

Schools Forum SEN Working Group

Minutes – 24th February 2012

Present: Liz Williams, Karina Kulawik, John Hawkins, Carol Grant, Sarah O'Donnell, Bruce Douglas

Apologies: Julia Cramp, Mark Brotherton, Judith Finney, Phil Beaumont, Phil Cooch

		Action
1	<p>NPA Recoupment</p> <p>KK highlighted an anomaly in the current funding arrangements for NPAs under which pupils from other Local Authorities are funded at the full NPA level whereas pupils from Wiltshire are funded at the level above 10 or 15 hours. This has resulted in over funding for those pupils.</p> <p>A summary of the current funding received by schools for NPAs for out county pupils was circulated and the difference in funding for those schools if the pupils were funded at a consistent level with Wiltshire pupils. The overall impact would be a reduction in funding across the 24 schools of £180,977. The impact on individual schools ranged from £1,835 to £41,264.</p> <p>It was agreed that the impact of changing the funding system was too great to implement a change from April. It was recommended that the current funding arrangements remain in place for the current pupils (whilst in their current schools) but that for any new pupils schools would receive funding on the same basis as a Wiltshire pupil.</p> <p>The group asked that KK check whether any agreements had already been made with schools in relation to out of county pupils who may not have started with schools yet – these to be dealt with on a case by case basis</p> <p>The group also requested a breakdown of Wiltshire's expenditure on mainstream recoupment with other authorities</p>	<p>KK</p> <p>EW</p>
2	<p>SEN Support Service Analysis</p> <p>KK circulated a summary of the results from the consultation with clusters on SEN support services and the potential delegation of funding. 8 clusters had responded and there were a variety of views:</p> <p>4 clusters supported no further delegation of funding 1 cluster supported the delegation of approx 60% of services 2 clusters supported the LA retaining statutory services 1 cluster supported full delegation of funding</p> <p>Because of the variation in responses KK proposed that the LA</p>	

	<p>should pull together recommendations for Schools Forum and asked for the views of the group.</p> <p>EW outlined the differences between services which could be delegated and those which could only be devolved.</p> <p>It was agreed that a recommendation should be that all statutory services are retained centrally by the LA.</p> <p>Once the statutory services were removed the group asked for the amount of funding for each service that could be devolved/delegated to be identified and examples of amounts for different sized schools.</p> <p>It was noted that schools may be better placed to provide for high incidence needs than low incidence and that this would need to be considered as well as the potential amounts to be delegated.</p>	EW
3	<p>Workplan 2012-13</p> <p>The group agreed a workplan for the next financial year – see attached</p>	
8	Date of Next Meeting to be agreed and circulated.	