

SUPPLEMENT TO THE AGENDA FOR

Herefordshire Schools Forum

Friday 10 March 2017

9.30 am

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

6. LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Pages

3 - 36

Meeting:	Schools Forum
Meeting date:	Friday 10 March 2017
Title of report:	Initial Proposals of the Schools Forum High Needs task and Finish Group for wider consultation
Report by:	Les Knight (Head of Additional Needs) with Group Co-chair Sara Catlow-Hawkins (Headteacher – Bishop of Hereford Bluecoat School)

Classification

Open

Notice has been served in accordance with Part 2, Section 5 (Procedures Prior to Private Meetings) of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (Regulations) 2012.

Key decision

This is not an executive decision.

Wards affected

Countywide

Purpose

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

Recommendation(s)

THAT:

- a) **Schools Forum reviews all of the individual proposals outlined in Table A of the report and provides a view on each.**

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 proposals are shown in Table A below. Further detail is provided in Appendix C to F which are the responses from the individual sub-groups.

Table A				
Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
(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	This is the proportion of the population placed into special schools nationally. There is no reason why Herefordshire should exceed the national incidence of need, particularly because the evidence from statistical neighbours suggests it is relatively high. In the October 2016 pupil census Herefordshire had 339 special school places which also includes any dual registrations. This indicates that it is already close to the proportion indicated for 2021.	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.
	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 at the same time as considering the number of special school places and an improved mainstream offer.		
(b) The best offer in mainstream schools to	i. the high needs task group produces a shared statement for an	In order to reduce the pressure on specialist places, all mainstream need to take a	Time for task group	Lack of engagement from schools and settings caused by pressures of

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
reduce the need for specialist places	inclusive ethos with examples;	shared responsibility in successfully meeting the needs of as wide a range of pupils as possible		finance and performance. Mitigation: Leaders need to promote this in their respective Forums
	ii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies what further forms of SEN Network meetings would support inclusive practice	Only by sharing successful practice will the whole of the Herefordshire Learning Community become better equipped to address the widest range of SEND	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
	iii. the termly SENCO network meeting organised by Marlbrook Teaching School identifies gaps in provision which reduce costs to the High Needs Block in the longer term, as well as supporting an inclusive ethos	This will provide an opportunity to gather views from those working directly with SEND in schools	Agenda time at SENCO network meeting	Not all schools engaged in forums Mitigation: See (b) i
	iv. a short time limited project is commissioned to enhance the Herefordshire Local Offer pages with the aim of better supporting SENCOs	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.enhance the resources available to SENCOs	6 weeks of officer time to meet with SENCOs, to prepare materials and to put on web. (resource as one-off from vacancy savings when they occur)	Offer becomes static after 6 week period Mitigation: SENCO network time could be used once per year to update offer
	v. a project is commissioned which leads to recommendations for the sustainable	All attendees at reviews need to challenge whether everything possible is being done to offer an appropriate offer to those with SEND. It is	No new resource required as project already planned - Project Officer or Consultant time – 1 day per wk for 6 months plus peer-	There is a risk that: i) The resulting AR monitoring system is not realistic and therefore sustainable.

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
	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.	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.	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 project time funded by centrally held DSG budget (from vacancy savings when they occur).	Mitigation: Project Officer needs to work very closely with schools and SEN team to ensure that system is workable. There is a risk that by not doing this we do not fulfil our duties under the SEND COP.
	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	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.	Meeting time to discuss. Two Options to fund this: (i) Brookfield Intervention model is school contribution from existing pupil-led resource (ii) DSG allocation to specials to establish this work as in-reach/outreach. £50k for one experienced FTE teacher or equivalent time allocation working out of special school (s)	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
	vii. a minimum offer by all mainstream schools is agreed and used to challenge those schools not meeting this minimum standard	Schools, alongside 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 different from' can be established. This is a statutory requirement. Herefordshire is	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.

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
		not compliant at this point and a final draft should be agreed quickly.		
	viii. a commitment to a minimum amount of SEN experience for teacher training placements and NQTs is sought from schools through training institutions	Initial teacher training can only devote a limited amount of time to SEND. This would be a local arrangement to boost this.	Meeting time for teaching schools to set it up.	There is a risk that ITT establishments do not see this as a priority.
(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 across the whole county, consideration is given to a sustainable resource to co-ordinate education and employment opportunities in the 16-25 age-range;	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 for all learners with significant SEND across all settings. There will be an on-going need for this co-ordination.	Current resource is £30k for co-ordination role	Without this post, there is no central co-ordination of this work on employment opportunities which carries the risk that families seek expensive out-of-county provision for young people with LD
	ii. work is undertaken as part of recommendation (j) to develop 'pathways to employment' ;	It is important that there is a route, which is clear to all, by which YP can access supported employment	Included in (c) i.	The risk of not having this would be a lack of clarity for YP and families
	iii. further work is undertaken (linked to the accommodation strategy being developed by the Council's Adult Well-being Directorate) to	Young people often need appropriate and bespoke housing solutions if they are to gain the maximum benefit from their employment opportunities. There is an opportunity to reduce the cost	No new resource required	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

