

YORK SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING

TUESDAY 7TH JULY 2015 – 1.00pm – 4.00pm
in the Severus Room – F032 – West Offices

Key	 Information and routine business  Decision  Consultation
------------	--

	Item	Item leader	Purpose	Paperwork
1.	Welcome	Chair	Routine business	
2.	Apologies	Chair	For information	
3.	Minutes of the Schools Forum meeting of 13 th April 2015	Chair	For approval	Attached
4.	Matters Arising not on the agenda	Chair	For information	
5.	Adjustment to membership of schools forum	Chair	For information	Attached
6.	Special School Place Funding 2016/17 onwards	Jess Haslam	For discussion / decision	Attached
7.	SEN / High-Needs Funding Comparisons	Richard Hartle	For information / discussion	Attached
8.	SEN / Inclusion Review	Maxine Squire	For discussion	Attached
9.	Inclusion Review Pilot Projects	Tricia Head	For discussion	Attached
10.	School Budget De-delegations 2016/17	Richard Hartle	For information / discussion	Attached
11.	Schools Forum forward plan – update	Richard Hartle	For information	Attached
12.	Any Other Agreed Business	Chair		
13.	Date and time of next and future meetings: 29 th September at 1.00pm 14 th December at 1.00pm	Chair	For information	

Please send apologies to Salli Radford by email to salli.radford@york.gov.uk or by calling York 554210.

CITY OF YORK SCHOOLS FORUM

Minutes of the Schools Forum held on Monday 13th April 2015 at 1.00pm

Attendance list:

Members:

Tracey Ralph	Maintained Primary Headteacher and Chair
Trevor Burton	Maintained Secondary Headteacher
Brian Crosby	Academies Representative
George Gilmore	Special School Representative
Nicola Fox	Maintained Nursery Representative
Caroline Hancy	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Tricia Head	Pupil Referral Unit Representative
Cath Hindmarch	Maintained Primary Headteacher
Lorna Savage	Maintained Secondary Headteacher
Bill Scriven	Maintained Secondary Headteacher (VA school)
Karen Tatham	Maintained Primary Headteacher

Observers / Advisors:

Richard Hartle	Head of Finance, City of York Council
Maxine Squire	Assistant Director, Education and Skills, City of York Council
Jon Stonehouse	Director of Children's Services, Education and Skills
Andy Wilcock	Category Manager, Procurement
Jeremy Smith	Schneider Electric
	Linda Brook

Salli Radford Coordinator and Clerk

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received, with consent, from Alison Birkinshaw – Further Education Representative, Andy Herbert – Maintained Primary Headteacher, Ken McArthur – Early Years Sector Representative and David O'Brien – Governor Representative. Cllr Looker was absent from the meeting.

3. Minutes of the York Education Partnership meeting of 8th December 2015

Previously distributed.

The minutes of the meeting of 8th December 2015 were agreed to be a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

4. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

5. Role and responsibilities of the Schools Forum

Previously distributed. The information relating to responsibilities and membership requirements was noted. It was further noted that membership of the Forum would need to flex and be realigned as schools were re-categorised, with the Clerk agreeing to monitor this process and advise as appropriate.

Caroline Hancy joined the meeting at 1.10pm.

It was noted that terms of office for Forum members would be clarified by the Primary Heads' Forum and Secondary Heads' Group prior to the next meeting.

The Chair requested the inclusion of SEN provision and support as an item on the next agenda, agreeing to speak to Tricia Head and Jess Haslam prior to this.

6. Analysis of the 2015/16 Schools Budget

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle presented the report, drawing the attention of Forum members to Annex 1 which summarised the budgets described in the paper. Richard asked the Forum to consider the information provided and to request any further information they would like to receive prior to setting the 2016/17 Schools Budget.

In response to a question regarding the contingencies outlined in paragraph 7, in particular the split in allocation of General Schools Contingency between primary sector (£50,000) and secondary sector (£26,000), Richard advised that contributions were based on pupil numbers across the two phases but that, with the agreement of the forum, the fund was treated as one general contingency rather than two funds.

In response to a question regarding the continuing Carbon Reduction Commitment assigned to Danesgate, Richard advised that this was currently a statutory requirement for PRUs only, having previously been charged for all schools.

