

# Appendix 1 – Review of Top-up Funding 2018

## Review of top-up funding arrangements in North Somerset: October 2018

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The local authority, in partnership with the Strategic Schools Forum (SSF), commissioned a review of the top-up funding arrangements in North Somerset for children and young people with high level special educational needs. The current top-up funding (TUF) arrangements have been in place since 2013. There has been historic pressure on the TUF budget, which forms part of the high needs block within the Dedicated Schools Grant. The local authority and the Strategic Schools Forum want to ensure that a fair, equitable and robust system of allocating top up funding is in place which addresses the pattern of overspending.
- 1.2 The review was carried out by Rik Boxer, who is an independent consultant from RBMM Education, in collaboration with relevant local authority staff and representatives from schools and other educational settings. It involved the following activities:
- review of relevant documentation and processes
  - analysis of data including financial data and benchmarking data from statistical neighbour authorities
  - meetings with key personnel from the local authority and schools/settings.
  - meeting with parent representatives
- 1.3 The review was undertaken in the period from May 2018 to September 2018. An interim progress report was produced for consideration by the SSF at their July meeting. This is the final report with recommendations for change and will be discussed at the SSF on 24 October 2018.

### 2. National context

- 2.1 There is widespread concern being expressed nationally about the rising demand and costs of SEND provision. An increase in the number of Education, Health and Care plans has been seen nationally, leading to rising costs at a time of increasing financial constraints facing local authorities and schools. A number of likely contributory factors have been identified by London Councils and other bodies, including:
- A general population increase and, in some authorities, an increase in the young population in particular
  - Increase in accuracy of diagnosis and earlier identification of SEND
  - Advances in paediatric care for babies and children with complex conditions
  - Introduction of the extended age range (0-25) in the Children and Families Act
  - Raised parental awareness and expectations following the 2014 Act
  - Increasing financial pressures faced by schools leading to a rising number of applications for EHCPs and high needs funding
  - Reduction in early prevention services due to funding pressures.

- 2.2 Formerly local authorities could move funding between blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant, subject to Schools Forum approval, to respond to increases in demand within the high needs block. However, from April 2018, a cap on the amount of funding that can be transferred between the general schools block and the high needs block has been introduced. Such transfers are limited to 0.5% of the total schools block and can only be made with the agreement of the Schools Forum. Requests for transfers above that figure are considered on a case by case basis by the Education, Skills and Funding Agency (ESFA).
- 2.3 The rise in demand and costs of SEND support, allied with reduced budgetary flexibility, is causing widespread concern nationally. In this context, many authorities are considering a range of actions, including a review of historic funding arrangements, to mitigate the pressures.

### **3. Local context**

- 3.1 North Somerset is experiencing funding pressures within the high needs block. The TUF budget has increased from £9.54 million (in 2017/18) to £11.18 million (in 2018/19) in response to increased spend and an overall increase of pupil numbers of 1.62%. This equates to growth of £1.64 million.
- 3.2 There are other significant financial pressures within the high needs block. Notably, the out of authority placement budget is set at £4 million for 2018/19. The Specialist and Alternative Provision Review, which has been recently undertaken, highlighted the need to increase local capacity to meet the wide ranging and complex needs of children and young people with EHC plans. The review has made recommendations for extending local provision and reducing out of area specialist placements in the medium term.
- 3.3 In response to the financial pressures, the SSF requested a transfer from the schools block to the high needs block to exceed the cap of 0.5% to be funded by reducing the age-weighted pupil unit (AWPU) for all pupils by £14.65 per pupil. The ESFA have agreed that North Somerset can transfer 0.97% of the total schools block to the high needs block in 2018/19. This is not a sustainable position and in future years there is no guarantee that the ESFA will allow transfers to the high needs block exceeding 0.5%.
- 3.4 In this context, some of the key questions that the review of top-up funding has sought to address are as follows:
- How can the increase in demand for top-up funding and increased spend be explained? What does the data say about specific pressure points?
  - Is the method for allocating top-up funding sufficiently fair, equitable and robust? Are decision-making and moderation processes appropriate? Are there any changes required to the criteria and guidance underpinning decision-making?
  - Is the actual funding, through the funding bands, set at an appropriate level? How do the funding bands in North Somerset compare with other authorities?
  - Is there more that could be done to manage demand for top-up funding? How can schools be supported and encouraged to utilise their notional SEN budget to best effect?

