds

- 2.2 The LA retains the right to re-distribute funding across the three notional funding blocks to ensure funding is allocated effectively and efficiently to meet all the required needs.
- 2.3 This report will outline below (sections 3-12) the initial plans of the LA on how the total DSG funding available will be distributed and will seek Forum members' agreement and views on the options available prior to finalising the 2017-18 Total Schools Budget.

3. Schools Block

- 3.1 The schools block of funding will continue to be allocated to LAs on the current guaranteed unit of funding (GUF) basis and following the completion of the 2016-17 baseline exercise of DSG allocations to local authorities provides us with a 2017-18 GUF of £4,232 per pupil. This is before any adjustments for the inclusion of Education Services Grant (ESG).
- 3.2 The 2017-18 schools block of funding will be determined by the final pupil numbers as recorded on the October 2016 school census. Current LA estimates provide for an estimate of 201,106 pupils (an increase of 3,486 on last year) and provides a funding level of £839.8m (which includes £14.8m additional income) as per the table provided at section 2.1 above.
- 3.3 The LA is statutory required by regulations to adhere to the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) protection afforded to schools delegated budgets and this is set nationally at -1.5% per pupil in 2017-18.
- 3.4 The LA however does have options available as to what level of the available "headroom" is allocated via the local funding formula and what is released to meet other cost pressure areas (e.g. high needs). This issue is discussed in more detail later in this paper.

4. Changes to the IDACI bandings (Deprivation factor)

- 4.1 The income deprivation affecting children Index (IDACI) dataset is updated every five years by the Department for Communities and Local Government. The most recent update to the dataset, which took effect in local authorities' 2016-2017 schools block dataset in December 2015, showed a markedly different distribution to the previous 2010 dataset.
- 4.2 The DfE have now recognised that the 2015 data update created unexpected and unhelpful turbulence in budgets, towards the latter stages of the local formula-setting process.
- 4.3 The DfE have considered the concerns raised by local authorities and views expressed through the first stage national funding formula consultation, and have decided to update the IDACI banding methodology to return the IDACI bands to a roughly similar size (in terms of the proportion of pupils in each band) as in 2015 to 2016.
- 4.4 Attached at appendix 1 is a table comparing the current distribution of funding across the bandings to the re-banded dataset. You will see that we currently distribute nearly £34m through our deprivation factor using the IDACI dataset. If we leave the funding rates for each band the same as 2016-17, we will have a budget pressure of £1.6m. We can avoid this pressure by small adjustments to the banding funding rates so that we continue to distribute the same pot of funding for deprivation.
- 4.5 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to amend the funding rates for each band, in line with the model at appendix 1, to avoid a budget pressure of £1.6m.

5. Pupil Growth

- 5.1 The LA is required to agree its Growth Policy annually with the Forum. The 2016-17 policy was agreed on 20 November 2015 and the policy is supported with a retained DSG budget of £5m. The policy's purpose is to confirm when additional funding is paid to schools to meet rising pupil numbers. In 2016-17 we are experiencing unprecedented levels of demand and this has meant that the forecast spend has exceed the budget by over £2m.
- 5.2 We have undertaken an exercise to look at 2017-18 requirements and can see no signs of the current level of demand reducing. We therefore need to review the level of budget retained for pupil growth and it is my recommendation that this should be increased by £2.5m from 2017-18.
- 5.3 Attached at appendix 2 is an analysis by area of the current years and next year's forecast for growth spend in accordance with the policy.
- 5.4 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to increase the value of the growth fund from £5m to £7.5m from 1 April 2017 which it proposes to fund from schools block headroom.

6. Rates

- 6.1 The Valuation Office Agency (VOA) currently re-assess all rateable values in England and Wales every five years to reflect changes in the property market (2010 and 2017 postponed from 2015). Rateable values in the 2017 rating list will be used by local councils to calculate business rates bills from 1 April 2017.
- 6.2 Many schools in Kent will see modest increases in their rateable values between the 2010 and 2017 rating lists. Although the government will reduce the tax rate (known as the multiplier) so that revaluation does not raise extra revenue for the Exchequer, schools will still face modest increases in their overall business rate bills from April 2017.
- 6.3 We currently fully fund school rates bills. Our estimate of the unavoidable pressure following this re-assessment of rateable values is around £800k.
- 6.4 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to increase the value of the rates funding pot by £800k from 1 April 2017 which it proposes to fund from schools block headroom.