In response to a question regarding the costs for servicing the Forum detailed in paragraph 20 and whether these included any payment for headteachers' time to attend meetings, Richard advised that this was not included in the budget allocation. Richard confirmed that it was anticipated that all schools would at some time contribute to the forum and that the overall burden would be shared over time.

In response to a question regarding the level of the top-up threshold for SEN pupils, Richard advised that the threshold for PRUs would increase from £8,000 to £10,000 to match the existing threshold for Special Schools and ERPs from 1st April 2015. It was noted that the Additional Targeted High Needs Funding was allocated at the discretion of the Forum.

In response to a question regarding the trade union facilities time budget, Richard advised that this would be reduced to c50% of its 2013 level from September 2015.

In response to a question regarding the mental health support for schools referred to in paragraph 11, Richard advised that detail could be sought on this and included in the SEN information already requested for the next meeting.

In response to a question regarding the criteria for schools to access Nurture Group funding, referred to in paragraph 13, Richard advised that the LA currently supported two Nurture Groups. It was noted that Tina Hardman could provide further information.

In response to a question regarding the complex formula used to calculate the Additional Targeted High Needs Funding for Mainstream Schools and Academies, detailed at paragraph 10, Richard advised that this formula had been required from 2014/15 when previous arrangements involving schools bidding for contingency funds were ended. Richard advised that the new regulations were designed to recognise the variation in circumstances between schools as some schools experienced a high proportion of SEN pupils. It was noted that the new transparent formula had been agreed with the York Education Partnership and that schools with a disproportionate number of statements received additional funding.

In response to a question regarding the replacement of statements with EHCPs in the formula, Richard advised that the formula was based on the proportion of pupils requiring top-up funding, with this being any allocation over the £6,000 threshold.

In response to a question regarding the role of the Forum in considering specific allocations to individual schools, Richard advised that this was not permitted, though the Forum could consider outcomes as part of its consideration of the formula. It was noted that factors that could be taken into account were very limited, though some indicators could be adjusted. The meeting discussed this, with Richard advising that a very small number of schools were experiencing disproportionately higher numbers of high needs pupils. Richard further advised that the Forum could consider how to allocate funding through the main formula but could not take into account the number of statements or EHCPs as this was not permitted within the regulations.

In response to a question regarding the use of SEN data to allocate funding, Richard advised that only limited factors could be included in the main funding formula, including pupil numbers, FSM, EAL, low prior attainment and pupil mobility.

The meeting discussed SEN top-up funding, with Richard advising that previous consideration had shown that the current system worked for the majority of schools, with exceptional circumstances being covered by the additional formula used to calculate the Additional Targeted High Needs Funding for Mainstream Schools and Academies.

Richard acknowledged that the main funding formula could not specifically recognise SEN but, that the High Needs top up did take this into account.

In response to a question regarding a previous structure including a general SEN fund as well as an additional contingency, Richard advised that this dual approach was still operating as schools were funded for the first £6,000 of SEN support through the main funding formula, with costs above this threshold being met by the High Needs top up.

In response to a question regarding the value of the funds, Richard advised that this detail could be provided, though the High Needs top up fund was c£1.15M in 2015/16. This was discussed. The view was expressed that c£12M was allocated to schools to cover the first £6,000 of support per high needs pupil with no reference to the location of these needs.

The meeting further discussed the issues raised, with Richard outlining the mechanism by which basic and top-up SEN funding was allocated. It was noted that there was only limited flexibility in the mechanism allowed. The view was expressed that requests had been brought to the Schools Forum in the past and that current basic main formula high needs funding was not being allocated where needed.

Further discussion followed, with Richard advising that DfE analysis showed that FSM and low prior attainment indicators were reasonable proxies of SEN support needs for most schools, but the contingency recognised that despite this a small number of schools were less well served by the formula.

The Chair asked Richard to bring further analysis to the next meeting, whilst recognising that DfE regulations could not be changed.

In response to a question regarding the option to reduce the general SEN fund and lower the threshold at which the High Needs contingency could be accessed, the Chair suggested that the Forum be provided with illustrations of the impact on all schools. Richard advised that the level of funding maintained in the main funding formula worked well for the majority of schools, with the Chair requesting that this level of detail be brought to the next meeting.

