

**SUPPLEMENT TO THE AGENDA FOR**

# **Herefordshire Schools Forum**

**Friday 13 January 2017**

**9.30 am**

**The Council Chamber - The Shire Hall, St. Peter's Square,  
Hereford, HR1 2HX**

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>5. BUDGET WORKING GROUP</b>	3 - 8
<b>6. DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT AND HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS BUDGET 2017/18</b>	9 - 14
<b>7. LOOKING TO THE FUTURE</b>	15 - 50



**HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM – 13 JANUARY 2017**

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE BUDGET WORKING GROUP**

(This report which includes additional recommendations to the Forum should be read in conjunction with the accompanying presentation slides).

The Budget Working Group (BWG) met on 6 January. The report to the Schools Forum on the Dedicated Schools Grant 2017/18 includes details of the final DSG settlement as published by government on 20 December 2016. However, it does not include any comment from the BWG referring only to the submission of a supplementary report from the Group. This is set out below and includes comments from the BWG together with a number of additional recommendations to the Forum.

The notes of the Group's meeting have been circulated separately to members of the Forum for information.

**1. PROPOSALS FOR DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2017/18**

Following a presentation of the updated position regarding Dedicated Schools Grant for 2017/18 The BWG was asked to consider the following points:

- a. school funding values for 2017/8
- b. confirmation of Education Services Grant (ESG) proposals for 2017/18 – including the use of one-off transitional funding
- c. confirmation of ESG retained duties and central school services block funding
- d. early years consultation paper – BWG to agree central EY budget proposals.
- e. initial consideration of the implications for Herefordshire schools of the DfE's stage two consultation on the national school funding formula

The presentation re-iterated the BWG's guiding principles as the basis for discussion and agreement of the proposals to be submitted to Schools Forum.

In summary the DSG settlement for 2017/18 was slightly better than expected with an increase of £280k to the schools block, £360k to the high needs block and an increase on the early years hourly rate.

**a. School funding 2017/18**

It was proposed to use the surplus funds in the schools block to move funding rates towards those proposed for the national formula. A range of options were presented to increase the primary lump sum, increase rates for low prior attainment, increase rates for deprivation or a combination of these. The BWG felt the funding should seek to address those factors where Herefordshire spent a lower percentage than the proposed national formula. The BWG agreed to propose that the surplus funds be allocated to increase the factors for deprivation and low prior attainment. The formula calculations (on the basis of a percentage increase) would allow increases as follows:

- Deprivation per primary ever-6 free school meal pupil – increase of £40

- Deprivation per secondary ever-6 free school meal pupil – increase of £41
- Low prior attainment per primary pupil – increase of £95
- Low prior attainment per secondary pupil – increase of £110

Additionally, the DfE has requested that Herefordshire apply for an exceptional premises funding factor to cover the cost of the property lease in relation to Eastnor school following its conversion to academy status. This would not affect any other school and that from 2018 the DfE would pick up the cost as part of the national funding formula. It is proposed to overspend the schools block by £8,460 and underspend the central schools block to account for the cost.

#### **b. ESG proposals for 2017/18**

The ESG transition grant fund has been confirmed as £372k which was more than expected. This is one-off funding which the council proposed to use to reduce the impact of the ESG reduction on local authority maintained schools. It was noted that should any school convert to academy status before August 2017 then the grant would be reduced accordingly.

The proposals were:

- to create a reserve for exceptional redundancies reducing the top-slice on maintained schools from proposed £15.70 to £13.50 per pupil (cost £210k);
- to replace the school improvement funding for maintained schools for the summer term 2017 prior to the DfE/RSC funding kicking in (cost £50k); and
- Retain remainder for school improvement functions in discussion with school improvement partnership (cost £110k).

Regarding exceptional redundancy costs, it was explained that each case would be judged on its merits but that there could be situations where the council would be liable for redundancy costs such as where a small school closed with insufficient funds to meet the redundancy costs.

It was suggested that the £110k retained for school improvement functions be used to support apprenticeship levy costs for LA maintained schools. It was acknowledged that this support would only be for a limited period.

#### **c. ESG retained duties and central school services block**

The ESG retained duties funding was £360k, much as expected and the central school services block was £300k again as expected. Approval had been given from the DfE to increase expenditure for schools forum and admissions costs. It was proposed to increase school forum funding by £7k to £12k pa to better reflect the costs of both schools forum and the budget working group and to increase admissions funding by £15k from £127k to £142k to include software licensing costs.

It was confirmed that the funding for the MASH team was now included within an SLA as directed by the DfE. The previous permission for a top-slice applied for one year only.

#### **d. Early years consultation paper**

The early years consultation paper was summarised as a national increase to the hourly rates which translated to Herefordshire as a proposed average hourly rate for 3 and 4 year olds was £4.01, up from £3.48. The deprivation factor had also increased but eligibility would be more restricted.

The proposed retained central spend was 4.6% (after the extension to 30 hours), being well below the maximum allowed which was 7% for 2017/18 and 5% for 2018/19. The central spend was proposed to cover quality improvement, inclusion support and training, NEF payment admin and marketing & advertising.

The proposed rates were out to consultation with a closing date of 31 January 2017. The new hourly rate would commence from 1 April 2017.

It was proposed to transfer responsibility for some early years high needs costs from the high needs block to the early years block. The cost was projected at £100k but could be higher depending on demand for support for high needs early year's pupils increasing to 30 hours. This would alleviate some pressure on the high needs block.

There was discussion of the proposal which covered the following points:

- that the principle of retaining the integrity of the funding blocks should be adhered to
- if the pressure on the high needs block required additional funding that these should be drawn equally from the early years and schools block
- that the national funding formula restricted the option to take funds from the schools block
- that regulations and guidance from the DfE allowed these costs to be funded from either block
- that the information on special school funding shared at the last meeting of the BWG showed a potential cost of £485k to uplift budgets to meet inflationary pressures
- that there could be seen to be a contradiction in the guiding principles in that to meet the principle of supporting vulnerable pupils it might be necessary to disregard the integrity of the funding blocks
- that the high needs block was intended to cover needs of children and young people aged from 0 to 25
- that there should be consistency across the phases in how high needs costs were met

Following full discussion of the potential implications for both early years settings and schools it was proposed to:

- a) it consider the allocation of the high needs block and early years block further at the BWG meeting on 24 February 2017 when more detail on high needs pressures would be available;
- b) it make recommendations on the allocation of both blocks on that date for the Schools Forum to consider at its meeting on 10 March; and
- c) it review its guiding principles to ensure that they remained sound.

## **2. Initial discussion on National school funding formula – Stage two consultation**

The outcome of the proposed national funding formula was poor overall for Herefordshire. On the currently proposed values Herefordshire would gain by about £1 a pupil in the first year overall and around £10 per pupil by 2021. There would be wide variation on an individual schools basis and not all schools in low funded authorities will see an increase.

A spreadsheet, compiled from data made public by the DfE, was circulated which showed the funding each school would have received for 2016/17 had the national funding formula currently proposed been in effect. It was noted that the pupil premium allocation would be in addition to these figures. Generally small primary schools gained from the higher lump sum and larger primary schools lost due to the lower per pupil funding. Schools with relatively little deprivation and high prior attainment also lost out. It was noted that no Herefordshire school would have lost more than 3% of their budget under the proposed formula.

Further information would be provided following a meeting of the f40 group later in the month where the formula would be discussed with senior staff from the DfE. It was proposed that a joint response be compiled to the stage 2 consultation with views from both the LA and the Schools Forum. The stage 2 consultation closes on 22 March 2017.