7. Rentals

- 7.1 The Council is looking to include an exceptional premises factor in the Kent local funding formula for schools from 1 April 2017. This factor would provide additional funding to schools that are required to rent premises or land to deliver the curriculum.
- 7.2 Prior to 2013-14, Kent's local funding formula for schools included a rental factor. Following the Schools' Funding Reform changes in 2013, the rental factor was removed by the Department for Education (DfE) as an allowable factor. Following feedback from schools and local authorities, the DfE have amended their guidance and now allow LAs to submit an annual application to have an exceptional premises factor.
- 7.3 The DfE have also added some additional criteria, stating that school rentals can only be considered if their value is greater than 1% of a schools budget and, in total, the number of schools in receipt of rental funding does not exceed 5% of the schools in a LA area.
- 7.4 The Education Funding Agency (EFA) deadline for submitting an application to introduce such a factor for the 2017-18 financial year was the 30 November. The LA has submitted an application but made it clear to the EFA that the Forum has not yet consider this proposal.
- 7.5 Attached at Appendix 3 is a list of schools that have a rental which meets the DfE criteria. The LA is currently funding the costs of these rentals from a one-off funding source. This is unsustainable and a permanent funding source needs to be identified. Please note that this list may not be complete as some schools may meet the eligibility criteria but be paying the rental from their school budget.

7.6 Looking forward to the introduction of a National Funding Formula (NFF) we are keen to ensure that Kent schools' share of the national pot is maximised. Although we don't have the details of what a NFF might look like, this year may be our one and only opportunity to introduce a new factor before greater restrictions are imposed. As the value of this commitment is relatively small we are recommending to the Forum that they support this request.

7.7 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to introduce an exceptional premises factor (rentals) from 1 April 2017 at an estimated cost of £0.2m which it proposes to fund from schools block headroom.

8. Private Finance Initiative

8.1 The costs of the three school PFI schemes are uplifted annually in accordance with the RPIX government inflationary index. Whilst we were able to absorb last year's increase, due to the fact that RPIX was relatively low, this is not going to be possible in 2017-18. This is because RPIX has steadily increased over the last six months or so and is now around the 2% level. Our estimate of a 2% increase is £300k.

8.2 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to increase the PFI factor by £0.3m from 1 April 2017 in recognition of the unavoidable contractual price increase which it proposes to fund from schools block headroom.

9. Education Services Grant

9.1 As outlined in the 2017-18 funding update report provided to Forum members at the meeting held 16 September 2016, the Education Services Grant (ESG) retained duties element of funding will be transferred into the DSG Schools block allocation from 1 April 2017.

9.2 The DfE have published indicative schools block allocation for 2017-18 and we can see that our allocation has increased by £15 per pupil (c. £3.4m). Retained element refers to the statutory duties that the LA has over all pupils within its area, regardless of whether they attend a maintained school or an academy.

9.3 This funding is used to pay for the statutory elements of the following core services:

- SEN
- Education Psychology
- Planning of places
- Safeguarding

9.4 Further information is still expected from DfE as to the specific roles and responsibilities of the LA linked to the decision to not proceed with the Education White Paper / Education Act proposed earlier this year and the

plans to remove the ESG general funding from local authorities and academies from 2017-18.

- 9.5 The LA is seeking the Forums approval to centrally retain this new DSG funding and continue spending it on the statutory services that it has to provide.

10.0 High Needs

- 10.1 The high needs block (HNB) for 2017-18 will be protected at the 2016-17 cash level as per the ministerial announcement by the Education Secretary in July 2016.
- 10.2 It is our assumption that some additional funding will be added to our high needs block for 2017-18 to reflect the increasing demand for SEND provision/support, which continues to increase locally above the rate of the general pupil population growth. Any additional national funding to be distributed to local authorities will not be confirmed until the December 2016 DSG allocations are released.
- 10.3 The position of increased SEND demand for local provision, local SEND capacity and increase in numbers of general high needs support continues to create cost pressures for the LA to manage in 2017-18. We are aware from speaking to other Local Authorities that this is not just a Kent issue, it's a national issue. Appendix 4 provides details of the LAs best estimate of the number of High Needs pupils in each type of provision for 2017-18 compared to previous years. Appendix 5 provides the LAs best estimate of the associated costs of these pupils. The table below provides a calculation of the pressure that the LA is facing in 2017-18:

