

Funding for pupils with SEN in mainstream schools

Please refer to paragraphs 3.1 - 3.4 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Mainstream schools educate the majority of children with SEN, using funds from their annual budget share (in the case of local authority maintained schools) or annual grant (in the case of academies). When developing the funding formula for mainstream schools, local authorities must ensure that funding is provided to enable schools to meet additional needs of their pupils, including those with SEN and who are disabled.

Funding for SEN through the schools funding formula

Local authorities use additional needs factors in their local funding formulae. The new national funding formula also includes factors to reflect the additional needs of a school's cohort, including deprivation factors such as children from families eligible for free school meals and the attainment of pupils in the prior phase of their education (known as low prior attainment).

We don't use measures relating directly to schools' or local authorities' assessments of pupils with SEN, as these would provide a perverse incentive to over-identify pupils as having SEN.

The following questions seek views on whether the schools funding formula, at both national and local level, could be improved to make sure that schools are receiving the funds they need to provide SEN support.

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.

- Age-weighted pupil unit of funding -- Please Select -- 5
- Low prior attainment† -- Please Select -- 3
- IDACI†† – a measure of area deprivation -- Please Select -- 2
- Eligibility for free school meals – a measure of deprivation relating to individual children -- Please Select -- 1
- Mobility – additional funding for schools that have a high proportion of pupils who start at a school mid-year -- Please Select -- 4
- Standard lump sum – intended to reflect fixed costs of a school, however many pupils and teachers are required -- Please Select -- 6
- Other (please add below any other factors you think are important for ensuring that schools get an annual budget that enables them to provide appropriate SEN support) -- Please Select -- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Further comments

We have no evidence to suggest the current factors and the funding basis are incorrect, likewise that they are correct. The main problem is the level of funding within the system and in particular the formula recognizing the support needed for young adults, aged 19-25.

We believe Nursery Schools and early years providers are disadvantaged by the current system and need particular recognition in any revised methodology to cope with needs before a child has an EHCP.

Funding for SEN through the schools funding formula

Please refer to paragraphs 3.5 - 3.12 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Low prior attainment is an important proxy measure that gives an indication of the number of pupils in a school who have achieved a low level of attainment in their previous phase of education. This has been used in local funding formulae, alongside deprivation measures, for a number of years, particularly as a proxy for the number of pupils with SEN. However, we recognise that prior attainment as a funding factor for SEN has limitations, and will not capture all pupils with SEN.

Nevertheless, we are exploring whether tiering this factor (introducing more than one level of prior attainment to differentiate between those who narrowly missed the standard or were at the bottom of their cohort) might improve our targeting of funding to those with the highest level of need. We would welcome views on this. Any specific proposals for changing this factor in future would be subject to further consultation.

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?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

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?

Comments

We do have a number of children who are cognitively able but have a range of other difficulties. For example, some children with ASD/SEMH are high functioning in some areas but their social and emotional needs are very high and it's the behaviours they exhibit that are the main barrier to their learning not actually their cognition. They are often excluded from school and end up costing us lots of money in OB schools. So, the lowest attainers are not actually the neediest children.

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

Comments

It could reward failing schools . The biggest affect on children with SEND is poverty. So, we believe a form of weighting on FSM and IDACI is best.

Targeted funding and support for SEN provision in schools

Please refer to paragraphs 3.13 - 3.18 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Many local authorities make available to mainstream schools additional funding from their high needs budget, to support schools who have more pupils with SEN than the local formula may suggest. Local authorities have budgeted to spend £57 million on this in 2018-19.

We would like to gather views on whether the targeting of extra SEN funding to specific mainstream schools, to take into account their particular cohort of pupils with SEN or disabilities, should be more standardised.

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.

Agree, Disagree , Neither agree nor disagree

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.

- 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. Agree
- 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. Disagree
- 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. Neither agree nor disagree

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 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. Agree
- 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. Disagree
- 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. Neither agree nor disagree

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.

- 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. Agree
- 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. Disagree

- 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. Neither agree nor disagree

Comments

Local flexibility allows local authorities working with their Schools Forum to target funding appropriately rather than national stipulation which will not meet all needs

Notional SEN Budget

Please refer to paragraphs 3.19 - 3.24 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

For the last 20 years or so, mainstream schools' funding has included the identification of a notional SEN budget that is intended to indicate an approximate amount within the school's overall funding for meeting the costs of the provision for supporting children with SEN (notionally up to £6,000 per pupil).

Some have questioned how meaningful this is for schools, particularly given the range of different approaches local authorities take in calculating the notional SEN budget, and because it is notional and not widely understood, and also taking into account the extent to which schools feel their overall budgets are stretched. Others argue that it is important to have an amount identified so that funding intended for pupils with SEN is not spent on other provision. Currently information about schools' notional SEN budgets is published.

