



Department
for Education

High needs national funding formula and other reforms

**Annex A - Detailed response to the first
stage consultation**

December 2016

Contents

Question 1: principles	3
Question 2: distributing funding to local authorities	4
Question 3: proxy measures	5
Question 4: formula factors	6
Question 5: hospital education	12
Question 6: area cost adjustment	13
Question 7: 2016-17 spending	14
Question 8: minimum funding guarantee	15
Question 9: national guidelines	16
Question 10: special units	17
Question 11: overcoming barriers to inclusion	18
Question 12: supporting inclusive schools	19
Question 13: independent special schools	20
Question 14: post-16 providers	21
List of organisations that responded to the first stage of consultation	22

Question 1: principles

Do you agree with our proposed principles for the funding system?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	737	69%
No	285	27%
Not Answered	53	5%

Summary of responses

The majority of responses agreed that the principles were correct. However, there was concern as to whether the proposals were sufficient for delivering the principles.

There was agreement that funding should be fair, transparent and predictable. Some respondents expressed concerns over how a 'fair' system would be defined, arguing that proxy indicators would not necessarily be fair, and a few respondents asked what was meant by 'efficient'.

Doubts were raised about the importance of having a simple system: high needs by their nature are not simple, so a simple funding system may not do the job well, and the system may require flexibility more than simplicity.

There were mixed responses to the principle of delivering funding to the front line: some took the view that funding schools directly was the best solution, while others argued for the need to take into account local circumstances, and the need for local flexibility.

Some respondents felt strongly that the pace of change needs to be manageable for both local authorities and institutions, but others argued for change to be implemented as soon as realistically possible.

Several additional points of principle were suggested: the presumption that children and young people should be included in mainstream provision wherever possible; recognition of the interaction between the funding blocks of the dedicated schools grant; the need for local flexibility; a focus on making provision for appropriate interventions at the earliest stage, and the overall sufficiency of funding.

Question 2: distributing funding to local authorities

Do you agree that the majority of high needs funding should be distributed to local authorities rather than directly to schools and other institutions?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	848	79%
No	185	17%
Not Answered	42	4%

Summary of responses

The vast majority of responses felt that most funding should go to local authorities as they are responsible for commissioning provision for children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities, and this would align with their statutory duties and responsibilities for 0 to 25 year olds resident in the area, including those not in schools.

Some responses said that all high needs funding, not just the majority, should be distributed to local authorities.

Those who disagreed, however, argued that giving more funding directly to schools and other institutions would allow more funding to reach the front-line, promoting inclusion and greater accountability in schools, and enabling them to work in clusters.

Many in the further education and independent sectors did not agree with the majority of high needs funding being distributed to local authorities. The student intake of these institutions tends to come from a number of authorities, and they expressed a lack of confidence in them.

These responses were also among those who raised concerns at the lack of consistency across local authorities in the distribution of core and top-up funding. Many requested a clearer national definition of bandings or criteria for top-up funding to providers, and also joint Departments of Health and Education guidance on funding for children with education, health and care needs.

Some felt that schools forums should have a greater role in high needs funding and planning. This would improve transparency and give schools greater responsibility for costs, including those in relation to alternative provision.

Question 3: proxy measures

Do you agree that the high needs formula should be based on proxy measures of need, not the assessed needs of children and young people?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	515	48%
No	483	45%
Not Answered	77	7%

Summary of responses

Those in support welcomed a system that would be simple, fair and comparable nationally, and felt that such a system would increase certainty over allocations, and therefore support resource planning. It was also felt that the system would reduce administrative burdens. Many highlighted the importance of identifying appropriate proxy measures to use.

Those who disagreed expressed concerns that the needs of pupils vary considerably and are too complex to be accurately represented by proxy measures. They also argued that high-achieving pupils with SEN and disabilities, and pupils with low-incidence, high-cost needs, are unlikely to be captured by proxy factors. To be effective, proxy measures would need to be closely linked to the characteristics of the high needs population and must be driven by the latest data.