- Once top-up funding has been agreed, how should its effective use be monitored? What should be the mechanisms for reviewing the allocation? In what circumstances may top-up funding no longer be required?

#### **4. Description of current top-up funding arrangements in North Somerset**

4.1 The national SEND funding framework has three elements:

Element 1 – funding which applies to all pupils, through the Age Weighted Pupil Unit, normally set at around £4,000 per pupil

Element 2 – the notional SEN budget, specifically for use with pupils with identified special needs and included within each school’s delegated budget share, normally set around £6,000 per pupil

Element 3 – top-up funding for pupils with high needs requiring provision over and above what can be made available through Element 1 and Element 2 funding. The amount of top-up funding and the system for its allocation are locally determined.

4.2 The current top-up funding system in North Somerset has been in place since 2013 when the new SEND national funding framework came into place. It replaced a previous SEN Audit system. It was developed in consultation between the local authority and schools through a working group. The model is based on calculating a ‘universal band value’ for pupils with various types of need whether they attend mainstream or specialist provision. The universal band value is calculated on the basis of expected staffing costs required to meet different types and levels of need. The universal band value is then adjusted by subtracting the expected contribution from the delegated budget share to arrive at the actual top-up funding value. For mainstream schools, the expected contribution from the delegated budget is £10,000 (Element 1 and Element 2). For special schools, the expected contribution is £6,000 (Element 2 only).

4.3 Over time, there have been some changes made to the universal band values which have not been based on the staffing costs model but on other factors, including budget sufficiency.

4.4 The actual amounts of top-up funding are determined through a banding system based on a set of descriptors of pupil needs. In North Somerset, there are five categories of need with each category broken down into levels of need

Category A: Cognition & Learning has 4 levels with top-ups ranging from £7,520 to £41,695 (mainstream) or £3,250 to £37,965 (special)

Category B: Communication/ASD has 4 levels with top-ups ranging from £6,405 to £41,695 (mainstream) or £2,405 to £37,965 (special)

Category C: Social, Emotional & Behavioural has 4 levels with top-ups ranging from £6,405 to £26,678 (mainstream) or £2,405 to £22,678 (special)

Category D: Sensory has 4 levels for Vision and 4 levels for Hearing with top-ups both ranging from £2,601 to £21,055 (mainstream) or £0 to £17,055 (special)

Category E: Physical/Medical has 3 levels of need with top-ups ranging from £9,159 to £30,860 (mainstream) or £5,159 to £26,860 (special)

The full breakdown is shown below:

**North Somerset Schools TUF Universal Bands 2018/2019**

| Category                            | Level | Schools Universal band value | Mainstream Schools | Special Schools |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| A - Cognition and Learning          | A1    | £13,520                      | £7,520             | £3,520          |
|                                     | A2    | £16,620                      | £10,620            | £6,620          |
|                                     | A3    | £27,055                      | £21,055            | £17,055         |
|                                     | A4    | £47,695                      | £41,695            | £37,695         |
| B - Communication - ASD             | B1    | £12,405                      | £6,405             | £2,405          |
|                                     | B2    | £16,620                      | £10,620            | £6,620          |
|                                     | B3    | £27,055                      | £21,055            | £17,055         |
|                                     | B4    | £47,695                      | £41,695            | £37,695         |
| C - Social, Emotional and Behaviour | C1    | £12,405                      | £6,405             | £2,405          |
|                                     | C2    | £16,620                      | £10,620            | £6,620          |
|                                     | C3    | £26,055                      | £20,055            | £16,055         |
|                                     | C4    | £32,678                      | £26,678            | £22,678         |
| D - Sensory<br>V=Vision, H=Hearing  | DV1   | £8,601                       | £2,601             | £0              |
|                                     | DH1   | £8,601                       | £2,601             | £0              |
|                                     | DV2   | £8,601                       | £2,601             | £0              |
|                                     | DH2   | £8,601                       | £2,601             | £0              |
|                                     | DV3   | £17,617                      | £11,617            | £7,617          |
|                                     | DH3   | £14,870                      | £8,870             | £4,870          |
|                                     | DV4   | £27,055                      | £21,055            | £17,055         |
|                                     | DH4   | £27,055                      | £21,055            | £17,055         |
| E - Physical / Medical              | E1    | £15,159                      | £9,159             | £5,159          |
|                                     | E2    | £18,887                      | £12,887            | £8,887          |
|                                     | E3    | £36,860                      | £30,860            | £26,860         |