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?

- Very helpful
- Somewhat helpful
- Neither helpful nor unhelpful
- Somewhat unhelpful
- Very unhelpful

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

Other (please comment)

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?

- Yes**
- No
- Not Sure

Do you have any further comments on the notional SEN budget?

There is currently no national guidance and there are significant differences between individual local authorities that seem hard to justify. Schools often feel very troubled about how to find the first £6K from the notional budget for all pupils with plans and make provision for all the other children. Maybe there should be a notional SEND amount for SEND support pupils only and a set amount for each child with a plan that we then pay a top up A bit like the RB £6K base.

The £6,000 threshold

Please refer to paragraphs 3.25 - 3.34 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions. From 2013-14 the school and high needs funding system was changed to bring in a more consistent approach. Local authorities were required to provide schools with sufficient resources through the formula to meet the costs of their pupils' additional SEN support up to £6,000. Schools could access high needs top-up funding for the costs of support in excess of this common threshold. In this way schools would have the resources to meet the costs of supporting those with lower level needs, and – through the top-up funding – the excess costs of those with more complex needs.

The arrangements from 2013 were intended to reduce the perverse incentive for schools in some areas to argue for increased costs of support so that they would have the full costs met. The introduction of the £6,000 threshold was also intended to encourage schools to meet lower level SEN without the need to “label” pupils as having SEN either to receive additional funding from the local authority or to drive placement decisions.

We have heard from schools about their increasing difficulties in meeting the costs of SEN support up to £6,000. We recognise that costs have risen since 2013. We want to know whether the difficulties that schools have brought to our attention are simply a reflection of a shortage of funding to meet those costs, or whether the level or operation of the £6,000 threshold needs to be reviewed.

We are therefore keen to hear views on whether the threshold should be altered. Changing the threshold for top-up funding within the current system would mean changes in the distribution of funding between schools funding and high needs funding through the national funding formula and consequent changes in the expectations we would have on the special provision made by schools and local authorities respectively. It is clear, therefore, that we would need to approach any change very carefully, with a clear understanding of the impact, and on how any adverse impact could be avoided.

- A lower threshold would imply schools making a lower level of provision for pupils with SEN before accessing top-up funding from the local authority, but would therefore require more funding from local authorities' high needs budgets. It has been argued that this would encourage schools to make more provision available for children with SEN because they would be able to access additional resources more readily, and that this would ultimately reduce the demand for special school places.

- A higher threshold would imply schools making more provision for pupils with SEN from their budgets, requiring a higher level of funding allocated through the schools funding formula (and in particular the additional needs factors), before accessing top-up funding. Some think this would be beneficial because it would not only give schools greater control over the available resources, but also reduce the demand on local authorities' high needs budgets, and possibly reduce the requests for education, health and care needs assessments where these might be sought primarily for financial reasons.

We are also keen to understand whether schools in particular circumstances are finding the £6,000 threshold more difficult to operate than others. If there are this could mean either changes to the operation of the threshold, or changes to the way that local authorities target funding from their high needs budgets.

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

Agree , Not Sure , Disagree

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 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.
Agree
- 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.
Not Sure
- 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.
Disagree

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.†

- 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.† Agree
- 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.† Not Sure

- 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.† Disagree
- 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 £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.†† Agree
- 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.†† Not Sure
- 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.†† Disagree

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

- The operation of the £6,000 threshold should take account of particular circumstances. Agree
- The operation of the £6,000 threshold should take account of particular circumstances. Not Sure
- The operation of the £6,000 threshold should take account of particular circumstances. Disagree

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.

Yes, Not sure , No

Schools that are relatively small.

- Schools that are relatively small. Yes
- Schools that are relatively small. Not sure
- Schools that are relatively small. No

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

- Schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs† or EHC plans. Yes
- Schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs† or EHC plans. Not sure
- Schools that have a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs† or EHC plans. No

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

- When pupils with EHC plans are admitted to a school during the year, which may create unintended consequences.†† Yes
- When pupils with EHC plans are admitted to a school during the year, which may create unintended consequences.†† Not sure
- When pupils with EHC plans are admitted to a school during the year, which may create unintended consequences.†† No

Other (please specify below)

- Other (please specify below) Yes
- Other (please specify below) Not sure
- Other (please specify below) No

Comments

We do think it would be helpful to agree what schools should be spending on SEND support and how plans are funded. We need more funds for EHCPs and the current system has reduced SEND support resources away from children with lower levels of needs resulting in more schools asking for EHC needs assessments. But unless the level of funding in the High Needs Blocks increases, LAs will continue to struggle. The funding problem is a matter of the level of resources rather than how we distribute it.