Table 2

	£m
Estimated total budget requirement for 2017-18	150.9
Current level of budget on High Needs	142.1
Shortfall	8.8

11.0 Early Years

- 11.1 The DfE launched formal consultation in August 2016 relating to the introduction of the new EYNFF to be implemented from 1 April 2017 and details of this matter was presented to Forum members at the last meeting held on 16 September 2016.
- 11.2 The Governments response to the above consultation is still awaited at the point of preparing this report, however it is envisaged the EYNFF will be

implemented from 1 April 2017 largely due to the introduction of the extended 30hours offer from September 2017.

- 11.3 The LA has established an Early Years National Funding Formula working group which includes some Forum members. In the absence of a decision document, the group have focused their efforts on the consultation and specifically the supplements that are optional. The group have considered how eligibility might be defined and whether the supplement should be specific to the setting or the child.
- 11.4 The DfE published their response to the consultation on 1 December. The LA intends to update Forum members at the meeting with a detailed appraisal of the implications for the Council and its Early Years providers.

12.0 Summary

- 12.1 We have a number of budget pressures in 2017-18, most of which are unavoidable. These pressures are predominately being experienced through:
- growth in our mainstream pupil populations requiring support in opening up new classrooms and schools, and
 - continued growth in high needs pupil numbers.
- 12.2 A summary of these pressures and our options for dealing with them are set out in the table below:

Table 3

	£m
Pressures – Schools Block	
Growth Policy – Expanding schools	2.5
Rates	0.8
Rentals	0.2
PFI	0.3
Pressures – High Needs	
See table 2 above	at least 8.8
TOTAL PRESSURES	12.6
Options to meet pressures	
1) Headroom in schools block (from additional pupils)	3.5 to 4.0
2) Additional funding in High Needs block (per capita share of national increase)	3.0
3) Review the payment of notional SEN top up payments	up to 2.0
4) Transfer further funding from schools prior	up to 5.0

attainment in recognition of high costs (reduction weighted to primary schools)	
5) Reduce Mainstream High Needs (£6k process) payments to schools: a. Targeted reduction to those schools who have more than 10 High Needs pupils b. General reduction to all schools of approx. 20%	up to 5.0
TOTAL OPTIONS	6.5 – 19.0

12.3 Option 3: Notional SEN Top-Up

12.4 The LA currently holds a budget of £4m which it uses to provide a school with a top up to their notional SEN budget. It uses this money to avoid a disproportionate impact on those schools that have a high number of High Needs Pupils compared to their notional SEN funding.

12.5 Notional SEN top up funding is calculated using two separate thresholds. The first threshold relates to the amount of your notional SEN budget that a school would be expected to contribute towards a HNP. This is currently set at 3% and is best illustrated through a simple example.

Example – A small primary school with a notional SEN budget of £10,000, with a High Needs pupil that has additional need costing £12,000.

Starting expectation is that the school is expected to pay the first £6,000 (E2) from its notional SEN budget and LA will pay top up funding E3 of £6,000 to the school.

School will only contribute 3% of notional SEN budget towards E2 (£6,000), $3\% \times £10,000 = £300$. School will be funded £5,700 through the Notional SEN top up and £6,000 E3 top up, making £11,700 in total towards the cost of supporting the pupil.

12.6 In addition to the 3% threshold, there is a further threshold applied which guarantees that no school will contribute more than 20% of its total notional SEN funding towards HNPs. Again this can be illustrated through an example.

Example - A school that has notional SEN funding of £210,000 and has 8 HNPs

The schools contribution per pupil towards the £6,000 is, $3\% \times £210,000 = £6,300$. Therefore, the school will pay the maximum of £6,000 per pupil.

20% threshold = £210,000 X 20% = £42,000. School will not pay more than £42,000 in total towards additional cost of High Needs pupils in the school.

Therefore, E2 contribution for 8 pupils = 8 X £6,000 = £48,000. School will receive notional SEN top up of £6,000 (£48,000 - £42,000).

