

As indicated in the review, there were some key data sets used to inform the financial allocations presented in the banding review meeting. We were informed that the selection of counties/areas used for the purposes of comparison weren't the only areas used but were instead a fair representation of the findings. As a federation of schools we, like the Local Authority, are always comparing our outcomes/Income/exclusions with our neighbours, however the data we have indicates that when the cuts have been made by the LA we will be funded the third from bottom compared with our SEMH counterparts in Derby, Northamptonshire, Coventry, Sandwell, Birmingham, Peterborough and Walsall.

Table included below:

Comparison with other SEMH specialist provision

School name	Local authority	School type	Main specialism	Total pupils	Attainment 8, 2019	Absence rate	Leadership pay scale, %	Mean staff sick days	Income, 2018	Fixed period exclusion rate, 2018
Keyham Lodge School	Leicester	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	112	6.3	23.30%	30.3%	3.3	£31,348	32.79
Kingsmead School	Derby	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	89	5.9	22.13%	18.0%	5.2	£50,736	8.20
Kings Meadow School	Northamptonshire	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	35		8.78%	33.3%	8.1	£23,702	14.29
Woodfield	Coventry	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	149	6.8	24.60%	9.7%	3.3	£24,255	33.33
Shenstone Lodge School	Sandwell	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	78		18.22%	16.7%	8.8	£42,032	50.70
Springfield House Community Special School	Birmingham	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	95		11.90%		11.2	£29,512	80.21
The Gateway School	Northamptonshire	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	62	7.0	18.11%	20.0%	2.3	£32,772	63.49
Nene Gate	Peterborough	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	46	3.0	30.60%	28.6%	3.2	£29,573	202.33
Elmwood School	Walsall	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	72	1.7	12.53%	20.0%	6.8	£26,941	47.69
Lindsworth School	Birmingham	Community/non-maintained school	Social, emotional and mental health	117	6.3	29.08%	22.7%	6.7	£29,381	103.51

However, when the financial adjustments are made the other schools will be:

Funding in 2018:

School name	Local authority	Main specialism	Total pupils	FSM, %	FSM6, %	Leadership pay scale, %	Mean salary	Mean staff sick days	Income, 2018
Nether Hall School	Leicester	Visual impairment	100	37.0%	61.0%	22.2%	£40,797	2.8	£23,611
Oaklands School	Leicester	Speech, language and communication	109	31.2%	41.3%	23.5%	£40,332	2.9	£21,343
Ash Field Academy	Leicester	Speech, language and communication	158	33.5%	48.9%	15.6%	£41,629	7.5	£35,585
West Gate School	Leicester	Speech, language and communication	177	42.4%	63.8%	15.6%	£42,182	2.1	£24,867
Ellesmere College	Leicester	Speech, language and communication	279	43.7%	55.8%	10.9%	£39,611	7.2	£19,470
Dorothy Goodman School Hinckley	Leicestershire	Speech, language and communication	291	28.5%	35.2%	14.3%	£38,961	3.1	£18,933
Brackenfield Special School	Derbyshire	Speech, language and communication	83	45.8%	60.2%	25.0%	£37,876	11.4	£23,391
The Grantham Sandon School	Lincolnshire	Speech, language and communication	75	29.3%	52.9%	27.3%	£35,986	2.9	£19,024
Bennerley Fields School	Derbyshire	Speech, language and communication	89	47.2%	59.6%	23.1%	£44,407		
St Clare's School	Derby	Speech, language and communication	127	37.0%	53.5%	23.5%	£47,782	3.7	£15,142
The Pines Special School	Birmingham	Speech, language and communication	167	36.5%	48.5%	12.5%	£41,497	8.9	£19,425
Oscott Manor School	Birmingham	Speech, language and communication	115	41.7%	57.5%		£41,828	2.4	£20,799
Hamilton School	Birmingham	Speech, language and communication	122	54.9%	58.2%	15.8%	£35,151	3.7	£20,744
Cherry Oak School	Birmingham	Speech, language and communication	112	36.6%	52.7%		£38,182	13.3	£17,792