### **Summary of recommendations to Schools Forum**

**DSG  
Rec  
(ii)**

**1) The BWG recommended that the surplus funds in the schools block be allocated to increase factors for deprivation and low prior attainment as follows:**

- **Deprivation per primary ever-6 free school meal pupil – increase of £40**
- **Deprivation per secondary ever-6 free school meal pupil – increase of £41**
- **Low prior attainment per primary pupil – increase of £95**
- **Low prior attainment per secondary pupil – increase of £110**
- **An exceptional premises factor for Eastnor school be approved at £8,460**

**DSG  
Rec  
(iv)**

**2) The BWG recommended that:**

- a) the ESG savings be put to the Schools Forum as proposed with the adjustments in part (b) below;**
- b) the ESG transitional grant be used to**
  - i. create a reserve of £210k for exceptional redundancies;**
  - ii. provide school improvement funding of £50k for the summer term 2017;**
  - iii. consider supporting LA maintained schools required to pay the apprenticeship levy for 2017/18**
- c) to reduce the strategic services top-slice for maintained schools to £13.50 per pupil from April 2017**

- DSG Recs (v) &(vi)**
- 3) The Budget Working Group agreed to recommend to the Schools Forum:**
- a) the retained ESG as proposed;**
  - b) the proposed central school services block spend; and**
  - c) the proposed arrangements to cover the Eastnor property lease cost.**
- 4) The BWG recommended that:**
- a) it consider the allocation of the high needs block and early years block further at its meeting on 24 February 2017 when more detail on high needs pressures would be available;**
  - b) it make recommendations on the allocation of both blocks on that date for the Schools Forum to consider at its meeting on 10 March; and**
  - c) BWG review its guiding principles to ensure that they remained sound.**
- DSG New Rec**







<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Schools Forum</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>13 January 2017</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Dedicated schools grant 2017/18 – UPDATE</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>School finance manager</b>

## Background

This document sets out the final recommendations to the Schools Forum in light of the comments and recommendations of the Budget Working Group of 6 January 2017. These recommendations replace those set out in the report to agenda item 6.

It also provides updated tables to reflect the latest information available. These tables replace those in the indicated paragraphs of the report to agenda item 6.

## Recommendation(s)

### THAT:

The local application of the National Funding Formula for 2017/18, as set out in the consultation document and as below, be recommended to the Cabinet member for young people and children's wellbeing as follows:

- (i) the final school funding values be agreed as follows, unless amended in (ii) below:
- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 1. Basic entitlement per primary pupil  | £2,875   |
| 2. Basic entitlement per secondary key stage 3 pupil                            | £3,843   |
| 3. Basic entitlement per secondary key stage 4 pupil                            | £4,436   |
| 4. Deprivation per primary ever 6 free school meals pupils                      | £2,192   |
| 5. Deprivation per secondary ever-6 free school meals pupil                     | £1,419   |
| 6. Low prior attainment per primary pupil                                       | £615     |
| 7. Low prior attainment per secondary pupil                                     | £1,121   |
| 8. Primary lump sum   | £87,000  |
| 9. Secondary lump sum   | £143,000 |
| 10. Looked after children, primary and secondary                                | £1,300   |
| 11. Primary sparsity, on a taper basis, over two miles and less than 105 pupils | £42,000  |

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green, school finance manager on Tel (01432) 260818

12. English as additional language per primary pupil	£505
13. English as additional language per secondary pupil	£1,216
14. Private finance initiative (PFI) contract	£267,500
15. Business rates	At cost
16. Exceptional premises factore for Eastnor school	£8,460

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation)*

- (ii) **that the savings from the national business rates revaluation exercise and the Minimum Funding Guarantee be used to support the implementation of the national school funding formula by increasing the deprivation and low prior attainment values in (i) above as follows;**

1. Deprivation per primary ever 6 free school meals pupil +£40 to	£2,232
2. Deprivation per secondary ever 6 free school meals pupil +£41 to	£1,460
3. Low prior attainment per primary pupil +£95 to	£710
4. Low prior attainment per secondary pupil +£110 to	£1,231

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation)*

- (iii) **local council maintained school members of the schools forum, be asked to approve the de-delegation in 2017/18 of funding for trade union facilities (primary schools only), ethnic minority support, free school meal administration and software licence costs for the financial planning software**

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools may vote on this recommendation)*

- (iv) **that the £1.1m Education Services Grant savings be achieved by:**

1. **a £600,000 reduction in the council's corporate services and in education and commissioning services, for example:**

a. Reduction in corporate overheads	£500k
b. Reduction in education and commissioning central school improvement funds	£47k
c. Efficiency savings in council service and full cost recovery	£53k

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation)*

**2. £200,000 of school redundancies, including the early release of pension costs, for maintained schools to be:**

- a. charged directly to the maintained schools that incur them; and
- b. loans from the local council be offered to help spread the redundancy cost over a five year period.

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools may vote on this recommendation).*

**3. a £170,000 budget top-slice of £13.50 per pupil for maintained schools only to support effective school management and cover statutory duties carried out by the local council**

<u>Service for local council maintained schools</u>	<u>£'000</u>
Governor services- support for schools	24
Monitoring national curriculum assessment	20
Internal audit	30
Strategic HR	30
Strategic finance	30
Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE)	6
Property landlord duties	30
Exceptional redundancy costs – now ESG transitional grant	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools may vote on this recommendation).*

**4. a £200,000 service level agreement is introduced for all schools to cover safeguarding and pupil wellbeing at a cost of £8 per pupil**

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation).*

**5. use of the one off transitional grant of £372k to:**

- a. create an exceptional redundancies reserve of £210k
- b. provide school improvement funding of £50k for the summer term 2017
- c. allocate £110k to projects to be determined following further consultation with the Budget Working Group, to include option to support LA maintained schools in paying the apprenticeship levy for 2017/18. Recommendations to be brought to the Schools Forum in March 2017.

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation).*

**(v) that the retained services Education Services Grant of £360,000 be used to provide statutory services to all maintained and academy schools**

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation).*

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green, school finance manager on Tel (01432) 260818

- (vi) that the central school services block of £300,000 be used to meet the costs of national licences for schools, admissions and schools forum in accordance with Department for Education (DfE) guidance.

*(NB only representatives of LA maintained schools, academies and early years providers may vote on this recommendation).*

### Updated paragraph 6

6. Dedicated Schools Grant 2017/18 was announced on 20 December 2016. The recommendations in this report are based on the final DSG settlement of:

a. Schools block		£'000
21,760 pupils at £4,463.11		97,120
less central schools block		300
National licences	127	
Schools forum	12	
Admissions	142	
Unallocated*	19	
less retained education services grant		360
Available for distribution to schools		96,460

\*To fund overspend on schools block reference £8,460 property lease cost

b. High needs block		
Protected at 2016/17 level 1		13,970
Additional allocation for 2017/18		0,360
Less deducted at source by Education Funding Agency (EFA) for places		-2,050
High needs block available to spend		12,280
c. Provisional early years block		
Three and four year olds funding at £4.30 per hour		6,225
Part year funding (7/12 <sup>th</sup> ) for the 30 hour extension		1,109
Two year old funding at £5.20 per hour		1,046
Early years pupil premium		120
Expected total DSG 2017/18		117,923

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Malcolm Green, school finance manager on Tel (01432) 260818



**4) £200,000 SLA proposals for all schools that cover safeguarding and pupil wellbeing, including data analysis**

This includes the consolidation of some existing charges e.g. the current cost of two education advisors within the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) was approved by the secretary of state for education from central DSG for 2016/17 only.

The cost of the existing staff (£75,000) will be funded through an SLA with schools for 2017/18 and will incorporate MASH operational costs that previously have not been part of the costs. The work of a school improvement advisor, which is predominantly pupil wellbeing and safeguarding in all schools, will be included in the new SLA.

The MASH SLA will be approximately £10 per pupil and further details will be circulated in due course. The alternative to the SLA will be to purchase MASH services at a consultancy rate of £75 per hour, however this could undermine the collective Herefordshire schools approach to the MASH.



<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Schools Forum</b>
<b>Meeting date:</b>	<b>13 January 2017</b>
<b>Title of report:</b>	<b>Initial recommendations of the Schools Forum High Needs task and Finish Group for wider consultation</b>
<b>Report by:</b>	<b>Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) with Group Co-chair Sara Catlow-Hawkins (Headteacher – Bishop of Hereford Bluecoat School)</b>

## Classification

Open

## Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

## Wards affected

Countywide

## Purpose

To make initial recommendations resulting from the Schools Forum High Needs Task and Finish Group and to seek the views of the Schools Forum.