- 12.7 In summary the 3% threshold aims to protect schools where they have low notional SEN budgets and the 20% threshold aims to provide protection where a school has a high number high needs pupils.

Raising the Notional SEN % Thresholds

- 12.8 After undertaking extensive modelling by adjusting the thresholds, we estimate that we can reduce the overall notional SEN cost of £4m to £2m, making a £2m saving. We would do this by increasing the phase 1 threshold from 3% to 10% and the phase 2 threshold from 20% to 30%.
- 12.9 By setting a 3% threshold it allows schools with a notional SEN budget of just under £200,000 to receive some element of notional SEN top up funding. Upon reflection this seems too generous and our expectation is that a school with such a high level of notional SEN funding should not require any top-up. By increasing the threshold to 10% it is felt that this would better target top up funding to schools with low or modest notional SEN budgets.
- 12.10 The illustration detailed on appendix 6 provides details of the impact on a schools notional SEN top funding. Focusing on increasing the phase 1 threshold from 3% to 10% you can see the following results.
- A school with a notional SEN budget of £20,000 would currently receive top up of £5,400, by increasing the threshold to 10% the top up would reduce to £4,000 a reduction of £1,400.
 - A school with a notional SEN budget of £100,000 would currently receive top up of £3,000, by increasing the threshold to 10% the top up would reduce to £0 a reduction of £3,000.
- 12.11 Two factors influence the triggering of the 20% threshold. The factors are size of notional SEN budget and number of pupils. The phase 2 illustration on appendix 2 provides details of the impact on a schools notional SEN top funding.
- A school with a notional SEN budget of £20,000 and 12 HNPs would currently receive top up of £3,200. By increasing the threshold to 30% the top up would reduce to £1,200 a reduction of £2,000.
 - A school with a notional SEN budget of £100,000 and 12 HNPs would currently receive top up of £32,000. By increasing the threshold to 30% the top up would reduce to £12,000 a reduction of £20,000.

12.12 Option 4: Reduce Prior Attainment rates

- 12.13 When the LA introduced the process for High Needs pupils in mainstream schools in April 2015, Forum members will recall that £10m was transferred from school budgets (via a reduction to the prior attainment factor rates) to add to the £8m the LA was already holding for the previous Individually Assigned Resources process (statement of +25 hours). This transfer was excluded from the MFG calculation as it was accepted that this was a transfer of responsibility from a school to a LA to fund. The LA was clear when this new process was introduced that if costs exceeded the available funding (£18m in total) then one option would be to transfer further funding from school budgets to meet these costs.
- 12.14 Based on the current year's expenditure and our best estimate of 2017-18 demand, a shortfall of £4.3m is estimated for 2017-18 (as shown on appendix 5 (£22.4 less £18.0m)). However there is a risk that demand will exceed this projection and therefore if the Forum is supportive of this option a transfer of up to £5m would be recommended. Based on current payment profile between each phase of education, it would seem unfair to transfer any further funding from secondary schools as the applications to date have predominately been received from primary schools. If this option is considered, the impact on the funding rates are shown in table 4 below.

Table 4

Current Prior Attainment funding rate - Primary				£729	
Options	Impact on funding rate	% reduction to PA rate	% reduction to notional SEN	% reduction to school budget	Impact £ per school (average)
Transfer £1m	£693	5%	2%	0.3%	£2,193
Transfer £2m	£658	10%	4%	0.5%	£4,386
Transfer £3m	£622	15%	6%	0.8%	£6,579
Transfer £4m	£586	20%	8%	1.0%	£8,772
Transfer £5m	£551	25%	10%	1.3%	£10,965

(figures are subject to rounding)

- 12.15 The LA is seeking the Forums view on whether any funding should be transferred from primary school prior attainment funding to meet the pressure on the High Needs mainstream budget.
- 12.16 **Option 5: Reduce payments to schools for successful High Needs funding applications**
- 12.17 Targeted reduction – we could consider introducing a change to the operation of our HNP process whereby we make a targeted reduction to the amount of E3 top up funding when the number of high needs pupils reach a certain level. The reduction could be stepped to avoid any cliff edges. The

thinking behind this proposal is that a school should be able to realise efficiencies/synergies from having a greater quantity of HNP through sharing of staff and resources.