In response to a question regarding Termination of Employment Costs detailed in paragraph 21, Richard advised that £383,000 had been retained from the DSG and that the LA could not increase this budget. It was noted that the fund covered redundancy and early retirement costs due to decisions made prior to 2013/14.

7. Funding for early retirement costs

Previously distributed. The Chair advised that, as secondary headteachers had been under-represented at the last meeting, reconsideration had been recommended. Richard Hartle presented the proposals, advising that the proposed contingency was for early retirement costs only and not redundancy costs.

The meeting discussed the proposals, with the Chair advising that the meeting that took place in June 2014 had expressed uncertainty about the costs of early retirement and what aspects of individual packages were included. Richard advised that this depended on individual circumstances.

The meeting further discussed the proposals, noting that the proposed contingency would be drawn from school funding and that a reluctance to establish a contingency was understandable as it would draw budget away from service delivery.

Richard advised that secondary headteachers had made representations to him following the decision at the last meeting. The view was expressed that schools were likely to move from achieving reductions through voluntary means to compulsory redundancies in the future.

The Forum agreed to uphold the previous decision not to create a contingency.

8. Review of 2015/16 Funding Formula values

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle presented the information, advising that this was being shared to stimulate debate in advance of 2016/17.

It was noted that York was the sixth-lowest funded LA based on national funding allocations for 2015/16, with a per-pupil allowance of £4,202.

In response to a question regarding the option of raising additional funds from Council Tax to add to this government allocation, Richard advised that this was possible though York did not pursue this option. Richard advised that the DSG was based on previous

LA expenditure on schools and had already been topped-up by c£4M by the LA when the DSG was first established.

In response to a question regarding additional funds contributed by the LA in addition to the DSG, Richard advised that the School Improvement Service and other support services were traditionally supported by the LA.

In response to a question regarding the allocation of any DSG funding to the LA for service provision, Richard advised that the de-delegations detailed in papers considered under item 6 illustrated de-delegations and central budgets managed by the LA. It was noted that central government provided DSG allocations for schools and that centralised support could be enabled by de-delegations. It was further noted that additional support and separate central functions were funded by the LA from its own revenue budget.

The meeting noted that the Schools Forum was the decision-making group for the DSG, whilst elected members were the decision-making group for the LA's own budget.

Richard referred the Forum to the Annex, which illustrated York's position in comparison to other LAs across a range of indices. It was noted that York's AWPU value remained unchanged. The meeting noted the high-level lump-sum payment made to York schools.

The view was expressed that Pupil Premium funding was not adequate to address need as public sector cuts impacted negatively on the poorest elements of society, with this funding requiring reconsideration. Maxine Squire advised that the Schools Forum would be challenged on attainment gaps if these were not being addressed.

In response to a question on the use of alternative indices to determine funding, such as the IDACI, Richard advised that York had traditionally kept funding allocations as even as possible. It was noted that, when last reviewed, it had been noted that the use of different indices would result in a different distribution pattern.

The Chair sought a view on next steps, with Richard advising that, following the forthcoming general election, a new National Funding Formula may be published and would be unlikely to permit much discretion.

In response to a question regarding the likelihood of Pupil Premium funding being continued, given that it was a coalition policy decision, Richard advised that it was unlikely to be removed though there was only one manifesto commitment to date.

In response to a question regarding the likelihood of continuation of the universal FSM entitlement for infants, Richard advised that, again, this commitment was not evident across all the major parties.

The view was expressed that there was inadequate understanding of the variety of issues facing schools across the city.

Richard asked the Forum to agree that if any additional resource became available it be targeted at the AWPU factors. Discussion took place, with the Forum noting that some schools were currently underfunded as needs were obscured by current funding criteria.

Jon Stonehouse advised that Cllr Looker would continue to lobby on behalf of York, as the city was not benefitting from “fair funding allocation”.

In response to a question regarding the increased allowance paid to secondary schools in comparison with primary schools for EAL pupils, Richard advised that this differential was in recognition of the greater degree of difficulty facing secondary schools in moving pupils forward. It was noted that pupils with EAL entering the UK education system within the last three years attracted additional funding.