Provision for pupils with SEN in mainstream schools

Please refer to paragraphs 3.35 - 3.40 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions. The Children and Families Act requires schools, other providers, and local authorities to co-operate with each other in preparing and publishing the “local offer” of provision and services for children and young people with SEN and disabilities. This must be done working with parents and young people. The local offer should include a description of the SEN support ordinarily available in each school, including primary and secondary mainstream schools, as well as additional services and provision provided by the local authority and other agencies external to the school. In addition, all maintained schools and academies must publish information on their websites about their arrangements for supporting pupils with SEN.

We would like to know more about how well the local offer of special provision is understood and communicated.

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?

- Yes
- No

Comments

12. How is this determined?

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)

If the offer is publicly available, please provide a web link.

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

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

15. How is this articulated?

- Published local offer

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

If this is publicly available, please provide a web link.

Funding for pupils who need alternative provision (AP) or are at risk of exclusion from school

Please refer to paragraphs 4.1 - 4.9 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

Local authorities are responsible for arranging suitable education for children who – because of permanent exclusion, illness or other reasons – would not receive suitable education, without such arrangements being made. Schools arrange AP for pupils through off-site directions to improve their behaviour and for pupils who have been subject to a fixed-period exclusion of more than five school days.

Local authorities are responsible for funding AP they arrange for children who have been permanently excluded from school. Schools usually contribute to or pay the full costs of AP they arrange for pupils who are on their roll. Local authorities can recover funding from schools who permanently exclude a child, but this is rarely the same as the cost of the pupil's subsequent education in AP.

We are interested to gather evidence about whether current high needs funding arrangements empower local authorities, schools and providers to intervene early for children at risk of exclusion from school, provide high quality AP and take collective responsibility for delivering best value from the funding available from the high needs and schools' budgets.

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

Strongly disagree, Somewhat disagree, Neither agree or disagree , Somewhat agree , Strongly agree

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 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
Strongly disagree
- 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
Somewhat disagree
- 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
Neither agree or disagree

- 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
Somewhat agree
- 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
Strongly agree

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

- The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate Strongly disagree
- The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate Somewhat disagree
- The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate Neither agree or disagree
- The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate Somewhat agree
- The current AP funding arrangements help schools and AP to reintegrate children from AP back into mainstream schooling where this is appropriate Strongly agree

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

Enable the full (real) costs of AP placements to be charged to permanently excluding schools.

Permanently excluded pupils remain on the rolls of their original schools and are included in schools' outcomes data unless they are subsequently admitted to mainstream or special provision.

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?

Comments

Provision of high quality AP ; The cost of AP has significantly increased over the last 4 years. Adopting a clear and accountable commissioning framework allows LA to monitor the quality and outcomes of AP with more rigour.

Registered Independent School are particularly expensive, some non registered AP may offer good quality but are not used in favour of RI Schools.

Early Intervention for those at risk of exclusion; LA spend on AP is focussed on pupils who cannot attend school and not early intervention. Additional funds could be used for more creative approaches, for longer periods and younger cohorts.

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.

Comments

In supporting pupils with medical needs back to school, we implemented a Home School /LA agreement which outlines our individual responsibilities in supporting the education of each pupil.

It is requirement that every referred pupil has a clear reintegration plan and a set review date . Each review is attended by, parent, pupil, school the LA, commissioned AP provider and health care professionals. It allows for clear and transparent educational planning at the start of the placement through to reintegration.

Each child has an allocated LA case officer who ensures that the plan is progressed to a set timeline and who also challenges the school, provider, parent and pupils to work together to plan. These officers also gather relevant risk assessment information from partners such as YOS, Health and Social Care.

The result in swifter reintegration, pupils feeling connected with their home school, and schools remaining actively involved.

Funding for students with SEN in further education

Please refer to paragraphs 5.1 - 5.9 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions. We would welcome views from colleges, schools and other providers of post-16 education, as well as from local authorities and organisations representing these providers, on any ways in which the operation of the funding system is acting as a barrier to young people's preparation for adulthood. Evidence from young people and their parents would also be welcome.

► Related Information

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?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Comments

There is just not enough funding for the large group of young people now entitled to access education or training post 19 with an EHCP.

The DSG has been stretched to meet the needs of the entire 0-15 population with no new funding in this area.

Education are being asked to fund anything that 'educates or trains' the YP and this has seen to be defensible in law leaving the HNB demands out of kilter with the budget. There needs to be better guidance and definitions of all agencies responsibilities in this area and additional funding for the adults we now are expected to support.

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.