Funding after the review:

DESCRIPTION	UOM	JHEF	OAKLANDS	ELLESMERE	NETHERHALL	WESTGATE	KEYHAM	MILLGATE
Revised 2020/21 funding rates								
Non teaching								
Leadership	£/pupil		£2,745	£2,215	£2,745	£2,134	£2,745	£2,745
Other staff and non staffing	£/pupil		£5,677	£5,677	£5,677	£5,677	£5,677	£5,677
Transfers to capital	£/pupil		0	0	0	0	0	0
Total non- teaching	£/pupil		£8,423	£7,892	£8,423	£7,812	£8,423	£8,423
Band 1 teaching	£/pupil		£12,211	£12,211	£12,211	£12,211	£12,211	£12,211
Band 2 teaching	£/pupil		£13,890	£13,890	£13,890	£13,890	£13,890	£13,890
Band 3 teaching	£/pupil		£14,427	£14,427	£14,427	£14,427	£14,427	£14,427
Band 4 teaching	£/pupil		£15,569	£15,569	£15,569	£15,569	£15,569	£15,569
Band 5 teaching	£/pupil		£18,927	£18,927	£18,927	£18,927	£18,927	£18,927
Band 6 teaching	£/pupil		£25,643	£25,643	£25,643	£25,643	£25,643	£25,643
Teaching - weighted average	£/pupil		£16,237	£14,984	£16,337	£17,226	£21,565	£22,091
Other income	£/pupil		(£1,500)	(£1,500)	(£1,500)	(£1,500)	(£1,500)	(£1,500)
Net Funding from LAs	£/pupil		£23,159	£21,376	£23,260	£23,537	£28,488	£29,014
Increase/(Reduction) in funding rate compared to 2019/20	£/pupil		£1,109	£2,947	£914	£1,463	(£2,637)	(£8,123)
			5%	18%	4%	7%	-8%	-22%
2019/20 Current funding rates (including specific)	£/pupil		£22,050	£18,429	£22,346	£22,074	£31,125	£37,137

This means that after the review:

Ellesmere will be the receiving more money than any comparable school in Birmingham, Derby, Lincolnshire and Leicestershire.

DSP funding for schools within the Leicestershire boundary will be funded at comparable rates with Keyham Lodge.

A staffing ratio of 2:1 at Band 6 cannot be funded within the amount of money allocated post-review

Ratios of Band 5 and 6 allocated as the average weighting will need to be maintained as staff/student ratios cannot be achieved within the funding in year

Within the national context and the current covid climate, it is imperative that as a federation of schools we also bring the focus on to disadvantaged students. Using the government document [Pupil premium allocations 2019 to 2020: school level \(updated March 2020\)](#) it is evident that the proportion of pupils that attend both Millgate and Keyham Lodge School, are from a significantly increased level of disadvantage than the students who attend the other special schools within the city. This means, that in real terms, this level of disadvantage, family instability combined with their complex social, emotional, mental health and learning needs means that these are the students who are at most risk of serious criminal behaviours that result in knife crime, violent crimes and who then go on to receive significant custodial sentences if effective therapy, education and interventions are not put in place.

Pupil Premium and Disadvantaged Students Comparison

School Name	School Type	Parliamentary Constituency	Number of pupils on roll (7)	Number of Primary pupils on roll (9)	Number of Primary pupils eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium	Percentage of Primary pupils eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium	Deprivation Pupil Premium Allocation (11)	Number of Secondary pupils on roll (10)	Number of Secondary pupils eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium	Percentage of Secondary pupils eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium	Deprivation Pupil Premium Allocation (12)	Total number of pupils eligible for the Deprivation Pupil Premium	Total allocation for the Deprivation Pupil Premium
Ash Field Academy	Special Academy	Leicester East	141.0	80.0	36.0	45.0%	£47,520	61.0	26.0	42.6%	£24,310	62	£71,830