The forum agreed to retain the current formula allocation pending any post election national formula announcement, with any additional resources by default being directed to the AWPU factor.

Andy Wilcock, Jeremy Smith and two other representatives of Schneider Electric joined the meeting at 2.20pm.

9. Water / sewerage billing review

Previously distributed. Andy Wilcock presented the proposal, advising that all schools were within the scope of the review. Jeremy Smith advised that Schneider Electric would provide audits and suggest cost-saving options, taking into account billing, accounts, water efficiency and conservation. Schneider would review data, visit sites and report back with recommendations in each case, with schools then being given the options to pursue the recommendations. Jeremy advised that Schneider would implement the work, making a charge from resulting savings, with no fees being payable until the point of savings being achieved. It was noted that fees were quantifiable and transparent.

Andy advised that the project had been approved by Legal Services and that Schneider had appointed a dedicated project manager for the LA.

Richard advised that the Forum was being asked to endorse Schneider’s approach to individual schools.

Andy advised that Gary Christie would lead on the project on behalf of the LA’s energy team, with Jacky Warren to provide follow-up.

The information was noted.

Andy Wilcock, Jeremy Smith and the other representatives of Schneider Electric left the meeting at 2.30pm. The meeting adjourned until 2.37pm.

10. Interim Commissioning Plan

Previously distributed. Maxine Squire presented the draft plan, which detailed the proposed move to sector-led school improvement arrangements. Maxine outlined the research that had been undertaken to determine what had and had not been successful in other LAs, with it being clear that the LA would need to invest in capacity to support sector-led improvement.

Maxine advised that research had identified what worked well in York and what needed to change. It was noted that a significant amount of DSG funding was currently used to support schools and that different models were in place across other LAs, with Teaching School Alliances delivering school improvement services in some areas and others focussing on cluster or phase networks.

If was noted that few LAs continued to maintain a large, subject-specific consultant team and that those that remained were under review. Maxine advised that school improvement partnerships were being developed in North Yorkshire and that the East Riding was using school improvement funds to pump-prime work amongst schools. It was noted that some York schools were working across LA boundaries as part of these emerging structures, with SLAs in place to enable this.

Maxine advised that the option of formation of a Schools Company had been considered, but at this time it was felt that the structures which currently existed through the School Improvement Commissioning Group, the clusters and the Schools Forum would be sufficient in the short term. Maxine advised that the Local Authority would continue to maintain a small central school improvement team to continue to deliver the LA's statutory duties, with this team to be funded from the LA's general fund rather than the DSG. It was noted that this would require a radical restructure of the existing team and that current strengths and structures had been considered alongside the key resources provided by the two teaching school alliances and their associated National Teaching Schools.

Maxine advised that cluster-led work was impacting positively and was enabling collaborative working, with this being reflected in comments in recent Ofsted inspection reports.

Maxine advised that the interim commissioning plan was providing structure that was simple, transparent and accountable as well as being designed to deliver positive results. The Forum was asked to consider the framework and associated costs, which included a saving of £160K against the DSG, various options about the use of this surplus were discussed including the option to be reallocated back to schools or clusters. The Chair commented that the reserve might usefully support recommendations arising from the outcome of the SEN place planning and spending review commissioned by the Forum.

In response to a question regarding the longevity of the proposed structure as schools required some certainty, Maxine advised that the proposals were designed to be sustainable.

The details of the interim commissioning plan were examined and discussed, including the work to be commissioned from the two teaching school alliances.

The Chair thanked Maxine for her research and development work and thanked the headteachers of the teaching school alliance schools for their support.

Maxine advised that it was proposed that the commissioning plan will be drafted each year and presented to the York Learning Partnership by the School Improvement Commissioning Group before being submitted to the Schools Forum for sign off.

The Forum discussed the option of topping-up cluster funding from £125,000 to £285,000 from the saving against the DSG, agreeing not to pursue this option as current cluster funding levels were adequate.

It was noted that the Schools Causing Concern budget held by the School Improvement Commissioning Group (SICG) had been under-spent during 2014/15 and that the surplus would be returned to the DSG.