4.5 Schools can apply for top-up funding for pupils who may meet the criteria. Schools provide details of the pupil's needs and a costed provision map detailing the support which has been put into place and the intended spend should the application for top-up funding be successful.

4.6 Applications are then considered at a twice- yearly moderation meeting. All schools are represented at the moderation meetings. Local authority and school staff make decisions based on the evidence presented about whether there is a case for top-up funding and at what level. There is then a quality assurance process carried out by local authority officers on a sample of cases to check the accuracy of the moderation process. There is also an appeal panel which sits annually to consider cases where schools feel that the evidence submitted has been misinterpreted.

- 4.7 There is a detailed guidance document for schools which set out the descriptors and the application and decision-making processes.
- 4.8 There is a similar system in place in the early years, but with some variations as required within an early years context. Early years settings may make applications for top-up funding in a similar way as to schools. Applications are considered by an Early Years Top-up Panel with multi-agency representation, which meets monthly. There is a specific Early Years Foundation Stage TUF criteria document and an hourly top-up funding rate has been calculated for each funding band. Top-up funding is paid for a maximum of 15 hours per week term time. At the lowest level (Level 0), funding is agreed to the end of the school year. For higher levels (Levels 1 to 4), funding is agreed to the end of the reception year to support transition into school.
- 4.9 There are also some variations in the system operating in the further education sector. The majority of FE students within the top up system attend Weston College. There is a block funding arrangement between the local authority and Weston College with a total amount of top-up funding calculated on an annual basis relating to the number of students and a predicted average top-up value.

## 5. Analysis of local data and benchmarking information

- 5.1 In May 2018, 1091 children and young people in North Somerset were in receipt of top-up funding. The breakdown of cases by category of need is shown below:

| Category of need                             | Numbers of TUF cases |
|--|----------------------|
| Cognition & Learning                         | 211                  |
| Communication/Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) | 391                  |
| Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH)   | 305                  |
| Sensory                                      | 39                   |
| Physical/Medical                             | 108                  |
| Other  | 37                   |

The largest categories of need attracting top-up funding are Communication/ASD and SEMH. Over 60% of TUF cases fall into these two categories

- 5.2 It is also worth noting that just under 50% of TUF cases are assessed at Level 1 (the lowest level of need and lowest cost) whilst under 5% of cases are assessed at Level 4 (the highest category of need and highest cost)
- 5.3 A full breakdown of these 1091 cases according to category and level of need is shown in Appendix 1
- 5.4 Costs have risen significantly over the past three years as shown in the table below.

|         | Budget (£m) | Expenditure (£m) |
|---------|-------------|------------------|
| 2015/16 | 9.18        | 9.43             |
| 2016/17 | 9.07        | 9.61             |
| 2017/18 | 9.54        | 10.47            |

There has been an increase in expenditure of just over £1 million between 2015/16 and 2017/18 on the TUF budget. This represents an increase of over 10%. For 2018/19, the budget has been set at £11.18 million.