Comments

I think we need a national offer for young people 19 plus that allows for 3 years of funding used flexibly over the 19-25 age range that augments what they have achieved in education up to 18 plus. The expectation that they just 'stay' in education to 25 if outcomes have not been met needs to change. All post 19 education needs to be related to pathways to work or we need to move young people into adult services with the most complex needs that are unlikely to be able to access paid FT work.

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. Comments

We need to look at a national banding system for college placements up to 18. In other words, element 3 should not be able to be set by each college individually but banded in a similar way to school funding allowing LAs more control of the funding system. Due to the more distant relationship between colleges and LAs this is more difficult for each LA to do.

Post 18 all courses should offer work experience as a minimum or follow the internship/apprenticeship route. With the pressure on LAs to deliver the EHCP system to expect them to deliver this on top requires specific post 19 funding or for central Government to ensure colleges all offer such programmes that links to a national post 19 programme as described in question 21 above.

Improving early intervention at each age and stage to prepare young people for adulthood sooner

Please refer to paragraphs 6.1 - 6.7 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

We want to understand whether the current operation of the funding system is creating a financial perverse incentive to resist a commitment of resources or restrict the availability of services when problems first arise, when such spending could in fact lead to a longer-term reduction in the complexity of support needed, and so longer-term savings. In a system that is intended to secure outcomes that imply a reducing need for support for many young people, as they prepare for employment and living more independently, it would be perverse if the lack of resources at one stage was leading to increasing costs later.

We are therefore keen to gather evidence on the extent to which financial and funding arrangements are driving the escalation of costs, and preventing those making spending decisions from taking an “invest-to-save” approach that leads to reducing costs in the longer term. If they are, we would appreciate views on how the arrangements could be changed to address this.

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

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Comments

The problem is when a new provider sees what has previously been spent on a YP, even if provision could be made for less, they tend to think they should get the same. So, a lot of funds going into early intervention may be difficult to trim down or remove at a later date. It requires a lot of trust, professional input and insight to do this well. All LAs are struggling to manage the larger increase in SEND cases and developmental work like this can suffer.

24. If you can 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.

Comments

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.

- The transition from early years provision to reception class in primary school
- The transition from Year 6 in primary school to Year 7 in secondary school
- The transition from secondary school to further or other tertiary education

Please indicate below any other transition points that you think we should look at.

Effective partnership working to support children and young people with complex needs

Please refer to paragraphs 7.1 - 7.8 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

When different organisations are responsible for their own budgets they are of course rightly interested in how best to discharge their responsibilities within the resources available to them. Separate funding streams and budgetary control are an inevitable feature of a complex landscape of provision, based on different legislation. This, however, can create barriers which discourage the partnership working that is essential for meeting the needs of those children and young people with SEN and who are disabled, and others with complex needs. Furthermore, conflict between budget holders can increase when budgets are tight and flexibility to move funding is reduced.

We would like to explore potential developments in funding arrangements that would overcome these barriers, empower effective collaborative working that can meet the complex needs of children and young people, and encourage budget holders to:

- share their resources and use appropriate pooling arrangements to most effectively meet the complex needs – and improve the outcomes – of children and young people (without arguments over who should pay for what);
- avoid taking inappropriate action to pass costs on to others, where this simply moves the cost pressures elsewhere and does not help to address the problem;
- strengthen joint leadership and strategic commissioning of services.

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.

Comments

Particularly relevant for YP in the care system where the responsibilities for funding could be pooled. For children who reach the threshold for services from the social care disability team and for young people 18 plus who are assessed by adult services as being eligible for services ongoing due to their disabilities. If we do not do this who pays for what and who is responsible for what arguments will continue. Let's make this just an LA responsibility if a YP is in the care system, adopted or eligible for social care disability services from children's or adults.

Other aspects of the funding and financial arrangements

Please refer to paragraphs 8.1 - 8.4 of the call for evidence document before responding to these questions.

We are aware that the amount of funding that is allocated to the Department for Education, and the amount that the department allocates to local authorities and others, is very important for making good quality provision for our most vulnerable young people. Securing a sufficient amount of funding for education in future, will remain a priority for the department.

But we want to make sure that there is nothing in the funding and financial arrangements, irrespective of the level of funding, that is creating barriers to informed decision-making in the best interests of children and young people.

It would also be helpful to have views on those aspects of the current system that are actively helping the right decisions to be made, so that we can make sure that they are not changed.

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

Comments

There should be more flexibility to move resources between funding blocks. The current system where Secretary of State approval is needed has hampered local flexibility and decision making between the Local Authority and the Schools Forum.

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?

Comments

Almost Done...

You are about to submit your response. By clicking 'Submit Response' you give us permission to analyse and include your response in our results. After you click Submit, you will no longer be able to go back and change any of your answers.

When you submit your response, you will be sent a receipt and a link to a PDF copy of your response.