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
	provide suitable supported housing solutions that support disabled young people to be able to access suitable education and employment opportunities;	to the high needs block of the DSG as for a proportion of post-19 learners living locally in their own accommodation would have their housing costs met from housing benefit rather than in expensive residential colleges		living.
	iv. post-16 education and training opportunities for students with learning difficulties 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	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. The focus is now on those with less severe needs. This was identified in the Local Area SEND Inspection.	Professionals time to meet in 2 nd round of Post-16 review	There is a risk that as a result of not having suitable post-16 LD provision locally, places will be sought at independent specialist providers resulting in a further growth in numbers and cost. There is also a risk that post-16 providers will not engage with this work.
	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.	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.	Cost £30k per annum	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
(d) Preventing the need for high-cost residential places particularly for	i. by examining the outcomes of the existing project to explore what works to reduce the risk of high-	Schools Forum granted funding in 2016-17 to explore ways in which children with a high risk of needing out-of-county residential provision can have their needs	No new resource in 2017-18	The risk of doing nothing is that we will continue to have significant expenditure on multi-agency placements out-of-county where monitoring of students is

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
ASD/LD and challenging behaviour	cost residential places particularly for ASD/LD and challenging behaviour, the successful elements should be taken forward on a sustainable basis.	addressed locally. 3/7ths of the cost of multi-agency residential provision comes from DSG. This work is underway but will take the duration of 2017-18 to reveal what works.		more difficult. 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.
(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);	It would be preferable to intervene early with psychological support, rather than waiting for the situation to be exacerbated. Research evidence demonstrates that investment in EY interventions can save at least £3 for every £1 invested.	£12k which could be re-cycled from additional traded EP work.	There is a risk that by not doing this, needs are not addressed early enough. If this is implemented, the risk would be one of excess demand and some sort of priority list would be needed to mitigate this.
	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;	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 to reflect the current level of demand. It would also allow a wider range of needs to be assessed. The use of outreach assessment is important because some	No new resource – re-arrangement of the existing resource	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). The risk of rearranging the resource is that a group that caters for lower level needs will be removed.

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
		families cannot travel into Hereford regularly for assessment visits.		
	<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>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 (almost doubling to just under 100 per 10000 of the school-age population), 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. 5 years ago, there were 7 children for the 6 places. Last year, there were 12.</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>This could be from re-assigning existing resource in LA managed DSG salary budgets.</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</p>	<p>A previously successful programme of work delivered by SALT assistants overseen</p>	<p>0.4 FTE SALT Assistant = £13.5k. Funding source would need to be identified</p>	<p>If this is not offered, there is a risk of continuing high levels of potentially</p>

Area	Proposal	Reason(s)	Cost/resource	Risks
	therapists (SALT) at Children's Centres are developed	<p>by qualified therapists demonstrated the value of this work. These advice clinics give parents earlier access to a SaLT – 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)</p> <p>This was identified in the Local Area SEND Inspection.</p>	<p>as part of anticipated joint commissioning exercise.</p> <p>Some cost for training could be built into SALT costing provided for EY Task and Finish group</p>	<p>inappropriate referral to SALT which would result in significant delays in referrals being accepted.</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 as part of Herefordshire's approach to providing Early Help.	<p>Concerns has 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 referrals through the child development centre for children with SEMH difficulties – often rejected as not seen as 'medical'. These cases can make up more than 1/3 of the monthly referrals.</p>	<p>Costed into EY task and finish group - no new resource required (PIP project on attachment)</p>	<p>Risk to be outlined in EY Task and finish papers</p>

Key considerations

4. 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. 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 C to F) and the recommendations from all of the sub-groups are included in this paper.

5. The sub-groups were asked to provide 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.
6. 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.
7. 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

8. 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

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

Financial implications

10. The financial implications are shown in Table A above.

Legal implications

11. A legal viewpoint is not required at this stage of consultation.

Risk management

12. Table A above includes risks and mitigation.

Consultees

13. N/A

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.

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 16th 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 7th 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		
ENGLAND (7)	101,249	3,953	105,202	8,438,143	1.20%
NORTH EAST(7)	6,689	284	6,973	393,805	1.70%
WEST MIDLANDS (7)	14,274	103	14,377	920,064	1.55%
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	324 (represents 1.19% of current population)	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

29

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,

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

<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 SEND Code Of Practice 8.22.</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

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
Designated Educational Psychology time for Early Years	<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"> 1. including an EP in the EY Review Panel monthly multi-agency meeting; 2. including EP assessment in some CDC multi-disciplinary assessments; 3. including an EP view during transition into YR (summer term) 	EP time – one day per week	
Increase Child Development Centre Assessment Places and outreach to localities	<p>Re-shaping the current CDC ‘Opportunity’ group to become an assessment group (potentially increasing assessment places at CDC from current 10 per term to 22 per term), 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
Increase of COSI (Communication and Social Interaction) group places and mainstream outreach for children with ASD	<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 intervention and developing social communication skills</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</p>	

<p>Re-start SaL advice clinics at Children’s Centres</p>	<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>	
<p>Parent Support Preventative work/intervention with families who don’t meet the Families First criteria – particularly in relation to children with challenging behaviour</p>	<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>	