In response to a question regarding capacity and the option of creating some spare capacity, Maxine advised of the need to invest in capacity to enable progress. Jon

Stonehouse advised that future discussions would be more straightforward and better-informed as new structures became embedded.

Richard Hartle advised that there were many uncertainties and suggested that an outline commitment be agreed as the plans would need to be revisited at a future date due to national turbulence.

The Forum discussed the draft plan, with Richard advising that a commitment could only be made for 2015/16 though the Forum could provide an indication of its future intentions. It was noted that longer-term commitment could be considered at any time.

The Forum further discussed the draft plan, with Maxine advising that there was considerable flexibility in the proposals. Given the volume of primary schools currently at Requires Improvement the Forum agreed to increase the proposed number of primary school-to-school support teams included in the draft plan by one. It was agreed that funding to support the interim commissioning plan would be provided from the DSG.

In response to a question regarding cluster funding, Maxine advised that the current top-sliced fund was c£125,000. It was noted that Bill Scriven would take a proposal to increase the number of clusters by one to establish a Catholic Cluster would be taken to the York Learning Partnership on 1st May. It was further noted that the cluster funding formula would be used to define cluster funding levels for 2015-16.

In response to a question regarding York Challenge Partner support for schools, Maxine advised that schools would be provided with one visit each year but could access further support via the LA's traded Services to Schools.

Linda Brook joined the meeting at 3.10pm.

11. New schools financial software

Previously distributed. Linda Brook invited feedback on the new school financial software and the reports that schools wished to extract from this. Forum members made suggestions for Linda to pursue.

In response to a question regarding information on Children's Centre funding, Jon Stonehouse advised that this could be provided by the LA, to include costs, use and outcomes.

In response to a question regarding the budget holder for the progress of vulnerable children, Jon advised that this responsibility sat with the Director of Children's Services.

Tricia Head left the meeting at 3.20pm.

Jon advised that further information on the Children's Centres could be provided, adding that consultations on a range of services were to be arranged.

The Forum discussed the reports they wished to access via the new software.

Linda Brook left the meeting at 3.25pm.

12. School budgets and balances monitoring – Spring term update

Previously distributed. Richard Hartle advised that the information had been circulated for information, asking whether the Forum wished to see this on a termly basis or at year-end outturn only. The Forum noted that academies were not included in the information. It was agreed that the information would be taken at the year-end only.

In response to a question regarding schools with a deficit budget forecast at the end of 2015/16, Richard advised that deficit budgets were approved by the LA and that an overview of these situations could be brought to the summer Schools Forum meeting. It was noted that some schools held cluster funds and that this might mask the true budget position.

The update was noted.

13. Schools Forum forward plan

Previously distributed. The plan was noted. It was agreed that Richard Hartle would update the plan to include consideration of SEN support in July 2015 and an update on School Improvement arrangements in December 2015.

14. Any Other Business

It was noted that governor representatives and the trade unions had requested to attend meetings as observers. It was noted that, as Schools Forum meetings were public meetings, there was no reason why they should not be invited to attend.

15. Date and time of the next and future meetings

7th July 2015
29th September 2015
14th December 2015

All meetings will begin at 1.00pm.

The meeting closed at 3.30pm.

Tracey Ralph
Chair

Date

ACTION PLAN FROM THE MEETING

Minute reference	Action	Outcome	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
15	Review of membership to ensure compliance with regulations	Membership changes to reflect recent academy conversions	Salli Radford	7/7/15 and as an ongoing review	In progress
25	Clarify terms of office of Schools Forum members	Ensure that all stakeholder groups understand terms of office, that appointment processes are transparent and that succession planning is enabled	Chair of Primary Heads Forum and Secondary Heads Group	7/7/15	In progress
36	Information regarding SEN provision, including funding detail, is brought to the next meeting	Clarify funding mechanisms for SEN support across the city	Richard Hartle / Jess Haslam	7/7/15	In progress