It was argued, by both respondents who agreed and disagreed with the proposal, that in addition to proxy measures, there should be an element of the formula that recognised actual needs and costs, to ensure all pupils' needs are met. They pointed to education, health and care (EHC) plans and local authorities' SEN data returns as possible sources of data.

Question 4: formula factors

Do you agree with the basic factors proposed for the formula?

Summary of responses

Respondents argued that any formula needs to be transparent and easily understood, and that all factors should be kept under review, perhaps annually, and with feedback from stakeholders taken into account.

There was general consensus that any data used should be updated regularly in order to match need. Respondents frequently emphasised that the basic factors need to be able to be captured from different sources and free from external manipulation.

A significant number of respondents said that they needed more information on weightings and impact before they could comment fully.

In addition, a number of respondents reiterated the belief that proxy indicators should not be used, and that high needs funding should be based on measures of actual need.

There was concern that only deprivation and population were proposed as factors for alternative provision funding. A significant number raised the issue that 16 to 25 year olds with SEN and disabilities would not be sufficiently covered by the proposed data to be used in the factors.

Other factors suggested by respondents include a growth factor, and a mechanism to capture complex or profound and multiple learning difficulties. In addition, it was argued that some special schools and academies built under the private finance initiative have inherited expensive liabilities, which should be included within the high needs funding formula.

Basic entitlement

	Total	Percentage
Agree	895	83%
Disagree	57	5%
Not Answered	123	11%

Summary of responses

A significant majority agreed that we should include a basic entitlement factor. A number of those who agreed considered that the basic per pupil/student element to recognise those in special schools and post-16 institutions should be £10,000.

It was also suggested that the basic entitlement factor should include pupils and students placed by local authorities in independent schools; and that the latest October schools census should be used rather than the previous January census, to ensure funding matched current needs as closely as possible.

Population

	Total	Percentage
Agree	723	67%
Disagree	199	19%
Not Answered	153	14%

Summary of responses

This factor was largely welcomed. It was felt that it would pick up the costs of high-cost pupils and students with complex needs who would not necessarily be captured by the other factors, such as deprivation and low attainment. Respondents noted that it should be updated regularly to reflect mobility. There were differing views as to whether it should have a high or low weighting.

The main reason given for disagreeing with the population factor as proposed was that its age range should be extended up to 25 years old, to reflect the responsibility of local authorities for 19-25 year-olds. This was also asserted by a number of those who agreed.

Children not in good health

	Total	Percentage
Agree	741	69%
Disagree	195	18%
Not Answered	139	13%

Summary of responses

The majority of respondents were in favour of the principle of a health factor in general, but some not with the specific measure proposed.

The criticisms were that the proposed measure was thought to be too subjective (i.e. based on parental reporting) and not updated with sufficient frequency (because the data set was drawn from the 2011 population census). It was also argued that this measure would not necessarily pick up children with mental health issues and those with more complex needs. Low birth weight was suggested as an alternative factor.

Child disability

	Total	Percentage
Agree	865	80%
Disagree	76	7%
Not Answered	134	12%

Summary of responses

A significant majority agreed that a child disability factor should be included.

A number of respondents welcomed the use of DLA, as it is regularly updated. However, many expressed concern that DLA is not always an accurate predictor of need, as some parents do not apply for it and it only identifies higher levels of disability.

A large number of respondents asked whether there is an equivalent factor for post-16 students.

Low attainment at key stage 2

	Total	Percentage
Agree	805	75%
Disagree	128	12%
Not Answered	142	13%

Low attainment at key stage 4

	Total	Percentage
Agree	790	73%
Disagree	131	12%
Not Answered	154	14%

Summary of responses

Although the key stage 2 and 4 indicators were met with similar levels of approval, a significant number of respondents argued that key stage 2 data is inconsistent and unreliable, and would need to be backed up by robust moderation systems.

One of the issues most commonly raised by both those who agreed and those who disagreed was that there should be an earlier measure of prior attainment, for early years and at key stage 1.