- 12.18 General reduction – we could consider introducing a change to the operation of our process whereby we make a general reduction to the amount of E3 top up funding we provide each school. As the current level of overspend on the High Needs mainstream budget is c.£5m we would need to reduce the top up funding we pay by approx. 20%.
- 12.19 The LA is seeking the Forums view on whether the LA should reduce HNP payments to schools (targeted or general) to achieve a balanced budget from 1 April 2017.

13 Recommendation

13.1 Members of the Forum are asked to:

- a) **Approve** the amendment of the funding rates for the IDACI bands to avoid a £1.6m budget pressure (as outlined in [section 4](#)).
- b) **Approve** the transfer of £2.5m from schools block headroom to the Pupil Growth budget (as outlined in [section 5](#)).
- c) **Approve** the use of £0.8m from schools block headroom to meet the additional costs of rates (as outlined in [section 6](#)).
- d) **Approve** the introduction of an exceptional premises factor from 1 April 2017 for Rentals at an estimated cost of £0.2m (as outlined in [section 7](#)).
- e) **Approve** the use of £0.3m from schools block headroom to meet the PFI affordability gap indexation cost (as outlined in [section 8](#)).
- f) **Approve** the transfer of the retained duties element of DSG funding, at £15 per pupil, to the centrally retained DSG budget (as outlined in [section 9](#)).
- g) **Comment** on the remaining options for meeting the 2017-18 DSG budget pressures as set out in [section 10](#) and [section 12](#). Specifically whether the LA should:
 - a. Use any (if available) spare schools block headroom (beyond £3.8m) to contribute towards the High Needs block
 - b. Adjust the notional SEN top up thresholds, as outlined in [section 12.3](#) to save £2m
 - c. Transfer up to £5m from Primary School Prior Attainment factor, as outlined in [section 12.12](#)
 - d. Reduce High Needs top up payments as outlined in [section 12.16](#)
- h) **Note** the latest position on
 - a. Early Years NFF as outlined in [section 11](#)

Background Papers

[Minutes of the Schools' Funding Forum 20 November 2015](#)

Distribution of Income Deprivation Affecting Childrens Index (IDACI)

Current distribution			Distribution using new IDACI distribution and same rates				Distribution using new IDACI distribution and revised rates		
Banding	No of pupils	Cost	New Banding	No of pupils	Cost	Total movement	No of pupils	Cost	Total movement
Band 1	22,288	£9,517,351	Band F	22,272	£9,510,455		22,272	£9,415,350	
Band 2	14,861	£6,662,904	Band E	14,853	£6,659,529		14,853	£6,592,933	
Band 3	20,501	£9,868,536	Band D	10,108	£4,871,115		10,108	£4,710,263	
Band 4	11,211	£5,932,071	Band C	10,444	£5,510,249		10,444	£5,086,099	
Band 5	3,381	£1,966,719	Band B	11,186	£6,510,922		11,186	£5,873,147	
Band 6	0	£0	Band A	3,379	£2,457,012		3,379	£2,304,983	
Total	72,242	£33,947,580		72,242	£35,519,280	£1,571,700	72,242	33,982,775	35,195

		(£)
Winners	£1,584,591	
Losers	£12,891	
	£1,571,700	

	(£)	No of schools	Range	
			Min	Max
Winners	£281,860	94	£1	£29,224
Losers	£246,665	450	-£1	-£6,078
	£35,195			

Growth Funding Forecast Spend 2016-17

Area	Primary Schools		Secondary Schools		Total cost
	No of schools	Cost (£)	No of schools	Cost (£)	
East	37	£2,435,228	3	£237,962	£2,673,190
North	46	£1,862,216	10	£831,165	£2,693,381
South	18	£950,459	0	£0	£950,459
West	25	£1,303,691	6	£470,567	£1,774,258
Total	126	£6,551,595	19	£1,539,694	£8,091,289