## Recommendation(s)

THAT :

- a) **Determining the number of specialist places**
  - i. **The planned number of special school places by 2026 should be somewhere in the range between 324 and 343 (1.2% of the predicted overall 2-19 school population for 2021) and this should be used as the starting point for any re-modelling of the special school estate as part of the Capital Investment Strategy. Further consideration needs to be given to the designation of need type within this overall figure**
  - ii. **Further consideration needs to be given to the number of places in secondary resourced provision**

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

- b) The best offer in mainstream schools to reduce the need for specialist places**
  - i. the high needs task group produces a shared statement for an inclusive ethos with examples;
  - ii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies what further forms of SEN Network meetings would support inclusive practice;
  - iii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies gaps in provision which result in additional costs to the High Needs Block in the longer term;
  - iv. a short time limited project is commissioned to enhance the Herefordshire Local Offer pages with the aim of better supporting SENCOs;
  - v. a project is commissioned which leads to recommendations for the sustainable monitoring of the quality of annual reviews and for sampling the effectiveness of the provision for those on SEN Support. The use of peer-to-peer learning should be considered;
  - vi. there is exploration of the possibility of a system of dual registration for pupils with LD along the lines of the Brookfield Intervention model which allows intensive work between special and mainstream without the presumption to it leading to a special school place;
  - vii. a minimum offer for all mainstream schools is agreed and used to challenge those schools not meeting this minimum standard; and,
  - viii. a commitment to a minimum amount of SEN experience for teacher training placements and NQTs is sought from schools through training institutions.
- c) Improving the SEND Post-16 Offer**
  - i. following a time-limited project to explore the co-ordination of employment opportunities funded by the SEN Implementation Grant, consideration is given to a sustainable resource to co-ordinate education and employment opportunities in the 16-25 age-range;
  - ii. work is undertaken as part of recommendation (j) to develop 'pathways to employment' ;
  - iii. further work is undertaken (linked to the accommodation strategy being developed by the Council's Adult Well-being Directorate) to provide suitable supported housing solutions that support disabled young people to be able to access suitable education and employment opportunities;
  - iv. post-16 education and training opportunities for students with MLD are mapped and that any gaps in provision are identified as part of the continuing review of post-16 review for those with learning difficulties and disabilities; and,
  - v. following the successful implementation of the post-16 NEET project for those with SEMH, a sustainable means of non-DSG funding is identified to allow the continuation of the project.
- d) Preventing the need for high-cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour**
  - i. by examining the outcomes of the existing project to explore what works to reduce the risk of high-cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour, the successful elements should be taken forward on a sustainable basis.
- e) Improving Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)**
  - i. consideration is given to designated educational psychology time for children in the Early Years (aside from providing advice for statutory assessment);
  - ii. an increased number of Child Development Centre assessment places are made available with outreach opportunities taking place in localities other than Hereford City;
  - iii. with the increasing number of diagnoses of children with ASD in the EY, the number of COSI (Communication and Social Interaction) group places is

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724



- increased with a commensurate amount of mainstream outreach for children in EY settings being provided;
- iv. speech and language clinics overseen by speech and language therapists at Children’s Centres are developed; and,
  - v. consideration is given as to how preventative work/intervention with families who do not meet the Families First criteria can be provided – particularly in relation to children with challenging behaviour.

## Alternative options

- 1 All of the recommendations potentially provide responses as part of an overall strategy to reduce the pressure on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). It is possible to remove or modify these recommendations without it altering the core purpose of the group as determined by remit given in the terms of reference for the group.

## Reasons for recommendations

- 2 The reasons for the recommendations are shown in the table A below. Further detail is provided in Appendix B to E which are the responses from the individual sub-groups.

<b>Table A</b>		
<i>Area</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Reason(s)</i>
<b>(a) Determining the number of specialist places</b>	i. The planned number of special school places by 2026 should be somewhere in the range between 324 and 343 (1.2% of the predicted overall 2-19 school population for 2021) and this should be used as the starting point for any re-modelling of the special school estate as part of the Capital Investment Strategy. Further consideration needs to be given to the designation of need type within this overall figure	This is the proportion of the population placed into special schools nationally. There is no reason why Herefordshire should differ greatly from the national incidence of need that requires a specialist response. In the October pupil census Herefordshire had 339 special school places which also includes any dual registrations.
	ii. Further consideration needs to be given to the number of places in secondary resourced provision	The national benchmarking data suggests that Herefordshire has fewer secondary resourced provision places. It would be useful to discuss the merits of increasing the number to the national level.
<b>(b) The best offer in mainstream schools to</b>	i. the high needs task group produces a shared statement for an inclusive	In order to reduce the pressure on specialist places, all mainstream need to take a shared responsibility

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

<b>reduce the need for specialist places</b>	<b>ethos with examples;</b>	in successfully meeting the needs of as wide a range of pupils as possible
	<b>ii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies what further forms of SEN Network meetings would support inclusive practice</b>	Only by sharing successful practice will the whole of the Herefordshire Learning Community become better equipped to address the widest range of SEND
	<b>iii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies gaps in provision which result in additional costs to the High Needs Block in the longer term</b>	This will provide an opportunity to gather views from those working directly with SEND in schools
	<b>iv. a short time limited project is commissioned to enhance the Herefordshire Local Offer pages with the aim of better supporting SENCOs</b>	The ongoing capacity to address this centrally within the LA is no longer available. A specific and time-limited focus on this would be helpful.
	<b>v. a project is commissioned which leads to recommendations for the sustainable monitoring of the quality of annual reviews and for sampling the effectiveness of the provision for those on SEN Support. The use of peer-to-peer learning should be considered.</b>	All attendees at reviews need to challenge whether everything possible is being done to offer an appropriate offer to those with SEND. It is not possible for the LA to attend every review. The previous arrangements for the monitoring of annual reviews were not sustainable. Monitoring of the progress and provision for children at SEN Support is also an expectation as made clear in the SEND Inspection. By using peer review, learning and reflection about practice is more likely to occur.
	<b>vi. there is exploration of the possibility of a system of dual registration for pupils with LD along the lines of the Brookfield Intervention model which allows intensive work between special and mainstream without the presumption to it leading to a special school place</b>	The intervention model used by Brookfield works well for some pupils because of the intensive nature of the placement plus intensive work back into the pupil's host school as outreach.
	<b>vii. a minimum offer for all mainstream schools is agreed and used to challenge those schools not</b>	The LA should publish what all mainstream schools are expected to offer as part of the Local Offer in order that 'What is 'additional to and

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

	<b>meeting this minimum standard</b>	different from' can be established. This is a statutory requirement.
	<b>viii. a commitment to a minimum amount of SEN experience for teacher training placements and NQTs is sought from schools through training institutions</b>	Initial teacher training can only devote a limited amount of time to SEND. This would be a local arrangement to boost this.
<b>(c) Improving the SEND Post-16 Offer</b>	<b>i. following a time-limited project to explore the co-ordination of employment opportunities funded by the SEN Implementation Grant, consideration is given to a sustainable resource to co-ordinate education and employment opportunities in the 16-25 age-range;</b>	A need has been identified for county-wide co-ordination of education and employment opportunities. The current one off grant being co-ordinated through Barrs Court Hub will allow exploration of the employment opportunities. There will be an on-going need for this co-ordination.
	<b>ii. work is undertaken as part of recommendation (j) to develop 'pathways to employment' ;</b>	It is important that there is a route, which is clear to all, by which YP can access supported employment
	<b>iii. further work is undertaken (linked to the accommodation strategy being developed by the Council's Adult Well-being Directorate) to provide suitable supported housing solutions that support disabled young people to be able to access suitable education and employment opportunities;</b>	Young people often need appropriate and bespoke housing solutions if they are to gain the maximum benefit from their employment opportunities
	<b>iv. post-16 education and training opportunities for students with MLD are mapped and that any gaps in provision are identified as part of the continuing review of post-16 review for those with learning difficulties and disabilities; and,</b>	This has been recognised as an area of work that has not yet been tackled by the Post-16 Review of educational provision. Successful work has led to an improvement in the offer for those with more severe learning difficulties.  This was identified in the Local Area SEND Inspection.
	<b>v. following the successful implementation of the post-16 NEET project for those with SEMH, a sustainable means of non-DSG funding is identified to allow the continuation of the project.</b>	SF has supported this in 2016-17 but has indicated that it cannot do so in the future. The model has proved highly successful and therefore alternative funding needs to be sought.
<b>(d) Preventing the need for high-</b>	<b>i. by examining the outcomes of the existing project to</b>	Schools Forum granted funding in 2016-17 to explore ways in which