The indicators were criticised for being based on old assessment measures and for being too simplistic. It was argued that low attainment indicators can reflect poor teaching; are not relevant to children who attend special schools; and may not capture the costs of children and young people with mental health issues or those with autistic spectrum disorder who were high functioning. Some thought there was a risk that the measures would tend to reward failure, while penalising highly successful schools, or local authorities who achieve good outcomes for children and young people. It was also suggested that it would be more helpful to use an indicator that can differentiate between levels of low attainment, rather than using a simple cut-off point as proposed.

Deprivation – free school meal eligibility

	Total	Percentage
Agree	817	76%
Disagree	123	11%
Not Answered	135	13%

Summary of responses

There was widespread agreement that a deprivation factor should be included in the formula. Although many felt that it should be given a high weighting, there was also concern that this factor was being double-counted, having already been included in the schools national funding formula proposals.

Many respondents said that the Ever6 free school meals (FSM) measure should be used, as it is an indicator of persistent deprivation. It was also argued that FSM can be an unreliable factor, due to low registration rates since the introduction of free school meals at key stage 1, and that it could be further affected by the introduction of universal credit.

Deprivation – income deprivation affecting children index

	Total	Percentage
Agree	765	71%
Disagree	172	16%
Not Answered	138	13%

Summary of responses

Again, there was general agreement that a deprivation factor should be included, but the use of the income deprivation affecting children index (IDACI) measure raised more concerns than the use of FSM, mostly due to the infrequency of updates and the turbulence such updates could cause.

It was also argued that IDACI on its own does not work well as a proxy measure in rural areas.

Adjustments – for “imports/exports”

	Total	Percentage
Agree	716	67%
Disagree	183	17%
Not Answered	176	16%

Summary of responses

Although not fully reflected in the percentages above, this proposal was very well received.

The main concerns expressed from those who disagreed were that an 'import/export' adjustment would not incentivise local authorities to provide special provision locally because it could encourage movement across local authority borders; that the arrangement may have a detrimental impact on small local authorities; and that more information is needed on how it would work. A significant number of respondents asked for a simple and regular system of adjustments.

Question 5: hospital education

We are not proposing to make changes to the distribution of funding for hospital education, but would welcome views as we continue working with representatives of this sector on the way forward.

Summary of responses

Whilst there was widespread agreement with our proposed course of action, many respondents expressed their concern with the continued use of historic spending levels as a basis for funding, and felt this should only continue in the short term. The caveat to this was the suggestion that it could be adjusted annually if used in the longer term.

There was a variety of suggestions about the means through which hospital education should be funded in future, including: a formula with proxy factors; and place-led funding using national rates.

Opinion was divided on the use of in-patient data as a proxy indicator. While numerous respondents supported exploring the use of this data, many did not believe it would work, as a majority of patients are discharged very quickly and many then tend to require continuing educational support while they recuperate at home.

Question 6: area cost adjustment

Which methodology for the area cost adjustment do you support?

	Total	Percentage
General labour market methodology	282	26%
Hybrid methodology	661	61%
Not Answered	132	12%

Summary of responses

The majority of respondents were in support of the hybrid methodology, as they felt that it better mirrored costs in the education sector, whereas the general labour market (GLM) methodology would overfund high-cost areas, such as London. There were, however, a number of suggested modifications, including adjustments for non-teaching and specialist staff. There were a number of respondents who preferred the hybrid methodology to GLM, but did not agree with the principle of an area cost adjustment.

Those in favour of the GLM indicator felt that it was simple and transparent. London authorities also believed that it better reflected high costs associated with London. There was also support for the area cost adjustment not being specific to London: for example, taking into account high-cost rural areas.

Those who did not answer included respondents who did not agree with the principle of an area cost adjustment, those who suggested a 'cost of living' adjustment instead, and some who felt the same methodology should be used in both the high needs and schools national funding formulae.