5.5 The number of full-time equivalent TUF pupils and expenditure broken down by type of provision over the same period is as follows:

|                       | Pupils/Expenditure<br>2015/16 | Pupils/Expenditure<br>2016/17 | Pupils/Expenditure<br>2017/18 |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mainstream pre 16     | 398/£2.61m                    | 344/£2.72m                    | 400/£3.19m                    |
| Special pre 16        | 225/£1.6m                     | 240/£1.9m                     | 255/£2.1m                     |
| Special post 16       | 47/£346k                      | 37/£343k                      | 37/£351k                      |
| Resource bases        | 26/£26k                       | 28/£30k                       | 25/£41k                       |
| Alternative provision | 80/£730k                      | 62/£651k                      | 75/£687k                      |
| Further education     | 497/£2.9m                     | 488/£2.8m                     | na/£2.91m                     |
| Other local authority | 37/£676k                      | 32/£608k                      | 42/£717k                      |
| Early Years           | na/£340k                      | na/£389k                      | na/£404k                      |

The biggest increases in expenditure over this period has been for mainstream pre-16 TUF cases and special pre-16 TUF cases. Although mainstream TUF numbers have remained approximately the same over the three-year period, the expenditure has increased by just under £600,000. Special pre-16 TUF numbers have increased by 30 over the three-year period and expenditure has risen by approximately £500,000. FE and special post 16 TUF spending have remained stable. Early years TUF spending has risen by £64,000; however an increased spend in early years would be anticipated given the introduction of extended hours in early years settings from September 2017.

5.6 Spend on top-up funding in North Somerset for maintained schools (mainstream and special) is well above statistical neighbours at £230 per head of the 2-18 population in North Somerset as compared with £167 per head in statistical neighbour authorities. Spend on top-up funding for non-maintained and independent schools is just above statistical neighbours (£106 per head as compared to £96 per head).

5.7 It is difficult to obtain data on the details of top-up funding schemes in other authorities, but information from a small sample of authorities is attached as Appendix 2. Although there are various models of allocation, most schemes have a smaller number of funding

bands than is the case in North Somerset with a smaller maximum top-up allocation and with more graduated funding between the bands.

5.8 In summary, the data suggests the following contributory factors underlying the increase in TUF expenditure in North Somerset

- A small increase in the number of TUF cases over the past three years
- More expenditure per case particularly with regard to mainstream pre-16 cases which suggests more children and young people are being assessed as having higher level needs
- A funding system where financial values are set high, relative to other authorities, and where there are significant 'jumps' in funding between bands

## **6. Analysis of documentation and decision-making processes**

6.1 The guidance to schools on top-up funding is useful and comprehensive. It covers the application process, moderation arrangements, appeals procedures and provides a clear timeline. It also provides guidance on expectations of how funding should be used on SEND from the delegated budget share (Element 1 and Element 2 funding) and requires evidence from schools on the use of this funding as part of the application process.

6.2 The descriptors of need are set out according to categories and levels (e.g. Cognition & Learning broken down into 4 categories of need and similarly for other categories). Schools are asked to identify the category and level of need for the pupil for whom they are applying, and to provide evidence against the descriptors. There are over 20 variations of categories and needs, each of which carry a discrete top-up funding value

6.3 The descriptors have been carefully crafted and refined over time. However, some of the descriptors are difficult to evidence and some of the descriptors at Level 1 may apply to pupils with lower level needs which may be able to be met through the school's delegated budget share. There are also some criteria which are not needs-led but are dependent on a diagnosis or require staff to have had specific training.

6.4 The moderation arrangements are described in Section 4.6 of this report. All schools are represented at twice yearly moderation meetings along with relevant local authority staff. Participants are split into groups and each group is tasked to consider a number of applications to check that the evidence supports the need for top-up funding at the particular level applied for. The involvement of all schools in the process is a strength, building collective responsibility and understanding of the system. However, the drawback of large-scale moderation processes such as this is that it is difficult to ensure consistency of approach across decision-making groups. The local authority carry out quality assurance on a sample of cases and there is an annual appeals process, to mitigate against variability in decision making.