YORK SCHOOLS FORUM – MEMBERSHIP 2015/16 – FROM JULY 2015

Schools members: 13	Five maintained (including VA and VC) primary school members including a governor representative <i>Maintained school / academy representation to be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with regulations.</i>	Tracey Ralph (Westfield Primary) (Chair) Caroline Hancy (Dunnington CE Primary (VC)) Andy Herbert (Fishergate Primary) David O'Brien (Governor representative) Karen Tatham (Burton Green Primary)
	Three maintained (including VA and VC) secondary school members	Bill Scriven (All Saints RC School (VA)) Lorna Savage (Fulford School) Trevor Burton (Millthorpe School)
	Two academy members	Brian Crosby (Manor CE Academy) Richard Ludlow (Robert Wilkinson Primary Academy)
	One special school member	George Gilmore (Cath Hindmarch from September 2015)
	One maintained nursery school member	Nicola Fox
	One PRU member	Tricia Head
Non-schools members: 2	One 16-19 representative	Alison Birkinshaw
	One PVI early years representative	Ken McArthur
TOTAL MEMBERS: 15		15
Invitees:	Executive member for children and young people	Cllr Jenny Brooks / Cllr Carol Runciman
	Director of Children's Services, Education and Skills	Jon Stonehouse
	Assistant Director, Education and Skills	Maxine Squire
	Head of Finance	Richard Hartle
TOTAL INVITEES: 4		4

York Schools Forum

7 July 2015

Report of the Director Children's Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

SPECIAL SCHOOL TOP-UP (ELEMENT 3) FUNDING CHANGES FROM 2016/17

Summary

- 1 This paper describes the implementation of the City of York (CYC) Special Educational Needs (SEN) banding thresholds in mainstream provision and the proposed approach for special schools in York. It gives the national background and provides feedback from the implementation of the mainstream banding. The proposed model seeks to align the approach for special schools with the mainstream model, describes good practice and creates a fair system of funding.

Background

- 2 The Children and Families Act 2014 was passed in March 2014 and implemented in September 2014. The focus of the reforms is around four key areas:
 - Improving outcomes for children and young people and their families
 - The views, wishes and feelings of the child or young person, and the child's parents, must be central to the planning of provision
 - Children, young people and parents should participate as fully as possible in decisions and be supported to enable participation in those decisions
 - Young people should be supported from the earliest time to plan for adulthood, extending the SEN offer up to 25 years, if a young person needs additional time for their learning.

The National Context

- 3 From April 2014 SEN funding banding thresholds were implemented as part of the Special Educational Needs Disability (SEND) Reforms.
- 4 Each Local Authority (LA) is expected to develop their own banding thresholds linked to funding available for children and young people with SEN. This funding is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- 5 All schools have a duty to identify, assess and make special educational provision for all children with SEN, and the local authority has a duty to set out what schools are expected to provide from their delegated budget. This information must be published on the local authority website. Schools are required to publish their SEN Information Report (previously referred to as the SEN Local Offer) on their website and link to the

LA Local Offer. The report should detail how the special educational needs of children and young people are assessed and met within the delegated SEN budget and through any top-up funding.

The new school funding system and SEN

- 6 The new funding system, introduced in April 2013, defines three elements for funding of SEN in settings: Element 1 - the core budget (broadly equivalent to AWPU funding); Element 2 - the school's notional SEN budget; and Element 3 - additional top-up funding on a named pupil basis.
- 7 Element 1 is the core budget for each school and is used to make general provision for all pupils in the school including pupils with SEN. Element 2 has been set nationally at £6k per pupil, 'the notional SEN budget'. The majority of children, who access this funding are registered as SEN Support (previously termed School Action and School Action Plus) and have needs that can be met at less than £6k. The funding covers anything that is 'additional to or different from' the provision that is made for all children.
- 8 Element 3 (or Top up funding) is provided if the school or education provider can show that they have already implemented support up to £6k and assessed progress made. A reviewed My Support Plan will demonstrate attainment, progress and levels of educational, social and health needs that a pupil has. This can then be submitted to the Education, Health and Care Panel to request that the child has an Education, Health and Care Assessment with the potential to move to an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP). If the assessment demonstrates needs that are additional to those provided through elements 1 and 2, they will be issued with an EHCP and top up funding will be allocated according to need.