Question 7: 2016-17 spending

Do you agree that we should include a proportion of 2016-17 spending in the formula allocations of funding for high needs?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	831	77%
No	159	15%
Not Answered	85	8%

Summary of responses

A large number of comments on this question cross-referenced question 8, which relates to the proposed protection of high needs funding levels for local authorities through a minimum funding guarantee (MFG); many responses agreed that a form of transitional protection would be required, but did not agree with using two forms of protection, i.e. 2016-17 spend and an MFG. It was argued that using two layers of protection would unfairly benefit highly funded local authorities, at the expense of those less well funded.

Of the two forms of transitional protection, responses indicated a preference for only the MFG to be applied, due to its simplicity and transparency.

To enable a smooth transition and allow local authorities to fund current commitments, many felt a 5 year transition period would be reasonable, although suggestions ranged from 3 to at least 10 years, due to the typical length of an EHC plan. Most respondents agreed that a clear, planned, phased approach would be needed during that period.

The baseline was generally seen as a good starting point. However, many felt that this should reflect total spending on high needs, including the use of reserves; and some felt that spend over the last three years would present a truer picture of the pattern of spend. There were concerns over the ring fencing of schools funding and its impact on planning for authorities facing reductions in high needs funding. Some highlighted that places in colleges and non-maintained special schools should be included in the baseline, or that pupil numbers should be removed.

Question 8: minimum funding guarantee

Do you agree with our proposal to protect local authorities' funding through an overall minimum funding guarantee?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	952	89%
No	61	6%
Not Answered	62	6%

Summary of responses

The majority strongly agreed that a minimum funding guarantee (MFG) would be the best way to manage a smooth transition. It was felt that use of an MFG would need to be set out clearly in advance, to enable planning over the relevant time period (e.g. 5 years).

As in the responses to question 7, many felt that only one form of transitional protection should be used, and there was a clear preference for an MFG over the use of 2016-17 spending levels, although clarity would be needed on whether the MFG would also be based on the 2016-17 high needs spend baseline.

Most expressed a preference for a low-rate MFG, to enable authorities to manage change and long-term commitments. For example, many London authorities suggested an MFG set at 0%. 2% and tapered or phased MFGs were also advocated. However, it was felt that an MFG should not stop the new formula, and a 5 year MFG was seen as reasonable by many.

The comments of those who disagreed or did not answer the question also referred to the need for a smooth transition to the new formula, but wanted further information on how the MFG would be applied and work alongside the 2016-17 spend element from question 7.

Question 9: national guidelines

We welcome views on what should be covered in any national guidelines on what schools offer for their pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.

Summary of responses

Many schools felt that this question should be dealt with in a separate consultation and that more detail was needed before a response could be given.

Many respondents were against the idea of national guidelines rather than in favour. One of the most frequent themes was that schools should have freedom to tailor their provision and offer.

The inclusion of children and young people with SEN and disabilities was mentioned most often by schools and other organisations as a subject to be covered in national guidelines, both in terms of their admission into mainstream schools and their integration into the life of the school. There was also reference to mitigating the risk of exclusions, once children were admitted.

Those respondents in favour of national guidelines wanted to know what schools should be expected to offer and what good provision for pupils with SEN and disabilities would look like. They sought examples of good practice; the encouragement of evidence-based approaches; and increased visibility of schools' offers via their websites.

Question 10: special units

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the funding of special units in mainstream schools?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	587	55%
No	348	32%
Not Answered	140	13%

Summary of responses

Those in favour believed that this would simplify and increase transparency, and supported the change towards funding pupils rather than places, not least so that the funding special units receive could reflect area costs.

Responses expressed concerns as to whether this proposal would improve flexibility for in-year placements, which are common in this type of setting, or financially disadvantage providers who accept pupils in-year. There was also concern that special units would be underfunded if they were not full on census day, leading to places being filled early and reducing the scope for later in-year placements. There was general agreement, however, that flexibility for in-year placements is important.

Many respondents thought that it was important that any new arrangement encouraged mainstream schools to be more inclusive.

Some responded that inconsistencies in the age-related per pupil funding would mean primary schools, especially those in affluent areas, would lose out, while secondary schools would benefit from this proposal. It was suggested that the amount of place funding should be the equal to the difference between the per pupil element and £10,000.