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

<p><b>cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour</b></p>	<p><b>explore what works to reduce the risk of high-cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour, the successful elements should be taken forward on a sustainable basis.</b></p>	<p>children with a high risk of needing out-of-county residential provision can have their needs addressed locally. 3/7ths of the cost of multi-agency residential provision comes from DSG.</p> <p>This work is underway but will take the duration of 2017-18 to reveal what works.</p>
<p><b>(e) Improving Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)</b></p>	<p><b>i. consideration is given to designated educational psychology time for children in the Early Years (aside from providing advice for statutory assessment);</b></p>	<p>It would be preferable to intervene early with psychological support, rather than waiting for the situation to be exacerbated</p>
	<p><b>ii. an increased number of Child Development Centre assessment places are made available with outreach opportunities taking place in localities other than Hereford City. This can be achieved by re-organising existing groups;</b></p>	<p>The priority should be to assess as many EY children at an early stage. This proposal would increase assessment places at CDC from current 10 per term to 22 per term. It would also allow a wider range of needs to be assessed. The use of outreach assessment is important because some families cannot travel into Hereford regularly for assessment visits.</p>
	<p><b>iii. with the increasing number of diagnoses of children with ASD in the EY, the number of COSI (Communication and Social Interaction) group places is increased with a commensurate amount of mainstream outreach for children in EY settings being provided;</b></p>	<p>The COSI group has provided high quality support for families and children with severe social communication needs including the nationally recognised 'Early Bird' parenting programme. The increase in the number of diagnoses, many as young as 3 years old, requires additional resource in order to offer the programme to all before they reach reception age and transfer to school. Research evidence has shown that diagnosis and early intervention is cost-effective. Outreach work with the child's EY setting and as the children transfer to school is an integral part of the programme. The numbers are such that previous attempts to manage a waiting list are no longer possible.</p>
	<p><b>iv. speech and language clinics overseen by speech and language therapists (SALT) at Children's Centres are developed</b></p>	<p>A previously successful programme of work delivered by SALT assistants overseen by qualified therapists demonstrated the value of this work. These advice clinics give parents earlier access to a SaLT –</p>

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

		usually within 4-8 weeks. Appropriate ideas and strategies for intervention are also given. Formal referrals to SALT are more appropriate as a result. (therefore fewer inappropriate referrals increasing the waiting list)  This was identified in the Local Area SEND Inspection.
	<b>v. consideration is given as to how preventative work/intervention with families who do not meet the Families First criteria can be provided – particularly in relation to children with challenging behaviour</b>	Concerns have been raised by EY settings about attachment /behaviour and lack of support for children and families unless at high risk. There are an increasing numbers of SPORT referrals through health for children with SEMH difficulties – often rejected as not seen as ‘medical’.

## Key considerations

- iii. As part of a five year funding strategy to ensure that Herefordshire Schools Forum and the council pro-actively manage future funding pressures in the Dedicated Schools Grant, Schools Forum agreed to set up four task and finish groups. One of these was the High Needs Task and Finish Group (HNTFG). The full terms of reference (TOR) are provided in Appendix A. The TOR included the issues to be addressed by the group. These issues can be summarised as concern for the rising cost of high needs in Herefordshire and in particular the rising number/cost of specialist places. In order to tackle the breadth of the High Needs agenda, the HNTFG set up sub-groups to deal with the different strands as follows:
- i. **How many special places do we need? (Rec. (a))** Note: Work subsequently added to by Sue Woodrow working as a consultant to the Capital Investment Strategy
  - ii. **What should mainstream schools do to provide the best offer for those with learning difficulties? (Rec (b))**
  - iii. **How do we improve the offer for young people with SEND post-16 (both MLD and SLD/PMLD includes post-19)? (Rec (c))**
  - iv. **How could we prevent high cost residential placements, particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour? (Rec (d))**
  - v. **How could we improve Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)? (Rec (e))**
  - vi. **Review of High Needs Matrix** Note: this work was added to the work of the group to save a duplication but was not within the TOR.

Each sub-group reported back to the HNTFG (Appendix B to E) and the recommendations from all of the sub-groups are included in this paper.

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

- iv. The sub-groups were asked to provide as many solutions that would address the issues raised in the TOR. This paper is the collation of the proposals and the aim is to gain broader consultation responses. The HNTFG were made aware that there could be no presumption that the ideas would necessarily be adopted.
- v. The contributing sub-groups were also asked to ensure that their proposals had an evidence base that would ensure that this was not just a ‘resource and hope’ approach but rather one which was likely to ensure improved outcomes for children and young people.
- vi. Some of the work described within the recommendations has been commenced already as there was felt to be an imperative to do this or because there is a crossover with the work of other groups or strategies. These recommendations are included here for the sake of completeness.

## Community impact

- 7 There are particular links to the children with disabilities, Early Help and Early Years strategies governed by the children and young people’s partnership.

## Equality duty

- 8 All of the proposals are intended to have a positive impact on children with SEND.

## Financial implications

- 9 The financial implications are shown in the table below:

<i>Area</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Cost/resource</i>	<i>Risks</i>
<b>(a) Determining the number of specialist places</b>	<b>i. The planned number of special school places by 2026 should be somewhere in the range between 324 and 343 (1.2% of the predicted overall 2-19 school population for 2021) and this should be used as the starting point for any re-modelling of the special school estate as part of the Capital Investment Strategy. Further consideration needs to be given to the designation of need type within</b>	Revenue – minimal as the upper range is 343 and the current number of special school places is 339.  Capital Investment Strategy is a self-contained piece of work with its own financial arrangements.	There is a risk that the number of special school places continues to grow.  Mitigation is that all concerned need to ensure that assessment is specific enough to ensure that all children placed meet the criteria for specialist places.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

	<b>this overall figure</b>		
<b>(b) The best offer in mainstream schools to reduce the need for specialist places</b>	<b>i. the high needs task group produces a shared statement for an inclusive ethos with examples;</b>	Time for task group	Lack of engagement from schools and settings caused by pressures of finance and performance.  Mitigation: Leaders need to promote this in their respective Forums
	<b>ii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies what further forms of SEN Network meetings would support inclusive practice</b>	Agenda time at SENCO network meeting and the attendance time at any other network meetings	Not all schools engaged in forums  Mitigation: See (b) i
	<b>iii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies gaps in provision which result in additional costs to the High Needs Block in the longer term</b>	Agenda time at SENCO network meeting	Not all schools engaged in forums  Mitigation: See (b) i
	<b>iv. a short time limited project is commissioned to enhance the Herefordshire Local Offer pages with the aim of better supporting SENCOs</b>	6 weeks of officer time to meet with SENCOs, to prepare materials and to put on web.	Offer becomes static after 6 week period  Mitigation: SENCO network time could be used once per year to update offer
	<b>v. a project is commissioned which leads to recommendations for the sustainable monitoring of the quality of annual reviews and for sampling the effectiveness of the provision for those on SEN Support. The use of peer-to-peer learning should be considered.</b>	No new resource required as project already planned - Project Officer or Consultant time – 1 day per wk for 6 months plus peer-to-peer release or cover time (should be seen as CPD). £10k consultant plus peer-to-peer release time  This is to be funded through some limited project time in	There is a risk that:  i) The resulting AR monitoring system is not realistic and therefore sustainable.  Mitigation: Project Officer needs to work very closely with schools and SEN team to ensure that system is workable.

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

		centrally held DSG budget.	There is a risk that by not doing this we do not fulfil our duties under the SEND COP.
	<b>vi. there is exploration of the possibility of a system of dual registration for pupils with LD along the lines of the Brookfield Intervention model which allows intensive work between special and mainstream without the presumption to it leading to a special school place</b>	Meeting time to discuss.  Two Options to fund this:  (i) Brookfield Intervention model is school self-funded from existing pupil-led resource  (ii) DSG allocation to specials to establish this work as in-reach/outreach	There is a risk that dual registration encourages pupils to seek a special school place.  Mitigation: There would need to be a very clear contract with host school that this about supporting the school intensively for a block of time to develop the curriculum for the pupil in the host school
	<b>vii. a minimum offer for all mainstream schools is agreed and used to challenge those schools not meeting this minimum standard</b>	LA Officer time and SENCO release time – Work in final draft stage.	There is a risk that the offer described is not specific enough and therefore does not provide the clarity required.
	<b>viii. a commitment to a minimum amount of SEN experience for teacher training placements and NQTs is sought from schools through training institutions</b>	Meeting time for teaching schools to set it up.	There is a risk that ITT establishments do not see this as a priority.
<b>(c) Improving the SEND Post-16 Offer</b>	<b>i. following a time-limited project to explore the co-ordination of employment opportunities funded by the SEN Implementation Grant, consideration is given to a sustainable resource to co-ordinate education</b>	Current resource is £30k for co-ordination role	Without this post, there is no central co-ordination of this work which carries the risk that families seek expensive out-of-county provision for young people with LD