6.5 A breakdown of the outcomes of TUF applications following the most recent moderation round in 2018 is as follows:

|                        | Agreed | Turned down completely | Reduced to lower level | Increased to higher level | Changed to another category |
|------------------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cognition and Learning | 37     | 24                     | 2                      | 3                         | 1                           |
| Communication          | 111    | 41                     | 7                      | 0                         | 0                           |
| Behaviour              | 76     | 27                     | 8                      | 0                         | 0                           |
| Sensory                | 7      | 0                      | 0                      | 0                         | 0                           |
| Physical/Medical       | 18     | 3                      | 1                      | 0                         | 0                           |

Out of a total of 366 cases, 249 (68%) were agreed, 95 (26%) were turned down completely and 22 (6%) were changed to another level or category.

6.6 There are some exceptions to the above decision-making process. In particular, when a pupil is at the point of admission to alternative provision at the Virtual Learning Centre (VLC), a top-up allocation is made to support the placement. Also, top-up funding is also used on some occasions to fund packages of support for pupils out of school or at risk of exclusion through the Out of School Panel. Whilst there will be circumstances where decisions are required between moderation meetings, these should be kept to a minimum and only apply in clearly defined circumstances otherwise the integrity of the overall system may be compromised.

6.7 Once top-up funding is agreed, this is normally for a three- year period (apart from categories B1 and C1 which are annual allocations). There are no monitoring arrangements in place to assess the impact and continuing need for funding. At the end of the agreed period, a school may apply for continuation of funding through the normal application procedures.

## **7. Issues raised by school and parent representatives**

7.1 As part of the review, individual meetings were held with a sample of six school representatives from mainstream primary, mainstream secondary and special school representatives. The representatives were all experienced practitioners with interest and expertise in the area at SENCO, senior leadership team and headteacher levels.

7.2 Whilst the school representatives each had their own particular perspectives, there were clear common themes that emerged., summarised below:

- There are a variety of strengths to the current system in terms of clear processes, a collective approach, set timescales to allow time to plan for transitions and applicability to pupils both with and without EHC plans
- The most commonly expressed concern related to lack of consistency in decision-making This was attributed to a number of factors including different levels of rigour being applied by different groups at the moderation meetings, some criteria being difficult to evidence and some schools being more successful than others in meeting the paperwork requirements in making applications.
- Top-up funding should be used in addition to the support provided through the school's delegated budget share but there were some doubts that this was the case in all schools
- It can be difficult to make the case for top up funding for pupils with social, emotional and mental health difficulties due to the way that the descriptors are framed with an emphasis on behaviour difficulties
- For new intake into a school, the November moderation meeting can be too early to get sufficient evidence in place to support a TUF application and there is a wait of six months before the next application round
- Some respondents were aware of exceptions to the system where top-up funding was allocated outside of normal moderation arrangements
- Where a child has multiple needs across more than one category, it can be difficult to provide evidence to reflect the level of needs as only criteria associated with one category can be used
- Some respondents felt that threshold criteria (i.e at Level 1) were not operating effectively and that what is viewed as a significant and long-term difficulty may vary across socio-economic areas

7.3 Some school respondents provided a wider strategic perspective suggesting that the TUF budget should be seen in the context of the overall high needs budget. If the TUF budget continues to overspend, this is likely to be to the detriment of other provision for meeting the needs of high needs students and may further restrict early help/preventative initiatives. The need to increase local specialist placement options and reduce expensive out of authority placements was also raised and that proposals arising from the Review of Specialist and Alternative Provision need to be considered alongside the TUF review.

7.4 There was also some concern that changes in TUF arrangements may unintentionally negatively affect special school funding. The impact of any changes in TUF arrangements on special schools will require careful consideration.

7.5 A meeting was also held with two parent representatives from the Parent Carer Forum and Parent Reference Group. They expressed concern that delays in getting a diagnosis, particularly in relation to autism, may make it more difficult to access support that a young person requires. They also referred to delays in schools making TUF applications related to the six-month gap between moderation meetings. They were also concerned about the availability of support for young people with social, emotional and mental health needs who may be out of school or have been excluded. They were in agreement

that support packages should be creative and tailored to need and not necessarily take the form of 1-1 support.