Less EFA contribution Academies April to August

-£740,893

Total

£7,350,395

Growth Funding Forecast Spend 2017-18

Area	Primary Schools		Secondary Schools		Total cost
	No of schools	Cost (£)	No of schools	Cost (£)	
East	27	£2,026,311	3	£327,972	£2,354,283
North	32	£1,594,710	10	£707,373	£2,302,083
South	13	£568,251	0	£0	£568,251
West	10	£840,847	4	£464,230	£1,305,078
Total	82	£5,030,120	17	£1,499,575	£6,529,695

Estimated additional growth in 2017-18

£1,711,198

Less EFA contribution Academies April to August

-£740,893

Total

£7,500,000

School Rentals in Kent 2016-17

DfE	School	Total Rentals 2016-17	2016-17 School Budget Share	% of budget
2622	Murston Infants	£17,750	£635,640	2.8%
3022	Benenden CEP	£15,101	£567,778	2.7%
3053	St Peter's CEP T/Wells	£7,250	£540,086	1.3%
3054	Crockham Hill CEP School	£22,450	£543,497	4.1%
3057	St Peter's Aylesford	£28,560	£593,506	4.8%
3138	Chilham St Mary's CEP	£8,400	£436,624	1.9%
3150	St Peter's CEP Folkestone	£27,480	£523,146	5.3%
3330	Bredgar CEP School	£7,560	£441,210	1.7%
Total		£134,551		

High Needs Numbers - By Institution

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Latest forecast	Latest forecast
Special Schools	3,272	3,349	3,572	3,688	3,733
Resource Provision	804	810	874	859	900
Mainstream Schools	802	860	1,475	1,916	2,129
Independent - pre 16	458	491	521	533	533
Independent - post 16	87	71	64	52	52
Independent	545	562	585	585	585
OLA Maintained	95	103	87	108	108
FE Colleges	467	570	636	845	845
SPI and CCP				55	141
TOTALS	5,985	6,254	7,229	8,001	8,299

Cost of High Needs (£'000) - By Institution Type

	2013-14 £'000 Actual	2014-15 £'000 Actual	2015-16 £'000 Actual	2016-17 £'000 Forecast	2017-18 £'000 Forecast
Special Schools	67,048	68,543	68,118	70,326	71,093
Resource Provision	13,118	14,919	15,274	15,938	15,658
Mainstream Schools	8,755	8,899	14,398	20,808	22,344
Independent - pre 16	17,581	19,840	22,588	23,661	23,661
Independent - post 16	6,000	5,359	4,281	4,665	4,665
Independent	23,581	25,199	26,869	28,326	28,326
OLA Maintained	2,295	2,531	2,661	3,247	3,948
FE Colleges SPI and CCP	4,229	4,980	6,867	8,332 366	8,425 1,123
TOTALS	119,026	125,071	134,186	147,342	150,916
Increase from previous year		6,045	9,115	13,156	3,575
% increase from previous year		5.1%	7.3%	9.8%	2.4%

Notional SEN Examples

Phase 1 - threshold per HNP

Notional SEN Budget	Initial cost to school per pupil	CURRENT		PROPOSED		Movement
		Schools contribution 3% of notional SEN budget	Notional SEN top up	Schools contribution 10% of notional SEN budget	Notional SEN top up	
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

£20,000	£6,000	£600	£5,400	£2,000	£4,000	-£1,400
£50,000	£6,000	£1,500	£4,500	£5,000	£1,000	-£3,500
£100,000	£6,000	£3,000	£3,000	£10,000	£0	-£3,000
£200,000	£6,000	£6,000	£0	£20,000	£0	£0

Phase 2 - maximum cost to notional SEN budget

Notional SEN Budget	No of HNPs	contribution from school to £6,000 - phase 1 col C	Total contribution from school to £6,000 - phase col C	CURRENT		PROPOSED		Movement
				20% threshold	Amount reimbursed to school	30 % threshold	Amount reimbursed to school	
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
			= (B X C)	= (A X 20%)	= (D - E)	=(A X 30%)	= (D - G)	= (H - F)

£20,000	12	£600	£7,200	£4,000	£3,200	£6,000	£1,200	-£2,000
£50,000	12	£1,500	£18,000	£10,000	£8,000	£15,000	£3,000	-£5,000
£100,000	12	£3,000	£36,000	£20,000	£16,000	£30,000	£6,000	-£10,000
£200,000	12	£6,000	£72,000	£40,000	£32,000	£60,000	£12,000	-£20,000