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724



	<b>and employment opportunities in the 16-25 age-range;</b>		
	<b>ii. work is undertaken as part of recommendation (j) to develop 'pathways to employment' ;</b>	Included in (c) i.	The risk of not having this would be a lack of clarity for YP and families
	<b>iii. further work is undertaken (linked to the accommodation strategy being developed by the Council's Adult Well-being Directorate) to provide suitable supported housing solutions that support disabled young people to be able to access suitable education and employment opportunities;</b>	No new resource	The risk of not doing this is that we would develop a good education and employment offer that YP would not be able to take up because of where they are living.
	<b>iv. post-16 education and training opportunities for students with MLD are mapped and that any gaps in provision are identified as part of the continuing review of post-16 review for those with learning difficulties and disabilities</b>	Professionals time to meet in 2 <sup>nd</sup> round of Post-16 review	There is a risk that as a result of not having suitable MLD provision post-16, places will be sought at providers for SLD resulting in a further growth in numbers.  There is also a risk that post-16 providers will not engage with this work.
	<b>v. following the successful implementation of the post-16 NEET project for those with SEMH, a sustainable means of non-DSG funding is identified to allow the continuation of the project.</b>	Cost £30k	There is a risk that the successful work in developing this project will be lost with the result that more of those with SEMH needs are NEET.  Mitigation: Identify other funding sources
<b>(d) Preventing the need for high-cost</b>	<b>i. by examining the outcomes of the existing project to</b>	No new resource in 2017-18	The risk of doing nothing is that we will continue to have

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

<p><b>residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour</b></p>	<p><b>explore what works to reduce the risk of high-cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour, the successful elements should be taken forward on a sustainable basis.</b></p>		<p>significant expenditure on multi-agency placements out-of-county where monitoring of students is more difficult.</p> <p>The risk with this project is that successful strategies are identified in the existing project but the young people concerned are so individual that the strategies are not transferrable. However, by adopting an approach that requires every possible strategy to have been considered before we place in an out-of-county setting, it is more likely to produce creative answers.</p>
<p><b>(e) Improving Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)</b></p>	<p><b>i. consideration is given to designated educational psychology time for children in the Early Years (aside from providing advice for statutory assessment);</b></p>	<p>£12k</p>	<p>There is a risk that by not doing this, needs are not addressed early enough.</p> <p>If this is implemented, the risk would be one of excess demand and some sort of priority list would be needed to mitigate this.</p>
	<p><b>ii. an increased number of Child Development Centre assessment places are available with outreach opportunities taking place in localities other than Hereford City. This can be achieved by re-organising existing groups;</b></p>	<p>No new resource – re-arrangement of the existing resource</p>	<p>The risk of not doing this is that children with potentially more severe needs are not assessed early enough (or at all if family cannot get into Hereford).</p> <p>The risk of rearranging the resource is that a group that caters for lower level needs</p>

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

			will be removed.
	<p>iii. with the increasing number of diagnoses of children with ASD in the EY, the number of COSI (Communication and Social Interaction) group places is increased with a commensurate amount of mainstream outreach for children in EY settings being provided;</p>	<p>5 additional COSI places to be made available (2x half day sessions)</p> <p>Specialist outreach into mainstream settings for those not accessing a COSI place(1x half day)</p> <p>Minimum 0.3 fte specialist teacher= £15k</p>	<p>The risk of not making this provision is that there will be children entering school with severe complex communication needs where early intervention is not possible.</p> <p>There is a potential risk of continued growth in demand as more early diagnoses are made.</p>
	<p>iv. speech and language clinics overseen by speech and language therapists (SALT) at Children's Centres are developed</p>	<p>0.4 FTE SALT Assistant = £13.5k</p> <p>Could be built into SALT costing provided for EY Task and Finish group</p>	<p>If this is not offered, there is a risk of continuing high levels of potentially inappropriate referral to SALT which would result in significant delays in referrals being accepted.</p>
	<p>v. consideration is given as to how preventative work/intervention with families who do not meet the Families First criteria can be provided – particularly in relation to children with challenging behaviour</p>	<p>Costed into EY task and finish group - no new resource required</p>	<p>Risk to be outlined in EY Task and finish papers</p>

## Legal implications

10 A legal viewpoint is not required at this stage of consultation

## Risk management

11 Table B above includes risks and mitigation.

## Consultees

12 None

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

FOR INFORMATION

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Terms of reference for Task and Finish Groups

Appendix B – Sub-group composition

Appendix C – Place Planning Briefing

Appendix D – Report from the Best Offer in Mainstream Sub-group

Appendix E – Report from the Improving the Post-16 Offer Sub-Group

Appendix F – Report from the Improving EY Provision Sub-Group

## **Background papers**

- None identified.

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) on Tel (01432) 261724

## Looking to the Future

### Schools Forum Task and Finish Groups

As part of a five year funding strategy to ensure that Herefordshire Schools Forum and the council pro-actively manage future funding pressures in the Dedicated Schools Grant, Schools Forum has agreed to set up four task and finish groups with the following terms of reference:

- All groups need to consider how to incentivise change, whether it be by, for example managing demand, meeting need in a different way or incentivising new models of school
- To clarify additional sources of support and research needed and identify best practice elsewhere
- To prepare costed proposals to achieve better value for money from current spending as appropriate on
  - Outcomes
  - Capital
  - Early years
  - High Needs
- To provide the evidence base for improved educational standards in Herefordshire to support educational standards in Herefordshire
- To call for evidence from all Herefordshire schools and early years settings as appropriate and as required
- To prepare suggested implementation timelines setting out funding implications
- To make interim recommendations and proposals to Schools Forum in May 2016, following discussion at the Education Strategic Board and final recommendations by May 2017
- Each task and finish group to consider its operating practice whereby rather than meeting regularly the group could alternatively block out slots of time to do concentrated work to finish quicker.

Herefordshire Council's General Overview and Scrutiny Committee be invited to either shadow or work alongside the task and finish groups.

Question – how best to involve governors?

All proposals for change must take account of current expenditure and standards, DfE finance regulations that may restrict spending flexibility and clearly set out the proposed changes to ensure effective spending of Dedicated Schools Grant taking full account of the increased demand for reducing resources in a time of financial stringency

School Forum's notes on key issues are attached.

## Group 1: Outcomes - Herefordshire School Improvement Partnership

Co - Chair: Lisa Fraser

Co-chair and Lead Headteacher: Tracey Kneale

Issues to address

1. Are we as effective as we could be and how can we evidence funding is having a positive effect?
2. Can we target the funding we have in better ways?
  - Lump sum
  - Low prior attainment
  - Deprivation i.e. ever-6 free meals funding
3. Removing barriers to learning e.g. mental health, therapeutic support, early help/troubled families.
4. What do the graphs tell us?
5. How do we target for outcomes?
6. Consider whether by pooling funds say between schools and/or with the Local Authority and Clinical Commissioning Group could help secure better outcomes.

## Group 2: Capital – Capital Strategy Group

Co-Chair: Andy Hough

Co-chair and Lead Headteacher: Anne Pritchard

Issues to address

1. High quality learning environments are more likely to deliver the best outcomes for all children and young people
2. Don't have the money to spend via "traditional routes"
3. Becoming academy not the answer
4. Size of school
5. Leadership and management
6. Use of range of funding:
  - Use of DfE grants

- Recycling funding e.g. Broadlands/Aylestone
- Dedicated Schools Grant/school revenue – schools already doing this – how to do it better?
- Academies fund
- CIL and section 106
- Business sponsorship
- Business investment
- Corporate council borrowing

7. Make the case at local and national political level

Group 3: Early Years Strategy Group plus additional representatives to ensure full representation

Co- Chair: Julia Stephens

Co-chair and Lead Headteacher: Julie Rees

Issues to address

1. Base for all future schooling – evidence from the research is “quality of early years provision is carried through to GCSE
2. Overall, outcomes improving, but not where we want them to be – gap for the vulnerable too big.
3. National funding issue particularly for expansion to 30 hour provision
4. No increase in rate paid to Herefordshire providers since circa 2007
5. Herefordshire is 16<sup>th</sup> lowest funded nationally by DfE for early years
6. How can we invest more in early years?
7. Can we afford not to?
8. Who pays?
9. How do we lobby government?
- 10 Strategic nursery classes in schools – where? Rationale? Outcomes?



