

Summary of responses to Special School Budgets 2007/08 consultation questionnaire

	Yes	No	Abstain	Comments	Questions
Q. 1. Do you agree with the principles of the formula funding review? (Paragraph 25)	11	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * PAN changes good, due to change of need. * Agree in principle. Pupils however should be directed to the appropriate school according to their need. 	* Would the money follow the student if move during in the financial year? Concerns statements may be simplified to fit matrix category, who on statements panel will have overarching expertise?
Q. 2. Do you agree with at least 80% of the special schools budget being distributed via the matrix? (Paragraph 27)	9	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Feel 90% would be more representative as the small school allowance encourages retention of inefficient provision. * The matrix process needs to be robust and properly moderated. 	
Q. 3. Do you have any comments regarding the descriptors proposed for use with the matrix? (Paragraph 30)	9	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Moderation exercise and training be shared with mainstream. * Helpful if descriptors on Integris database mirrored the funding matrix descriptors. * EBSD should have an A category (x4). * Clear process required for reviewing descriptors to ensure range of disabilities across pupils is reflected. * EBSD should include a weighting of 2.5 for KS4 students. * Descriptors do not appear to allow for pupils who may not easily be categorised. * Concerns with S&C/ASD descriptors and weightings, support staff: pupil ratios do not appear to be representative of many real situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Is there any significance in the fact that more than 2/3rds of neighbouring authorities have adopted matrix funding? * Has Sensory and Physical category been merged with Social and Communication/ASD?

	Yes	No	Abstain	Comments	Questions
<p>Q. 4. Do you agree with the proposed weightings? (Paragraph 31)</p>	3	5	4	<p>* Figures don't reflect those agreed by head teachers at Autumn Term meeting at Sutton. L&C "A" should be 2.6, L&C "B" should be 1.5. No allowance is made for SLD with physical needs.</p> <p>* Not agreed by Special Heads, contain inequalities (x4).</p> <p>* Figures in document not the same as discussed in Special heads meetings, need to be clarified in future. EBSD weighting 1.0 is questioned.</p> <p>* Generally agree subject to additional category for KS4 EBSD.</p> <p>* Proposed weighting reveal inconsistencies and do not allow for sufficient support for BESD pupils.</p>	
<p>Q. 5. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed process of moderation? (Paragraph 34)</p>	6	3	3	<p>* Annual Review Statement should be utilised in moderation process instead of the statement. We would like details of appeals procedure (x2).</p> <p>* It must be thorough and effective with all parties taking part.</p>	<p>* What is the make up of the matrix audit working group? (x2)</p> <p>* Document has two systems for moderation - which one? (x4).</p> <p>* How is the moderation process effected?</p> <p>* What are the parameters used?</p>
<p>Q. 6. Do you agree with the proposed annual revision to the special schools PAN? (Paragraph 35)</p>	9	1	2	<p>* Consideration of ability to accommodate pupils needs to be remembered.</p> <p>* Making PANs more appropriate to places needed has a positive impact on the level of funding per pupil for pupils actually in the system.</p>	
<p>Q. 7. Do you agree with the proposed methodology for the revision of the PAN? (Paragraph 35)</p>	9	0	3	<p>* Overall agree with methodology but concern with Annex 5 - PAN rises to 62, effects small schools protection. 61 or more pupils reduces funding by 15%.</p>	

	Yes	No	Abstain	Comments	Questions
Q. 8. Do you agree with the proposed PAN increase at Rosewood from 40 to 60 places from September 2007? (Paragraph 36)	10	0	2	*Savings made when pupils are brought back into borough provision should be ring fenced for further development of special needs provision in Dudley and not go into mainstream schools. * It makes sense to increase pupil numbers at Rosewood but timescale from Sept 07 is questionable. Careful preparation for these pupils is paramount and the existing facilities are inadequate.	* Will this be achievable for September 2007?
Q. 9. Do you agree with the proposed implementation date of April 2007 for the formula funding review? (Paragraph 44)	10	0	2	* Subject to the weightings being amended to figures quoted in draft document and agreed by special head teachers.	
Q. 10. Do you agree with the revised methodology for the proposed small schools protection? (Paragraph 46-48)	9	1	2	* The principle is fine but the proposed SSP banding encourages inefficiency and reduces the funding available for other schools. * Note under new SSP calculation we would be £45k worse off BUT overall budget shows slight gain. * New method is easier to calculate and more transparent however, we will receive approx. £7k less.	
Q. 11. Do you agree that the other formula factors should remain unchanged for 2007/08? (Paragraph 49)	9	1	2	* Some elements may need review in the future.	* Generally 18% of budget is made up from other formula factors, will the amount in the pot be increased following Rosewood's move to larger premises?
Q. 12. Do you agree to the delegation of the: £450k growth allocated outside of ISB, to the special schools budget from April 2007? (Paragraph 51)	10	0	2	* Essential that SEN gets top sliced. * Essential. * This ensures additional funding and greater stability necessary to stabilise staffing levels in schools.	
Q. 13. Do you agree to the delegation of the £20k for school nurses, to the special schools budget for April 2007? (Paragraph 52)	10	0	2	* Old Park and Pens Meadow require a full time nursing element on site to meet the complex medical needs of many pupils.	* How does LA propose that the £20k is targeted at the two schools concerned?

	Yes	No	Abstain	Comments	Questions
<p>Do you agree to the delegation of the £50k for prior 1:1 support, to the special schools budget for April Q. 14. 2007? (Paragraph 53)</p>	9	1	2	<p>* The matrix should decide the need.</p> <p>* Matrix does not allow for 1:1 funding for more complex pupils. The maximum support of 2.5:1 will not meet their needs, some pupils need 1:1 at all times.</p> <p>* It is appropriate that all funding for each pupil is determined by application of the matrix rather than ad-hoc arrangements.</p> <p>* Can only be workable if every pupil has been assessed correctly and additional weighting allowance applied successfully (i.e. enough funds are available in total budget) to that pupil if 1:1 support is required.</p>	
Other Comments				<p>* This revision is long overdue.</p> <p>* We would like to think that our comments will be considered, particularly the incorrect weightings recorded in the consultation document.</p> <p>* We welcome this review but emphasise the importance of reviews particularly after the first twelve months, but also on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>* These are very complex matters requiring much more time to discuss and assimilate, particularly by those not so familiar with education finances. A symposium would have been helpful.</p> <p>* Review is appropriate although some concerns over planned reductions of numbers of pupils for some schools.</p> <p>* The financial viability of some provision could be called into question should pupil numbers drop further.</p> <p>* Children's Services are proposing saving money by reducing out of borough placements, but as there are no plans for residential provision in Dudley the need for residential provision will remain the only option for pupils with needs which cannot be met in a Dudley special school.</p>	

	Yes	No	Abstain	Comments	Questions
Other Comments				<p>* Recent trends suggest an increase in pupils suffering from mental health problems, who do not have learning difficulties but find it impossible to access mainstream education.</p> <p>* The rising numbers of children with severe and complex needs surviving beyond school age due to advances in medical science will continue to put pressure on special school provision.</p> <p>* Recent changes regarding transporting children to special schools could put some families at a disadvantage.</p> <p>* Concerns regarding the amount of funding which does not appear to represent any increase but is being distributed differently.</p> <p>* Dudley NUT are strongly in favour of the development of a consistent and coordinated plan which would best serve every child with special needs and promote confidence in all stakeholders.</p> <p>* Has anyone performed a review of needs of out of borough pupils to ensure they can be effectively catered for in borough?</p> <p>* Liason with Special Heads has been very useful.</p>	