Those who disagreed with the proposal had concerns about the level of funding and adverse impact of pupil numbers fluctuating year-on-year. They believed that the place funding should be sufficient to fully support fixed costs and argued for keeping funding for units in line with funding for special schools, at £10,000 per place.

Question 11: overcoming barriers to inclusion

We welcome examples of local authorities that are using centrally-retained funding in a strategic way to overcome barriers to integration and inclusion.

Summary of responses

Respondents said that cross-school collaboration (e.g. schools working together in clusters) is key to reducing financial burdens, and that working across regions as opposed to just local authorities can also be effective and reduce costs.

Outreach programmes with staff from special schools working with pupils in mainstream schools could improve the inclusion of pupils with SEN and disabilities in the latter. Centrally retained local authority specialist staff (e.g. area SENCOs and educational psychologists) can be used to increase the integration of pupils with SEN.

Early intervention is important, with local authorities centrally allocating funding and monitoring individual pupil outcomes for under-5s. Such early intervention strategies can promote a smooth transition for mainstream pupils with potential SEN, removing the need for an education, health and care (EHC) plan and reducing the burden of misdiagnosis or misplacement.

A strategy for reducing permanent exclusions was also said to be significant in increasing inclusion and integration.

Improving the retention of children and young people in their own local school, with the support of specialist provision, reduces overall costs in the long term, with less reliance on more expensive permanent placements, especially those at some distance from their home.

Such investment could also reduce transport costs for pupils with SEN and disabilities.

A collaborative approach between those responsible for education budgets and those responsible for health budgets would also be beneficial for high needs provision.

Question 12: supporting inclusive schools

We welcome examples of where centrally-retained funding is used to support schools that are very inclusive and have a high proportion of pupils with particular types of special education needs, or a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs.

Summary of responses

We received a number of examples where centrally retained funding is used to support schools that are very inclusive and have a high proportion of pupils with particular types of special education needs, or a disproportionate number of pupils with high needs. The majority of these examples related to authorities supplementing the notional SEN budget of such schools.

Question 13: independent special schools

Do you agree that independent special schools should be given the opportunity to receive place funding directly from the Education Funding Agency with the balance in the form of top-up funding from local authorities?

	Total	Percentage
Yes	354	33%
No	585	54%
Not Answered	136	13%

Summary of responses

The majority of responses were against giving independent schools the opportunity to receive place funding. Those who agreed with this proposal often expressed the same concerns as those who disagreed, but also believed that the proposal would bring about consistency.

19 independent or non-maintained special schools responded. Except for 2, all agreed with the proposal. However, nearly all of them stated that they were unsure as to the benefit of opting in.

The majority of local authorities who responded disagreed, mainly due to the higher costs of placements in independent schools, and were concerned as to whether their budgets would be top-sliced to fund this.

Related to this, another concern expressed by a high number of respondents was the issue of unfilled places: if places were funded but not filled, funding would be wasted, or there would need to be an effective mechanism for clawing back funding. Respondents noted that pupils are often placed or moved part-way through a year.

Question 14: post-16 providers

We welcome views on the outline and principles of the proposed changes to post-16 place funding and on how specialist provision in further education colleges might be identified and designated.

Summary of responses

There was strong agreement that funding should be consistent across pre- and post-16 settings, including to age 25.

There was also agreement that the £10,000 per year place funding should be extended to specialist colleges, although this should be pro rata for institutions who do not offer 5-day provision.

Many supported the move of some of the £6,000 per place funding into the formula, although there were mixed responses on the viability of proxy measures. Several responses highlighted issues in the accuracy of the individual learner record (ILR) and requested that allocations be based on later data returns, reducing the lag between data collection and funding.

Agreement on the proposal for specialist units in further education (FE) settings was mixed, with concern that units represented a move away from inclusive provision. There was strong agreement that the designation of special units in schools should not be replicated in FE, given the difference in FE study programmes, and because the facilities of the FE college as a whole would be relevant.