7.6 Overall, there was a consensus view that guidance to schools should be strengthened to promote best practice in use of funding for SEND from the delegated budget share, that TUF applications should clearly set out how additional TUF funding will be used and that an accountability mechanism is introduced to monitor use and impact of top-up funding

## 8. Recommendations

8.1 Taking into account the data analysis (Section 5 of this report), the review of documentation and processes (Section 6) and views of stakeholders (Section 7), a set of recommendations are being put forward for consideration by the Strategic Schools Forum on 24 October 2018. These recommendations relate to the TUF arrangements for children and young people in schools. No changes are proposed to the system in place in early years and further education.

8.2 The purpose of the recommendations are as follows:

- To improve consistency of decision-making in relation to TUF applications.
- To ensure that the TUF system is as fair, equitable and transparent as possible.
- To ensure that top-up funding supports the needs of children and young people with high level needs and is used in addition to Element 2 funding.
- To introduce arrangements to monitor the use and impact of allocated top-up funding.
- To reduce pressure on the TUF budget avoiding the historic pattern of overspending.

8.3 The recommendations are as follows:

- I. TUF applications for children of school age should be considered by a small moderation group of experienced school representatives with a good knowledge of TUF criteria and processes and relevant local authority representatives. The group should have a consistent common core of membership and meet on at least a termly basis. These arrangements would replace the twice-yearly large moderation meetings. It is recommended that there continues to be an annual training event for all schools. It is envisaged that an appeals process is maintained but that quality assurance processes from the local authority will no longer be required.**
- II. All decisions about TUF allocations should be made through the normal moderation processes except in clearly defined exceptional circumstances where an early decision needs to be made. In such circumstances, the rationale and evidence for the decision about funding should be documented and the case should be reviewed at the next moderation meeting.**
- III. In situations where children and young people are out of school, at risk of permanent exclusion or are being re-integrated into a new school following exclusion, any additional short-term funding requirements should be considered**

by the Out of School Panel rather than through TUF processes. It is recommended that a 'top-slice' of the TUF budget, based on projected number of cases and costs, is allocated for use by the Out of School Panel for provision of time-limited support in these circumstances. Where there is a case for longer term support and TUF criteria are met, a TUF application can subsequently be made in the normal way.

- IV. It is recommended that the TUF criteria and guidance document should be amended as follows:
- The criteria should be needs-related with no requirement for a diagnosis or specific training requirements for staff
  - All TUF applications should show evidence of a plan/do/review cycle and that external professional advice has been sought and acted upon
  - The evidence provided in support of a TUF application should include plans for the use of allocated top-up funding in addition to Element 2 funding
  - Guidance should be given on the possible menu of interventions which may be funded through TUF
  - The criteria in Category C (behaviour) need to be amended to more fully reflect social and emotional needs as well as behaviour difficulties
  - The criteria for entry into the TUF system at Level 1 (particularly cognition and learning, communication/ASD and behaviour) should be re-worked to ensure greater clarity and robustness.
- V. The current funding system, based on categories and levels of need, has over 20 funding bands in total and there are significant 'jumps' in funding between levels of need. It is recommended that a simplified system is developed in consultation with schools and that more graduated arrangements are put in place to ensure that the gap between funding levels is reduced. It is suggested that a system with between 6 and 8 funding bands is developed. Each funding band would reflect all categories of need (i.e pupils receiving funding at each band may have a variety of needs but will receive the same top up funding allocation). Development of this model will require further consultation, financial modelling, careful consideration of its application to both the special and mainstream sectors and ratification by the Schools Forum.
- VI. Funding arrangements for alternative provision in North Somerset are currently under review. Currently, young people entering the VLC automatically receive top-up funding at the point of admission. It is recommended that the new alternative provision funding model is based on an overall projection of need and funding requirements, not on case by case top-up funding allocations.
- VII. It is recommended that a system is developed and introduced to monitor the use of three-year top-up funding allocations. This will provide accountability to ensure that allocated funding is being used by schools to best effect. It will also help to identify whether there have been any changes to the level of need and whether