## Group 4: High Needs – Reconstituted High Needs tariff group plus additional nominees to ensure full representation

Co-Chair: Les Knight

Co-chair and Lead Headteacher: Sara Catlow-Hawkins

Issues to address

1. Cannot continue to grow special school places
2. High needs funding largely fixed irrespective of growth in demand
3. Review the DfE's high needs report published by ISOS July 2015
4. Growth in special school places of 25% since 2010 at a cost of £1.2m – impact is reduction of mainstream school funding
5. Similar growth of 25% to 2020 will cost further £1.2m i.e. £60 per pupil
6. High needs budget overspent in 2014/15 by £126k
7. And in 2015/16 propped up by £150k of one-off reserves
8. Growth pressures in hospital education, autism, out-county placements rising again, disproportionate impact of pension costs, early years SEN increasing
9. Consider whether by pooling funds say between schools and/or with the Local Authority and Clinical Commissioning Group could help secure better outcomes.



## **High Needs Task Group – Key Areas to tackle the issues outlined in the TOR from the Schools Forum**

The list below was taken from the discussion at the group. The leads and members of each group are suggestions which will be ratified at meeting on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> March. Additional members can be added.

The work is expected to take place outside of the Task and Finish group meetings.

A brief for each of the below will need to be developed. A pro-forma will be provided to support this.

### **A) How many special places do we need?** Lead = Sara Catlow-Hawkins + Andy Hough + Sian Bailey

- Review current specialist population in terms of individual need and factor into Capital Investment Strategy
- What is the national % for SLD/PMLD?
- How many MLD children in Herefordshire schools (5-16) – data source Tribal for Statement/EHC Plan (rationale is that would need a statutory plan to attend specialist provision)?
- What MLD arrangements in West Midlands – resourced provision, schools?
- What proportion of parents would opt for mainstream v special?
- How would additional cost (including transport) be funded?
- National evidence on outcomes for MLD children in mainstream v MLD special/resourced provision?

### **B) What should mainstream schools do to provide the best offer for those with learning difficulties?** Lead = Simon Robertson/Julie Rees and/or Liz Kearns + Hilary Walmsley

- Definition of what a mainstream school should provide is required
- Is a continuum of provision required? Collaborative approach between mainstream and special to pool resources including staff and/or provision - formal dual registration
- CPD
  - how to retain staff that have received specialist training?
  - could schools including special schools
  - SENCo Networks/IPCo Clusters?

### **C) How do we improve the offer for young people with SEND post-16 (both MLD and SLD/PMLD includes post-19)?** Lead = Alexia Heath + Oremi Gilbert

- Personalised transition offer
- Genuinely independent IAG
- What do other areas do?
  - Mainstream Post 16 provision
  - Exploring possibility of Post 16 Hub for MLD
- Consider information from Area Based Review
- Model of personalised, scaffolded support into Post 16 for particular groups (ie successful approach trialled at Brookfield)

### **D) How could we prevent high cost residential placements, particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour?** Lead – Les Knight + Lisa Appleton

- Collaborative multi-agency approach required from EY onwards (Early Bird/portage) with escalation via assess-plan-do-review
- Suitable range of care arrangements in Herefordshire
- Viability of short break/Vale of Evesham model

### **E) How could we improve Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)?**

Lead – Sue Sharp + Hilary Walmsley

- Health provision - SaLT in schools/EY, school nurses (note – difference between clinical need and preventative work; school nurse is latter)
- CDC – waiting lists, what are the expected outcomes, referral routes, liaison with schools, too Hereford centred (outreach?)

- Common understanding of services available for EY and how they can be accessed
- Portage – is there sufficient?
- Is it easy enough for 2 year olds to access Nursery provision? Is there sufficient funding?

**F) Review of High Needs Matrix** Lead – Ed Edwards + Malcolm Green

- Consider matrix descriptors in light of work by independent consultant
- Consideration of amounts, funding bands and weightings

## HEREFORDSHIRE CHILDREN'S WELLBEING DIRECTORATE

### BRIEFING 31 OCTOBER 2016

#### PLACE PLANNING FOR SPECIAL SCHOOLS 2016-2026 (NOT INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE PROVISION)

The information below is presented in order to assist Herefordshire Council in its planning for an appropriate number of high quality places in special schools for the children and young people of Herefordshire from 2016 – 2026, also to inform council planning for capital investment in special school sites and buildings over the next five years.

#### Information sourced from the following benchmarking spreadsheets -

- Excel spreadsheet high needs spend analysis 2015, Malcolm Green. (pertinent to children and young people 5-16). Local Authorities included – Herefordshire, East Sussex, Wiltshire, Dorset, Shropshire, Cornwall, Gloucestershire, Norfolk, Somerset, Suffolk, Devon, and Worcestershire.
- Excel spreadsheet SFR 16\_2015 LA tables (pertinent to children and young people 2-19). Local Authorities included – Herefordshire, Shropshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, East Sussex, Cornwall, Devon, Gloucestershire, Somerset, and Wiltshire.

#### Comparative information pertinent to place planning decisions

- Herefordshire provided 1.4% of the 5-16 school population with special school places in 2015. (Data skewed, as the total number of 5-16 pupils was used for calculation, but the subset special schools number used included 2-5 year old and 16-19 year old special school placed children). Re-calculating with a 2-19 higher figure for total, puts the percentage special school places nearer the 1.2% figure in the national spreadsheet below.
- Herefordshire provided 1.2% of the 2-19 population with special school places in 2015. This placed Herefordshire second of ten, East Sussex recording the highest % with 1.27%, Cornwall the lowest with 0.5%. See table.

	Special			All schools	
	State-funded (5)	Non-maintained	Total		
<b>ENGLAND (7)</b>	<b>101,249</b>	<b>3,953</b>	<b>105,202</b>	<b>8,438,143</b>	<b>1.20%</b>
<b>NORTH EAST(7)</b>	<b>6,689</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>6,973</b>	<b>393,805</b>	<b>1.70%</b>
<b>WEST MIDLANDS (7)</b>	<b>14,274</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>14,377</b>	<b>920,064</b>	<b>1.55%</b>
Herefordshire	296	0	296	24,567	1.20%
Shropshire	435	0	435	43,139	1.01%
Norfolk	1,199	0	1,199	117,285	1.02%
Suffolk	977	0	977	108,143	0.90%
East Sussex	909	177	1,086	71,431	1.27%
Cornwall	367	13	380	72,927	0.50%
Devon	916	111	1,027	102,215	0.90%
Gloucestershire	1,090	35	1,125	92,650	1.18%
Somerset	525	0	525	76,682	0.68%
Wiltshire	554	0	554	72,129	0.77%

#### Information pertinent to other settings providing SEN education – resourced provision.

**Current numbers of pupils in resourced provision in Hfds (The Bridge at BHBS, the speech, language and autism setting at Hampton Dene) – see table a. below. Information regarding this for our LA statistical neighbours is shown in table b.**

Table A – numbers of children with EHCPs or statements of special need educated in resourced provision. (From SEN Tribal database).

--

Table B – numbers and percentages of children in primary education with EHCPs or statements educated in SEN units, or resourced provision, in Herefordshire and its statistical LA neighbours.

LA	Total	No. in SEN unit	%	No. in resourced provision	%	Total % in unit or RP	Rank
Herefordshire	157	0	0	30	19.1	19.1	3
Shropshire	392	4	1.0	6	1.5	2.5	10
Norfolk	967	10	1.0	28	2.9	3.9	9
Suffolk	684	120	17.5	5	0.7	18.2	4
East Sussex	671	42	6.3	39	5.8	12.1	6
Cornwall	737	62	8.4	21	2.8	11.2	7
Devon	929	18	1.9	101	10.9	12.8	5
Gloucestershire	645	31	4.8	32	5.0	9.8	8
Somerset	155	0	0	30	19.4	19.4	2
Wiltshire	849	129	15.2	62	7.3	22.5	1

Table B – numbers and percentages of children in secondary education with EHCPs or statements educated in SEN units, or resourced provision, in Herefordshire and its statistical LA neighbours.