There were mixed responses on local authorities being involved in the designation of units, with some supporting automatic designation where institutions have more than 10 high needs students. Others were unsure why there was a need for funding to differ between institutions with different numbers of high needs students.

There were concerns from some that the post-16 offer is underdeveloped and that more needs to be done to improve the availability of suitable provision for young people with SEN and disabilities.

List of organisations that responded to the first stage of consultation

Achievement for All

Achieving for Children - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Achieving for Children - Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

Active Learning Trust

Afasic

Alliance for Inclusive Education

Ambitious about Autism

Ark

Ascent

Association of Colleges

Association of Independent Schools and Non-Maintained Special Schools

Association of London Directors of Children's Services

Association of National Specialist Colleges

Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)

Association of Swindon Special School Headteachers

Azure Charitable Enterprises

Bedford Borough Council

Bedfordshire East Multi Academy Trust (BEMAT)

Bicester Learning Academy

Birmingham City Council

Blackpool Council

Bolton Borough Council

Bolton Schools Forum

Bournemouth Borough Council

Bracknell Forest Council

Bradford City Council

Brent Council and Funding Forum

Brighton and Hove City Council

Bristol City Council
British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD)
Bromley Schools Forum
Brooke Weston Trust
Buckinghamshire County Council
Buckinghamshire Special Educational Needs and Disability Information, Advice and Support (SEND IAS) Service
Bury Council
Calderdale Schools Forum
Cambridgeshire County Council
Cambridgeshire Primary Heads Finance Group
Cambridgeshire Schools Forum
Catch22
Catholic Education Service
Central Bedfordshire Council
Chailey Heritage Foundation
Cheney School Academy Trust
Cheshire East Council
Cheshire West & Chester Special Schools Heads Association
Cheshire West And Chester Council
Cheshire West and Chester Schools Forum
Children's Services Development Group (CSDG)
Chilford Hundred Education Trust
City of York Council
Coombe Secondary Schools Academy Trust
Cornwall Council and Schools Forum
Cottenham Academy Trust
Coventry City Council
Cranmer Education Trust
Cumbria Association of Secondary Headteachers

Darlington Borough Council
Derbyshire County Council
Devon County Council
Doncaster Borough Council
Dorset County Council
Down's Syndrome Association
Dudley Borough Council
Durham County Council
Durham Sensory Team, SEND and Inclusion services
Ealing Schools Forum
East Midlands Education Trust
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
East Sussex County Council
Enfield Schools Forum
Engage in their Future
Essex County Council
Essex Schools Forum
f40
Family Voice Norfolk
Federation of Derbyshire Special Schools
Federation of Leaders in Special Education
Foundation for the Education of the Underachieving and Dyslexic
Freedom and Autonomy for Schools - National Association (FASNA)
Gateshead Council
Gateshead Schools Forum
Girls' Day School Trust (GDST)
GLF Schools
Gloucestershire County Council
Gloucestershire Schools Forum
Guildford Diocesan Board of Education

Guildford Education Partnership (GEP Academies)
Halton Borough Council
Halton Schools Forum
Hampshire County Council
Hamwic Trust
Haringey Schools Forum
Hartlepool Borough Council
Havering Schools Forum
Herefordshire County Council and Schools Forum
Hertfordshire County Council
Hornbeam Academy Trust
Hull City Council
Hull Schools Forum
I CAN
Independent Parental Special Education Advice (IPSEA)
Independent Schools Council
Isle of Wight Council
Islington Schools Forum
Kent County Council
Kent Schools Funding Forum
Kirklees Schools Forum
Kirklees Special School Heads
Knowsley Borough Council
Knowsley Schools Forum
Lampton School Academy Trust
Lancashire Association of School Governing Bodies
Lancashire County Council
Lancashire Schools Forum
Learning Alliance Academy Trust
Leeds City Council

Leicester City Council
Leicester Primary School Partnership
Leicestershire County Council
Lewisham Schools Forum
Lincolnshire County Council
Liverpool City Council
Local Government Association
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham School Forum
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Redbridge
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Councils
Luton Borough Council
Luton Schools Forum
Manchester City Council