**funding needs to continue at the allocated level. This recommendation will have resource requirements for staffing time, from school and/or local authority staff, to carry out the monitoring function and should be funded from the TUF budget.**

## **9. Implementation**

9.1 If the above proposals are agreed, an implementation plan and timescales will need to be drawn up. It is envisaged that adjustments to the current system could be put into place from April 2019 but that the more fundamental changes may require a longer lead up time with implementation from September 2019.

9.2 In particular, the proposed changes to the current funding system (Recommendation V) will require further work between the local authority and schools in developing an alternative model and further discussions will be required at SSF on the financial impact. An implementation date of September 2019 for this recommendation is suggested.

## APPENDIX 1: Breakdown of TUF cases May 2018

### Category A: Cognition and Learning

|    | Numbers of cases | Universal band value |
|----|------------------|----------------------|
| A1 | 138              | 13520                |
| A2 | 58               | 16620                |
| A3 | 13               | 27055                |
| A4 | 2                | 47695                |

### Category B: communication/ASD

|    | Numbers of cases | Universal band value |
|----|------------------|----------------------|
| B1 | 219              | 12405                |
| B2 | 128              | 16620                |
| B3 | 33               | 27055                |
| B4 | 11               | 47695                |

### Category C: Social, Emotional and Mental Health

|    | Numbers of cases | Universal band value |
|----|------------------|----------------------|
| C1 | 110              | 12405                |
| C2 | 148              | 16620                |
| C3 | 33               | 26055                |
| C4 | 14               | 32678                |

### Category D: Sensory

|     | Number of cases | Universal band value |
|-----|-----------------|----------------------|
| D1  | 1               | 8601                 |
| DH1 | 5               | 8601                 |
| DH2 | 7               | 8601                 |
| DH3 | 4               | 14870                |
| DH4 | 0               | 27055                |
| DV1 | 11              | 8601                 |
| DV2 | 2               | 8601                 |
| DV3 | 8               | 17617                |
| DV4 | 1               | 27055                |

Category E: Physical/Medical

|    | Number of cases | Universal band value |
|----|-----------------|----------------------|
| E1 | 61              | 15159                |
| E2 | 31              | 18887                |
| E3 | 16              | 36860                |

Other

|                  | Number of cases | Universal band value |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Other            | 35              | Variable             |
| Personal budgets | 2               | Variable             |

## **APPENDIX 2: Examples of funding systems in place in other authorities**

- a. Authority 1  
Category model but with much smaller maximum allocation:  
5 categories and 4 bands within each category, similar to North Somerset  
Speech/Language/Communication – up to £10,502  
Cognition & Learning – up to £9,335  
Behavioural/Emotional/Social – up to £10,502  
Sensory – up to £10,502  
Physical/Medical– up to £11,085
- b. Authority 2  
Use a range system. Funding amount can be anywhere within the range. Not separate categories but each band describes a variety of needs  
Band 1: no top up  
Band 2: no top up  
Band 3: £1,001-£5,000  
Band 4: £5,001-£10,000  
Band 5: £10,001- 13,500  
Band 6: individually commissioned  
Band 7: individually commissioned
- c. Authority 3  
Use a high needs matrix with four areas of difficulty – sensory and/or physical, communication and interaction, emotional/social/behavioural development and cognition/learning. Each area broken down into 5 levels of need which are translated into a point score (lowest need =0 points, highest need = 5 points). Assess students against all areas, total the points and convert the scores into a top up tariff. There are 6 top up bands ranging from £1,360 to £17,260.
- d. Authority 4  
12 bands based on a matrix funding model. Small funding graduations within each band to a maximum at Band 12 of £30,625
- e. Authority 5  
4 bands mainstream schools only:  
Band A: £2300  
Band B: £4,400  
Band C: £6,500  
Band D: up to £8,000