LA	Total	No. in SEN unit	%	No. in resourced provision	%	Total % in unit or RP	Rank
Herefordshire	118	0	0	4	3.4	3.4	9
Shropshire	582	8	1.4	36	6.2	7.6	7
Norfolk	1277	59	4.6	58	4.5	9.1	6
Suffolk	853	8	0.9	4	0.5	1.4	10
East Sussex	696	47	6.8	39	5.6	12.4	5
Cornwall	714	79	11.1	65	9.1	20.2	3
Devon	1036	55	5.3	143	13.8	19.1	4
Gloucestershire	589	13	2.2	14	2.4	4.6	8
Somerset	213	19	8.9	34	16	24.9	1
Wiltshire	467	72	15.4	28	6.0	21.4	2

For information

LA	% of total school pop. With EHCP/statements
Herefordshire	2.6
Shropshire	3.8
Norfolk	3.4
Suffolk	2.5
East Sussex	3.7
Cornwall	2.6
Devon	3.1
Gloucestershire	2.6
Somerset	1.6
Wiltshire	2.7

Data for calculation of numbers moving forward.

- **2-19 pupil numbers predictions for 2021** (Premise for 5-16 numbers - check this with Karen) Premise for 16-19 numbers in five years' time, current actual numbers of year 7, 8 and 9 pupils with percentage increase indicated by KK in her calculations
- Number of primary age pupils predicted in five years' time – 13 598 (now 13 006)
- Number of secondary age pupils predicted in five years' time – 9 272 (now 8 612)
- Number of 16-19 pupils predicted in five years' time – 5680 (now 5550)
- Total number predicted – **28 550** (now 27 168)

Applying a variety of percentages to the predicted total above \*\*

- Planning for 1.2% (Herefordshire current position in table above) of the predicted number in 2021 we would need **343** places for children and young people with special educational needs in 2-19 special schools.
- Planning for 0.5% (Cornwall) of the predicted number in 2021 we would need 143 places in special schools.
- Planning for 1.27% (East Sussex, highest percentage recorded by a statistical neighbour LA) of the predicted number in 2021 we would need 363 places in special schools.
- Planning for the median number between highest and lowest percentage recorded by statistically neighbouring LAs we would need 253 places in special schools.

**Current (October 2016) 2-19 placements in special schools –**

The Autumn 2016 Census shows the current numbers on roll for the 4 special schools as follows:

School Name	Single Registered	Dual Registered - Main	Dual Registered-Subsidiary	Grand Total
Barrs Court	111			111
Blackmarston	79			79
Westfield	56		2	58

Brookfield	78	2	11	91
Grand Total	<b>324</b> <b>(represents</b> <b>1.19% of</b> <b>current</b> <b>population)</b>	2	13	339

Note\*\* Data predicting the numbers in ten years' time would be unreliable, however consideration should be given to the likelihood of further increases after 2021. In addition, the impact of housing development and outcomes of Herefordshire core strategy, may increase or lessen the numbers needed.

#### Proposal A

Bearing in mind current numbers accommodated in special schools, and the predicted increase in the 5-16 school age population over the next five years, the planned number of places available by 2026 will need to be somewhere in the range between 324 and 343 (1.2% of the predicted number in 2021). In addition to this, planning could factor in the creation of provision that can accommodate inflation in numbers, but aiming to stay within the range planned for. Economies of scale should be sought so that funding is maximised across all settings. Shared leadership and governance could create the flexibility of provision that would be responsive to need from year to year

#### Proposal B

Bearing in mind the pressures brought to bear on schools in Herefordshire by the relative low level of education funding, a review of the mechanism for funding special school places, and the level of top up funding applied to special school places and mainstream SEN should be carried out.

#### Proposal C

When the total number of planned places for 2021 has been decided, a decision regarding the number of places needed for pupils with severe and complex special needs, as a subset of the overall total must be made. Consequently, in the discussion currently ongoing regarding capital investment in Herefordshire special schools, sufficient flexible provision to support those with severe and complex needs should be planned for.

Decision making body for

Proposal A -

Proposal B -

Proposal C -

S Woodrow 31 October 2016. Revised 22 Nov. 2016. Revised 5 Jan 2017 to show resourced provision.



## Supporting inclusion in mainstream school – mini-task group for Schools Forum

Suggested actions/recommendations

Recommendation	Notes	Cost	Date	By whom?
1. A shared statement for an inclusive ethos	Re-statement of inclusive practice with examples	Time only	launch Sept 2016	Mini-group
2. SEN Network meetings	A discussion as to how these might be extended and what the cost would be. This follows the successful introduction of the central network by the teaching school			
3. Identifying gaps in provision	Asking SENCOs what is missing and have we got the right support available? Also comparison to resourcing to other LAs to be provided. For example, is there enough resource for autism or SLD outreach?			
4. Adding to the Local Offer for SENCOs	Short time limited project to enhance LO following a survey of SENCOs. Clear definition of what is available in terms of outreach into mainstream	Cost of project Officer for x many days		
5. Providing challenge around Annual Reviews	Sample pilot project leading to recommendations for sustainable sampling	Cost of Consultant x many days		
6. Providing challenge around provision for those without a statutory plan	Devise a sampling system to facilitate peer challenge	Use of a pool of SENCOs – supply provided		

7. Devise an official system of dual registration between special schools and mainstream	Need to identify perverse incentives and to design them out – Brookfield intervention model might be used a starting point for this.	Transfer of resource – mainstream to special or reverse		
8. Developing a collaborative model for offering an alternative curriculum to reduce the cost to individual schools.	Need to define each 'school offer' and to map this for all schools	Time to map the respective offers – web based with updates?		
9. Definition of the minimum offer from mainstream schools.	What we would expect every school to provide – helps to define 'what is additional to or different from?' How to we make this user-friendly to SENCOs and Heads?			EE
10. Commitment to minimum SEN experience for placement and NQTs	Each school would be asked to agree to a minimum input for their placement students and NQTs. Also consider some free NQT input as per the SENCO network?			Teaching schools/ Specials/ Resourced Provision

## Schools Forum Budget Working Group – High Needs Task Group

### Task Group Title:

How do we improve the offer for young people with SEND post-16 (both MLD and SLD/PMLD includes post-19)?

### What is in and out of scope (definition and clarification)?

- Herefordshire resident young people aged 16-25 with SEND.
- Increase the number of these young people who are EET.
- Reducing NEET – e.g. reducing the over representation of young people considered to have Behaviour, Emotional Social of Development (BESD) difficulties.
- Exploring the need and potential for a Hub for those young people with MLD.
- Ensuring post 16 education and training provision meets needs and aspirations

### What steps have you taken to gather additional information including contacting/ visiting other areas (attach additional information)?

Visited Worcestershire Transition Service.

Information from other local authority areas including Luton Borough Council, Kensington and Chelsea,

<b>What are the group's recommendations (with costs if possible MG to assist if required)?</b>	<b>What are the advantages of this proposal?</b>	<b>What are the disadvantages of the proposal including risks and how they can be mitigated?</b>	<b>Please state the alternatives considered, their costs along with advantages and disadvantages of each?</b>

<p>1. The group recommends that the 'transitions' moving into adulthood service/team needs additional resource to co-ordinate bespoke learning and employment pathways for some individuals. Envisage that this is a part-time role. This is not to provide Careers Information Advice and Guidance. Need to scope out costs with MG.</p>	<p>A key driver of the SEND reforms is to ensure that young people are given support to prepare for adult life, including a focus on access to employment and independence</p> <p>Young people entering post-16 education and training should be accessing provision which supports them to build on their achievements at school and which helps them progress towards adulthood. Young people with EHC plans are likely to need more tailored post-16 pathways <a href="#">SEND Code Of Practice 8.22</a>.</p> <p>Young people who have more complex needs and disabilities and who may need ongoing support from adult social care are given support from the Transition Team. The Transition Team provides support and guidance to parents and young disabled people between the ages of 14 and 25 years.</p> <p>Additional resource is needed to complement the existing team for a brokerage adviser who will work with young people who are not able to access local mainstream further education. They will create bespoke packages of education and training which meet the individual's needs. They will work closely with the young person and the people that know them best. As well as education and training providers, employers and agencies such as Job Centre Plus Access to Work Advisers.</p> <p>The broker will work together with relevant professionals and the young person to support them to identify what outcomes they would like to achieve in respect of education and training and employment.</p> <p>This recommendation will not replace the schools and colleges responsibilities to: provide information, advice and guidance about options post 16; deliver a curriculum to raise awareness and prepare young person for adulthood; and work experience where appropriate.</p> <p>The goal is that young people are accessing the right provision given the right support at the right time in order to progress</p>	<p>Do nothing. This is not an option. To do nothing would deny young people the support needed to prepare for employment and independence. Young people are more likely to end up being NEET and dependent on services, which in turn affects their health and well-being.</p> <p>Employ a full-time broker – it is not envisaged with the number of young people that would need this support would at this time warrant a full-time broker.</p>
---	---	---