Manchester Schools' Forum
Medway Council
Mencap
Middlesborough Council
Milton Keynes Council
NAHT
National Day Nurseries Association
National Deaf Children's Society
National Governors' Association
National SEND Forum
National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP)
National Union of Teachers
Newcastle City Council
Newcastle Schools Forum
Norfolk Schools Forum
North East Lincolnshire Schools' Forum
North Essex Schools Partnership
North Lincolnshire Schools Forum
North Somerset Council
North Somerset Strategic Schools Forum
North Tyneside Council
North Tyneside Schools Forum
North Yorkshire County Council
North Yorkshire Education Partnership (Schools Forum)
Northumberland County Council
Nottingham City Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Nova Training
Oldham Borough Council
Olympus Academy Trust

Orchard Hill College & Academy Trust
Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire Schools Forum
Plymouth City Council
Plymouth Schools Forum
Poole Borough Council
Portsmouth City Council
Portsmouth Schools Forum
Priory Education and Children's Services
Progress to Excellence
Realgroup
Redbridge Schools Forum
Rochdale Borough Council
Rotherham Borough Council
Royal Borough of Greenwich Schools Forum
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Rutland and District Schools' Federation
Salford City Council
Sandwell Borough Council
Saturn Education Trust
SCHOOLS NorthEast
SchoolsCompany Multi-Academy Trust
Sefton Borough Council
SEND Family Voices
SEND Karma
Sense
Sensory Support Service
Sheffield City Council, Sheffield Schools Forum and Learn Sheffield
Shropshire Council and Shropshire Schools Forum

Slough Borough Council
Slough Schools Forum
Society of County Treasurers
Solihull Borough Council
Solihull Schools Forum
Somerset Road Education Trust
Somerset Schools Forum
South and West Leaders in Special Schools and Special Schools Voice
South Craven Academy Trust
South Gloucestershire Schools Forum
South Tyneside Council
Southend Borough Council
Southwark Council
Southwark Schools Forum
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Academy Trust (SENDAT)
Special Educational Needs. Somerset Expertise (sen.se)
Special Interest Group of Municipal Authorities (SIGOMA)
St Helens Council
Staffordshire County Council
Staffordshire Schools Forum
Staploe Education Trust
Stockport Council and Schools Forum
Stockport Primary Headteachers Consortium
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Strategic Services for Children & Young People (SSCYP)
Suffolk Association of Secondary Headteachers and Eastern Region Headteachers
Association
Suffolk County Council
Suffolk Schools Forum

Sunderland City Council
Sunderland Schools Forum
Surrey County Council
Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust
Swindon Association of Primary Headteachers (SAPH)
Swindon Borough Council and Swindon Schools Forum
Tameside Borough Council
Telford & Wrekin Council
The Association of Directors of Children's Services
The Association of Teachers & Lecturers
The Castle Partnership Trust
The Dunraven Educational Trust
The Howard Partnership Trust
The National Autistic Society
The Olympus Academy Trust
The Robert Carre Trust
Thurrock Council
Torbay Council Schools Forum
Torfield and Saxon Mount Academy Trust
Trafford Council
Trafford School Funding Forum
Twyford Academies Trust
Virtual School Sensory Support
Voice
Wakefield Council
Walsall Council
Walsall Schools Forum
Wandsworth Council
Warrington Borough Council
Warrington Borough Council

Warwickshire County Council
Warwickshire Schools Forum
WESC Foundation
West Berkshire Council
West Sussex County Council
Westminster City Council
Wigan Council
Wiltshire Association of Secondary and Special School Headteachers
Wiltshire Council
Wiltshire Schools Forum
Wimborne Academy Trust
Windsor and Maidenhead Schools Forum
Wirral Schools Forum
Wokingham Borough Council
Wolverhampton Schools Forum
Woodnewton Academy Trust
Worcestershire County Council
World of Inclusion Ltd
Wycombe High School Academies Trust



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2016

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9
4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications

Reference: DFE-00362-2016



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk