

**DRAFT MINUTES- MEETING OF THE SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM (SFF)**

**8:00 – 11:00, 8 July 2016**

<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Update on the progress of implementing the £6k high needs threshold</b></p> <p>Patrick Leeson (PL) provided an introduction to this item, then Louise Langley (LL) gave a presentation that provided an update on the £6k process from an SEN perspective and Ian Hamilton (IH) presented a report on the financial aspects of the £6k process.</p> <p>a) From an SEN perspective <a href="#">(link to presentation)</a></p> <p>Member of the SFF raised the following points;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slide four from the presentation illustrated the number of High Needs Pupils (HNP) in each year group. It was clear from this slide that there was a significant drop off in the number of HNPs between year six and year seven, the move from Primary to Secondary phase of education. <a href="#">Members of the SFF requested that an analysis detailing the reason for the noticeable change in numbers.</a></li> <li>It was recognised that a mandatory requirement to access high needs funding was having an impact on secondary school applications. The mandatory requirement classified groups of more than four pupils to one teaching assistant as not being high needs. As the secondary school curriculum was not structured to deliver provision in a way that supported small groups of four pupils to one teaching assistant it reduced the likelihood of applications meeting the £6,000 threshold. <a href="#">In light of this SEN Officers were requested to review the process to ensure that this difference did not unfairly penalise secondary schools.</a></li> <li>Was there any evidence that the improved targeting of funding under the new system, was actually improving the education outcomes for the High Needs Pupil (HNP). <a href="#">SEN Officers were requested to provide analysis to demonstrate whether this was the case.</a></li> <li>Under the old High Needs Funding system, funding was allocated at one of the four rates dependent on the need type of the pupil. One benefit of the new system is that the funding more closely reflects the actual additional needs of the pupil. This is due to an individual costed application for each pupil and also that it is reviewed annually. An expectation of this new system was that the additional support would tail off over time. <a href="#">SEN Officers were requested to provide analysis to demonstrate whether this assumption was holding true and subsequent applications were of a reducing value.</a></li> </ol>	<p>Julie Ely and Louise Langley</p> <p>Julie Ely and Louise Langley</p> <p>Julie Ely and Louise Langley</p> <p>Julie Ely and Louise Langley</p>
-----------	--	---

	<p>5 A welcome outcome of the new system was that 70% of new applications were agreed where pupils did not have Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs). The 70% statistic is not in line with the general trend where numbers of EHCPs are increasing. One possible reason why the 70% does not reflect the wider issuing of EHCPs is that the new process identifies the additional SEN need of a pupil at an earlier stage, however long term applications for an EHCP will still be made. <a href="#">SEN Officers were requested by the SFF to monitor whether, over time, the agreed applications without an EHCP are at some point in the future accessed an EHCP.</a></p> <p>6 From a Finance Perspective (<a href="#">link to paper</a>)</p> <p>IH presented this item to the SFF. The main point to note was that based on 1,714 HNPs the forecast for the year was £17.255 m. This meant there was only a remaining budget of £0.788m a relatively small increase in numbers around 70 would mean that the full budget had been utilised. The concern was therefore if the budget was exceeded, how would this pressure be funded in the future.</p> <p><a href="#">Members of the SFF requested that a further update be provided at its meeting on the 9 December.</a></p>	<p>Julie Ely , Louise Langley and Ian Hamilton</p>
--	---	--