	and to achieve clear outcomes that help them access adult life and, where possible, fulfil their aspirations.		
2. Work needs to be undertaken with employers to develop employment pathways. This is a focus for the next 12 months as part of CWD and Autism partnership strategy and plans. Linking into the first recommendation above.	See above		See above
3. Further work needs to be undertaken to ensure that housing meets needs. Work is currently underway with adult social care.			
4. Before making any recommendations for a Post 16 MLD Hub, there is a need to understand what current provision is available in Herefordshire for young people with MLD from secondary school onwards. To identify what is working well, good practice and gaps. Who should take this work forward? Resource needs to be identified to undertake this work.	This will ensure that we understand the need to inform any future commissioning.		Commission provision without undertaking a needs analysis to establish gaps in provision etc. This could result in the wrong type of provision in the wrong place being underutilised.
5. That funding is made available in the short term as	This proposal will support those young people most at risk of becoming NEET on leaving school to make a successful		Do nothing. Young people are more

<p>a contingency to continue the successful SEMH project that took place with Brookfields and St Davids. The aim of this project is to support students to make a positive transition in to post 16 education, employment or training; to support students to positively engage in their post 16 placement and to support post 16 providers in maintaining student engagement.*</p>	<p>transition into education, training and employment. It will ensure that there is not a gap in provision for those young people leaving school in 2016.</p> <p>Each young person not in employment, education or training bears a cost to the public purse, through benefit payments, lost tax revenue and healthcare and criminal justice costs, says a report by the Work Foundation and the Private Equity Foundation and Public Health England local action on health inequalities :Reducing the number of young people NEET.</p> <p>Each Neet, aged 16 to 18, is estimated to cost the economy £56,000 over the course of their lifetime with a further £104,000 per person cost due to missed opportunities and work that they would have created</p> <p>Spending time not in employment, education or training (NEET) has been shown to have a detrimental effect on physical and mental health. This effect is greater when time spent NEET is at a younger age or lasts for longer. On average, such young people are more likely to be unemployed, have lower-paid jobs, have addictions or go to prison</p>		<p>likely to end up being NEET and dependent on services. Each young person not in employment, education or training bears a cost to the public purse, through benefit payments, lost tax revenue and healthcare and criminal justice costs. Each Neet, aged 16 to 18, is estimated to cost the economy £56,000 over the course of their lifetime with a further £104,000 per person cost due to missed opportunities and work that they would have created</p>
---	--	--	---

\* **Project details** - Out of the starting 20 students, the programme finished with 17 that were *engaged* with the support programme, a retention of 85%. Out of the final 17 students, 1 had been removed from the provider due to poor attendance, one had left the provider due to moving out of county and 1 other was due to medical reasons and placed in a medical facility out of county.

Out of the final 17, that equates to 82.4% prevented from becoming NEET within the duration of the Programme.

The reason we are recommending funding in the short-term as a contingency is that ESF funding has been tendered and procured but we (local authority and Marches LEP) are awaiting contract implementation meetings with the successful bidder which could cause a delay to provision starting. It is hoped that we can get contracts in place in June and that the programme will start in June/July 2016. The contract ends 31 March 2018.

The ESF funding procured is to support young people who are:

- Aged 15-24 years on the start date of activity AND
- NEET OR
- Identified as being at risk of becoming NEET

For 15-16 year olds either on or off school roll, the use of ESF funds is restricted to those young people who are disengaged from regularly timetabled learning and are at risk of not participating post-16 or who are on the LA's Risk of NEET Indicator List. Pre-16 provision will support underachieving pupils in schools/academies and ensure statutory provision for those off the school roll.

The successful bidder must provide differentiated delivery for different groups of young people, demonstrating an in-depth understanding of their varied and complex needs. This must include the provision of personalised and flexible programmes

including (but not exclusively):

- ex-offenders, offenders and those at risk of offending
- those with disabilities including those with mild to moderate learning difficulties and/or disabilities
- those with mental health difficulties including behavioural and social difficulties
- those in care and care leavers
- young carers and teenage parents
- those from BME communities including travellers
- those who have been home educated
- those who are homeless
- those who have previously been excluded from school or withdrawn from post-16 learning programmes
- those with substance misuse issues
- graduates, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds

The Services must provide individual and continuous mentor/key worker support to encourage continued engagement. The mentor/key worker will be expected to engage with a young person's parent or carer as appropriate to foster positive outcomes.

The Services must include enhanced provision for those with learning difficulties and disabilities or other vulnerable groups who may require specialist support and training in alternative learning environments.

The Services must facilitate and broker opportunities for young people and support local employers to take on young people

£598,700 is available for Herefordshire.

Pre 16 NEET More Developed £102,000 80 young people

Post 16 NEET More Developed £496,700 195 young people



## Schools Forum Budget Working Group – High Needs Task Group

How could we improve Early Years provision to prevent later underachievement (and cost)? Sue Sharp			
In scope: Early identification and intervention for children with SEND			
Out of scope:			
Recommendation	Notes	Required	Cost
<b>Designated Educational Psychology time for Early Years</b>	<p>Currently EPs only conduct statutory assessments for EY children.</p> <p>Identification and intervention of SEND in EYs would be improved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. including an EP in the EY Review Panel monthly multi-agency meeting;</li> <li>2. including EP assessment in some CDC multi-disciplinary assessments;</li> <li>3. including an EP view during transition into YR (summer term)</li> </ol>	EP time – one day per week	
<b>Increase Child Development Centre Assessment Places and outreach to localities</b>	<p>Re-shaping the current CDC ‘Opportunity’ group to become an assessment group (potentially increasing assessment places at CDC from current 10 <b>per term</b> to 22 <b>per term</b>), Current MDA to remain focused on assessing social/communication difficulties/ SLD/ASD.</p> <p>Greater use of outreach services (possibly including assessment sessions in localities/Children’s Centres)</p>	Multi-agency development work with CDC team	neutral
<b>Increase of COSI (Communication and Social Interaction) group places and mainstream outreach for children with ASD</b>	<p>Need identified at EY Review Meeting – number of children with diagnosis of ASD increasing. Currently 15 on waiting list for Sept16 with only 5 places on offer.</p> <p>Concerns raised by EY leaders and managers over lack of places and specialist outreach</p> <p>Children with a diagnosis of ASD would be accessing appropriate early</p>	<p>5 additional COSI places to be made available(2x half day sessions)</p> <p>Specialist outreach into mainstream settings for those not accessing a COSI place(1x half day)</p>	

## Schools Forum Budget Working Group – High Needs Task Group

	intervention and developing social communication skills	Minimum 0.3 fte specialist teacher	
<b>Re-start SaL advice clinics at Children’s Centres</b>	<p>Waiting lists for initial SaLT appointments can be up to a year currently, in some areas of the County.</p> <p>The advice clinics gave parents earlier access to a SaLT – usually within 4-8 weeks. Appropriate ideas and strategies for intervention could be given.</p> <p>Referrals more appropriate (therefore fewer inappropriate referrals increasing the waiting list)</p>	<p>SaLT (or SaLT assistant)</p> <p>0.4 fte</p>	
<b>Parent Support Preventative work/intervention with families who don’t meet the Families First criteria – particularly in relation to children with challenging behaviour</b>	<p>Concerns raised by EY leaders and managers about attachment /behaviour and lack of support for children and families unless at high risk.</p> <p>Increasing numbers of SPORT referrals for children with SEMH difficulties – often rejected as not seen as ‘medical’</p> <p>Currently offered Solihull or Triple P parenting courses, input to the home from Health Visitor Community Nursery Nurse or a Homestart volunteer.</p>	<p>Capacity for family support through Children’s Centres</p> <p>Under-5’s CAMHS service</p> <p>PIP project (Making psychotherapeutic support available to all families who are struggling to form a secure attachment with their baby)</p>	

05