Nether Hall School	Foundation special school	Leicester East	77.0	32.0	26.0	81.3%	£34,320	45.0	21.0	46.7%	£19,635	47	£53,955
Millgate School	Community special school	Leicester South	100.0	18.0	16.0	88.9%	£21,120	82.0	60.0	73.2%	£56,100	76	£77,220
Oaklands School	Community special school	Leicester East	109.0	109.0	43.0	39.4%	£56,760	0.0	0.0	0.0%	£0	43	£56,760
Ellesmere College	Community special school	South Leicestershire	208.0	50.0	22.0	44.0%	£29,040	158.0	89.0	56.3%	£83,215	111	£112,255
Keyham Lodge School	Community special school	Leicester East	112.0	9.0	7.0	77.8%	£9,240	103.0	79.0	76.7%	£73,865	86	£83,105
West Gate School	Foundation special school	Leicester West	138.0	64.0	35.0	54.7%	£46,200	74.0	49.0	66.2%	£45,815	84	£92,015

To reduce the costs of these students provision using the banding methodology that you have applied in your proposal, which is wholly based on generalised staffing ratios instead of the specialist care that these students need; means that we will not be able to meet the complex needs that we are being presented with.

During the meeting, it was made clear that these cases were few, however our experience at ground level is very different. Our current cohort is made up of pupils currently who:

- We have called an emergency annual review for, because we know we cannot meet their needs at our current level of funding. This is because they are perpetrators of extreme and daily violence towards others. They use weapons against staff and adults, yet when other settings have been consulted, where the cost per place is significantly above ours, that have said they cannot offer a place due to the complexity of their needs (1 student of these has had 98 schools refuse him a place in the last 4 months).
- Have current sexual assault cases, in which they are the accused perpetrators; that cannot be in the school building, due to the vulnerability of others, so as a result we have to provide specialist therapy, a bespoke 1:1 education and find an alternative venue.
- Have such high/extreme self-harming behaviours that they have tried to slit their throat or wrists in front of other adults whilst at other provisions and in their homes

- Have a formal diagnosis of psychosis and other complex mental health needs that need specialist input.
- The school provides clothing, food and electricity for because they live in such abject poverty.
- Have had court orders to say they cannot be in the city and are consequently moved to other locations of the country; however because they cannot be educated in other provisions they are returned to the city and we are expected to resume their education. Again the other provisions receive a far higher per pupil place rate than we do but they have not been able to meet their needs.
- Are habitual knife carriers and actively part of the county lines.

Please do not think that this is emotive rhetoric, these are the facts that sit behind what we do.

If at the end of the consultation, no changes are made we will of course adjust what we do so that we can offer a service that is financially viable but this will come at the cost of working with these complexities of need. We are all held to account for meeting the needs as set out within the EHCPs, but please do not forget we are also legally responsible for our staff's safety at work. This funding model that you have proposed does not reflect the specialist provision that is needed and the perception that these cases are rare; does not meet with the reality of what is happening in our schools.

Please do not just take our word for it though, we are happy to welcome you into our provision and you can talk to the children first hand and see what you class as rare become the norm. However I must once again stress that the information that you have based these decisions on is flawed and the evidence that I have sited in this document only scratches the surface. Furthermore, the result of these funding cuts, if applied in the form that you have suggested, will force us to schedule a series of emergency annual reviews because we will not be able to continue to fund the education of these children after April. We will instead, from this point forwards, adjust our cohort so that the proportion of band 5's and 6's now matches what you have allocated.

In addition to this we will also need to reduce our numbers to ensure that we achieve safe working levels. We will not compromise on the quality of education on offer within our schools and if the LA can only base their decisions on staffing ratios instead of children's needs then unfortunately we must adapt how many Band 6 pupils we will be able to work with and reduce the flexibility of the provision to work within the confines which LCC dictates that we must operate.