

## SEN Review Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gauge the level of understanding and views of schools on the current methodology for funding SEN within the mainstream formula.

### Current position

For SEN, schools are currently funded via the following allocations:-

	£	£	£	%
	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Overall</u>
Notional 5% of AWPUP allocation	1,455,116	1,400,026	2,855,142	4.066%
Free school meals	394,462	545,952	940,414	1.339%
SATs scores in KS2 & 3	145,886	157,401	303,287	0.432%
BAHLAS results (primaries only)	345,605	0	345,605	0.492%
Child Protection numbers (primaries only)	55,062	0	55,062	0.078%
Delegated Statemented Pupil Allocation	476,609	462,173	938,782	1.337%
Special Units	205,192	239,280	444,472	0.633%
INA/INT allocation	223,498	140,232	363,730	0.518%
SEAL	124,761	66,887	191,648	0.273%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,426,191</b>	<b>3,011,951</b>	<b>6,438,142</b>	<b>9.169%</b>

### Position for Review

Following the OFSTED inspection of the LEA, schools commented that they felt that the methodology of delegation of SEN resources should be subject to review. Since then funds for Delegated Statemented pupil allocation and INA/INT allocation have been put through the formula. Proxy indicators such as CATs have now been replaced by SATs, together with other factors, such as BAHLAS tests in primary schools.

Currently some 9.17% of total formula funding £70m for mainstream Primary and Secondary schools is allocated for SEN. This amount will vary between schools depending upon local circumstances.

For 2004/05 the overall 'pot' of £70m will remain (only increased as per DfES/Government guidelines). However, we are now undertaking a comprehensive review of the way that SEN is funded in schools, in response to the concerns raised during the last OFSTED inspection, and through meetings between the LEA and schools representatives.

Each area under review refers to a question on those pages and schools views are sought on those areas. On pages 7 to 10 are the questions and comments for schools to complete.

**Please complete the attached questionnaire, and return it, signed by the Headteacher, no later than 17<sup>th</sup> October 2003 to:**

**Gill Gordon  
Children, Families & Schools Finance  
Room 300  
King's House**

## **Aims of the SEN Funding Review**

### **We aim to:**

- Simplify the way in which SEN funding is distributed via the Formula, and seek to address any contradictions and anomalies;
- Gather data in order to test a variety of potential proxy indicators, by researching best practice from other authorities, and by mapping data acquired against actual need in individual schools;
- Investigate the ways that individual schools use their SEN resources;
- Consult closely with schools to test their responses to alternative proposals.

**Based upon the evidence from both our own and national research, and from the SEN funding models used by other Authorities, we believe that the model for funding SEN in schools in this authority should contain the following elements:**

1. A proxy indicator for social deprivation;
2. A proxy indicator for attainment;
3. Funding for English as an Additional Language (EAL);
4. Pupil-led funding for pupils who are on the Child Protection Register and/or who are in Local Authority Care (Looked-After Children);
5. Pupil-led funding for pupils with High-Cost/Low-Incidence SEN.

### **Weighted numbers of pupils with SEN**

We have taken advice from the LEA's SEN advisors in order to arrive at a method of assessing the amount of intervention that is needed for the three categories of need that will be funded through the formula. We have attached a weighting of 1 to pupils with School Action, 4 to those with School Action Plus & 9 to those who hold high-incidence statements. We have been advised that this weighting broadly reflects the ratio of the level of SEN support that these pupils will require. We have taken numbers of pupils with SEN in each of these three categories in each school, and, using these weightings, we have arrived at a weighted pupil number for each school. It is this number that we have used to map against the various proxy indicators that we have investigated as part of the Review process.

### **Correlation analysis**

This document refers to the correlation between various potential proxy indicators and weighted SEN numbers, as detailed above. A perfect correlation is 1.0. The closer to this figure, the stronger the correlation (and therefore the better match between need and provision).

## Appendix 1

**There are a number of significant changes that are being considered during the Review; what follows is a summary of the rationale behind these. The questionnaire that forms the final part of this document seeks the views about these possible changes of every mainstream school within the Authority. By this means we aim to achieve a method for funding SEN in schools that closely matches levels of need, and that is clearly understood by all schools.**

## **1. Proxy Indicator of Social Deprivation** *(Please refer to Question 3)*

We need to identify the best possible proxy indicator of social need to be used in the funding formula. As you will be aware, the number of pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals is currently used as a means of assessing the level of social deprivation in schools. As part of the Review process, we have obtained data from other LEAs showing the means by which SEN is funded in other areas of the country; by this means we hope to incorporate best practice into the Review. We found that an alternative measure of social deprivation that is used by other Authorities is the 'Index of Multiple Deprivation' (IMD). This attaches a 'score' to every ward in the country, based on six factors (or 'domains') in each ward. These domains are:

- Income;
- Employment;
- Health & disability;
- Education, skills & training;
- Housing;
- Geographical access to services.

These domains each have a weighting attached to them, which is used to calculate the IMD score of each ward. The weights are: income 25%; employment 25%; health & disability 15%; education, skills & training 15%; housing 10%; and geographical access to services 10%.

In order to make use of IMD, accurate information on actual numbers of pupils from each ward in every school can be obtained by using the postcodes of pupils in schools and mapping these postcodes against the wards to which they relate. We could then use the deprivation score of each ward, multiplied by the number of pupils from each ward to arrive at an overall deprivation score for each school. Funding could then be distributed according to the results.

As part of the Review process, we have mapped both the numbers of pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals, and the overall IMD score of each school within the Authority based on PLASC data from 2003, against weighted SEN numbers in each school. Our findings from this research are as follows:

- There is a significantly stronger correlation between Free School Meals numbers and weighted SEN numbers (0.84) than there is between IMD scores and weighted SEN numbers (0.67);
- Free School Meals numbers is an easy measure for schools to understand and to verify. The method for arriving at an overall Index of Multiple Deprivation score is more complex, and data is difficult to source in a useable form;
- Input from the LEA's SEN advisors confirmed that the use of IMD to distribute formula funding poorly reflected the incidence of SEN in schools;
- National research has shown that eligibility for Free School Meals provides a strong link with social deprivation, thus lending support to our findings.

## Appendix 1

**We propose, therefore, that numbers of pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals should continue to be used as the proxy indicator of social deprivation in the funding formula.**

### **2a. Attainment Indicator for Primary Schools** *(Please refer to Question 4).*

We have looked closely at the attainment factor for primary schools to be used in the funding formula. Currently, funding is distributed by using both SATs results and BAHLAS results, and comparing these with the LEA average. Schools are then funded by a unit value for each percentage point that they achieve below the LEA average. We have examined a range of options, in order to find the proxy indicator that most accurately matches actual levels of SEN need in schools.

We considered using KS1 & 2 SATs results only as a proxy indicator, in order to simplify the funding formula. We found, however, that eliminating BAHLAS produces a weaker correlation with weighted SEN numbers. SATs alone produced a correlation with weighted SEN numbers of 0.79, whilst SATs and BAHLAS combined produced a correlation with weighted SEN of 0.85;

We also tested the correlation between BAHLAS alone and weighted SEN numbers, and found this to be 0.86. This was therefore the strongest correlation of any of the potential proxy indicators. This result is consistent with advice from schools advisers, that the majority of SEN results in literacy difficulties.

The BAHLAS tests are taken annually by pupils in years 1-4 (for reading), and in years 2-5 (for spelling), reflecting the performance of a range of pupils across a number of school years who are actually within schools, whereas end-of-key-stage SATs results are those for pupils who have left.

BAHLAS tests enable schools to track pupil performance across years, compare themselves with the LEA average for particular year groups, and identify SEN pupils via performance scores.

**We propose to use BAHLAS results as the proxy indicator for attainment for primary schools in the funding formula.**

### **2b. Attainment Indicator for Secondary Schools** *(Please refer to questions 5)*

From the analysis that we have undertaken during this review, it has emerged that there is an anomaly in the current way that funding for secondary schools is distributed via the attainment indicator that is used. Currently, KS3 (year 9) SATs results for each school are compared to the LEA average, and funding is allocated by a unit value per percentage point below this average. (For example, if the LEA average to achieve level 5 or above at KS3 is 45% of pupils, only schools achieving less than this would be allocated any funding.). It is clear that there are significant numbers of pupils in all secondary schools who enter with achievement levels below Government targets.

## Appendix 1

The present system gives no funding to eight out of Brighton & Hove's ten secondary schools, and allocates all funding via the attainment indicator to two schools only. Clearly, this does not reflect need levels in all schools, and therefore we have sought a means of distributing resources fairly.

As secondary schools have intakes from a range of primary schools, and are likely, therefore, to have a more socially-mixed population than primary schools, we propose to use the Entry-Level KS2 SATs results of pupils on entry to secondary schools. We believe that this would more fairly reflect the overall profile of the actual pupils who enter each secondary school, and whose needs have to be met whilst they are there.

We have mapped weighted SEN numbers in schools against entry-level KS2 SATs results using the data for year 7 cohorts into secondary schools over the last three years. We found that weighted numbers of pupils achieving below Government targets at KS2 (i.e. below level 4) expressed as a percentage of intake correlated extremely closely with weighted actual numbers of pupils with SEN in each school.

This correlation (0.97) leads us to conclude that the percentage of pupils achieving below Government targets in their KS2 SATs should be the proxy indicator of attainment that is used in the SEN funding formula for secondary schools. This will lead to a redistribution of funding through this element which allocates funding that closely matches actual numbers of pupils with SEN in all secondary schools in the Authority. We are aware that this redistribution will remove resources from the two schools that currently receive the entirety of the available 'pot'. Due consideration will therefore need to be given to how the impact on these two schools can be minimised in the revised formula.

**We propose to use the Entry-Level KS2 SATs results of pupils on entry to secondary schools, and to use the numbers of pupils who achieve below Government targets (i.e. below level 4) to assess the likely levels of SEN in schools. Also to weight levels of achievement below level 4, in order to arrive at a total weighted number of pupils achieving below Government targets in each school as a means of distributing SEN funding via the attainment factor.**

### **3. Service for English as an Additional Language (SEAL)**

Funding for EAL has been delegated to schools since April 2001. Funding is allocated to schools based on three categories of need as advised by SEAL. These categories are: Advisory, Teaching & High Priority, with the lowest weighting attached to Advisory, and the highest to High Priority. Schools then have the option of using this delegated funding to buy into SEAL as part of the Services to Schools that the LEA offers. Those schools that have bought back into this service currently have three-year contracts that run until August 2005.

**We do not propose to change the current funding mechanism for SEAL.**

### **4. Looked After Children & Children who are on the Child Protection Register** *(Please refer to Questions 6 & 7)*

Primary schools only currently receive additional funding for children in their school who are on the Child Protection Register. To date, secondary schools have not been allocated this funding.

## Appendix 1

There is no additional funding for Looked After Children (those who are in Local Authority care) in the current SEN funding model.

We recognise that there are additional levels of support required for vulnerable children in schools, and we believe that we should be targeting resources to help schools to provide this support. This funding reflects guidance about the non-classroom-based additional input necessary in consequence of having pupils from these groups in school, including, for example, time taken in attending case conferences.

**We propose to allocate an amount of funding to all mainstream schools (both primary and secondary) based on the actual number of pupils on roll who are either in Local Authority care (Looked After Children), or who are on the Child Protection Register.**

### **5. Pupil-led funding for pupils with High-Cost/Low-Incidence SEN.**

We have identified two different groups of pupils with high levels of SEN who are educated in mainstream schools. The first group is those who are educated in Special Units attached to mainstream schools. The second is those with low-incidence/high-cost statements who are in mainstream schools.

Pupils in special schools have been funded by an entirely different mechanism since April 2003. The mechanism that is used is the Special Schools Funding Matrix, which was agreed upon following a lengthy consultation process with all those involved, including the Headteachers of all the Authority's seven special schools. There is no pupil element in special schools' funding, as this is incorporated within the Matrix.

It is proposed that the funding for pupils with high levels of SEN (excluding pupils with statements for EBD; MLD; SpLD and Speech & Language) both in Special Units attached to mainstream schools, and also those who are within mainstream schools, should be funded using the Special Schools Funding Matrix. **An explanation of the Matrix, giving the rationale behind this proposal, is enclosed with this Questionnaire.**

#### **5a. Funding for Special Units in Mainstream Schools**

*(Please refer to Question 8)*

**We propose to link the funding of pupils who are in Special Units attached to mainstream schools to the Special Schools Matrix Funding allocations, less the element for the pupils' AWPU allocation (this would avoid any double-funding issues). The assessment of the places would be based on the latest information available before the budget shares are produced.**

#### **5b. Funding for Pupils with high levels of SEN in Mainstream Schools**

*(Please refer to Question 9)*

Funding for pupils with high levels of SEN is currently allocated according to individual assessments for each pupil through the INA/INT (Individual Needs Ancillary/Individual Needs Teacher) element of the SEN funding formula.

Appendix 1

We propose to link the funding of pupils with high levels of SEN in mainstream schools to the Special Schools Matrix Funding allocations, less the element for the pupils' AWPU allocation (this would avoid any double-funding issues). The assessment of the pupils would be based on the latest information available before the budget shares are produced.

Please enter School Name .....

**Views are sought from schools on the following questions:**

1. Do you think that the amount allocated for SEN is **currently** distributed via an equitable funding mechanism?

YES NO UNSURE

2. Please give your views about the current percentage of the total £70m 'pot' that is currently allocated for SEN. The current percentage is 9.17%  
**(Please refer to p.1)**

Current percentage is too high	
Current percentage is about right	
Current percentage is too low	

3. We recommend that Free School Meals should continue to be used as the proxy indicator of social deprivation in the SEN funding formula. Do you agree?  
**(Please refer to p.3, section 1)**



Appendix 1

Yes	
No	
Unsure	

4. Do you agree that BAHLAS should be used as the proxy indicator for attainment in the funding formula for SEN for primary schools?  
(Please refer to p.4, section 2a)

Yes – BAHLAS should be used as the proxy indicator for attainment for primary schools in the SEN funding formula	
No - continue to include End-of-Key-Stage SATs results in the formula	
Unsure	

5. Do you agree that Year 7 entry (KS2) SATs results should replace Year 9 KS3 SATs results as the attainment indicator for SEN funding in secondary schools. This will allocate funding according to the percentage pupils achieving below Government targets in their KS2 SATs. This would replace the current method, which allocates funding by results from each school compared against the LEA average.  
(Please refer to p.4, section 2b)

Yes – Year 7 entry KS2 SATs using weighted numbers who achieve below Government targets should replace KS3 SATs as the attainment indicator	
No – continue using KS3 SATs to distribute funds by comparing the schools against the LEA average	
Unsure	

6. Should an allocation be made within the SEN formula for children who are on the Child Protection Register?  
(Please refer to p.5, section 4)

Yes	
No	
Unsure	

## Appendix 1

7. Should an allocation be made for Looked After Children?  
(Please refer to p.5, section 4)

Yes	
No	
Unsure	

## Appendix 1

8. Do you agree that we should link funding for pupils in Special Units in mainstream schools to the Special Schools Funding Matrix?  
**(Please refer to p.6, section 5a)**

Agree – at the level of Special Schools	
Agree – at a reduced level to Special Schools	
Disagree – funding for pupils in Special Units should continue to be funded by the current mechanism	
Unsure	

9. Do you agree that funding for pupils with High-Cost/Low-Incidence Statements in mainstream schools should be linked to the Special Schools Funding Matrix?  
**(Please refer to p.6, section 5b)**

Agree – at the level of Special Schools	
Agree – at a reduced level to Special Schools	
Disagree – funding for pupils in mainstream schools with High-Cost/Low-Incidence statements should continue to be funded using individual INA/INT assessments	
Unsure	

Appendix 1

**In the space below, please give any further comments that you wish to make in connection with the SEN Funding Review.**

[Empty space for comments]

**Signature of Headteacher .....**  
**Date.....**

**Please return no later than 17<sup>th</sup> October 2003 to :-**  
**Gill Gordon**  
**Children, Families & Schools Finance**  
**Room 300**  
**King's House**