CYC SEN Banding Thresholds

- 9 The new CYC SEN Thresholds were developed with reference to the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Code of Practice: 0 to 25 years, - statutory guidance for organisations who work with and support children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities, published in January 2015, and seek to detail the graduated approach to support and provision from SEN Support through to Education, Health and Care Plans.
- 10 The CYC SEN banding thresholds aim to:
 - describe good practice and entitlement across all areas of need:
 - ensure clarity, consistency and transparency for schools, parents, practitioners and the Education Health and Care Panel, and inform the equitable allocation of finite resources:
 - centre on a child / young person's needs, from the perspective of the social model of disability, promoting the understanding that it is the responsibility of all practitioners working with the child to be proactive in tailoring the provision to meet these individual needs:

- form an essential part of the York Local Offer, which describes what the LA expects to be available locally for children, young people and young adults aged 0-25 years with SEN.
- describe the level of need and the support the child / young person should be offered by educational staff in planning, delivering and monitoring strategies and intervention as part of a their entitlement.
- describe both quality first teaching and more specific targeted and specialist support that should be available to children and young people with SEN

11 The City of York SEN banding threshold document can be used by parents / carers, practitioners, Local Authority SEN officers and anyone who supports a child or young person with SEN:

- to review the support offered within an educational setting
- to assess the level of additional SEN needs and additional educational support / provision that could be offered.
- as a prompt when considering appropriate strategies and interventions to support through all the levels
- to provide clarity about decisions made around the allocation of educational resources and the eligibility threshold for an Education, Health and Care Plan.
- to ensure finite resources are used equitably and fairly.
- to help schools to decide whether to request involvement of other agencies to meet

Feedback from the implementation of the mainstream banding thresholds

12 The mainstream banding thresholds were extensively trialled during 2013/14 and implemented from April 2014. A final version of the thresholds was published for the September launch of the SEN reforms. Feedback from Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs) in schools who are using the thresholds regularly has been very positive. They have been pleased that the banding supports equality across all schools, not being dependent on personal perception of SEN based on the local cohort, which can vary widely across the city. Many reported that it supports clear identification of needs and prompts about provision. It also supports tricky conversations with parents who expect a higher level of support than their child's needs may warrant. SENCOs have shared the banding documents and been able to demonstrate the wealth of support already provided through element two funding, at bands 1 and 2. One SENCO commented. 'Of all the things that the LA has written about SEN, this is the most useful, I use it every week'.

Place funding and current top up for special schools

13 Place funding for special schools, provided through the Education Funding Agency (EFA) is £10k per place, and equates to the element 1 and 2 for mainstream schools. Element 3 Top up funding is currently paid through a formula based on a medical model where funds are given according to diagnosis. Additional funding is provided

for those children where a complexity of need is recognised at one or two higher levels:- 'plus' and 'exceptional need'. There are 13 different funding categories, across 5 diagnoses, and these are listed below

- Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) / MLD plus / MLD exceptional need
 - Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) / SLD plus / SLD exceptional need
 - Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD) / EBD exceptional need
 - Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (PMLD) / PMLD exceptional need
 - Autism / Autism plus / Autism exceptional need
- 14 These levels equate to a funding system that provides adequate funding overall. However, the levels do not always match the needs of individual pupils. Two young children both described as having autism may have very different levels of need and while the two extra categories attempted to recognise this, the system is quite crude.

Development of thresholds for special schools

- 15 The new banding thresholds have been developed to provide a robust and transparent method of allocating resources to the two special schools to better reflect the needs of individual pupils. A working party with staff from the special schools and central staff from SEN, led by Carmel Appleton developed and tested the banding thresholds. The following information is summarised from the detailed guidance.
- 16 Children and young people who attend Hob Moor Oaks and Applefields School will:
- experience life-long learning difficulties
 - benefit from specialised provision, with personalised programmes of support delivered by
 - have access to staff with a high level of knowledge and expertise
 - have an Education, Health & Care Plan or a Statement of Special Educational Need
 - have cognition and learning needs and are likely to have a range of additional issues and a combination of layered needs. Additional needs may include some or all of the other 3 broad areas of special educational needs identified in the Code of Practice 2014. i.e. communication and interaction; physical and/or sensory; social, emotional and mental health.
- 17 Funding to support all children and young people who attend Hob Moor Oaks and Applefields Schools will be provided within BAND 5 of the City of York SEN Thresholds. The descriptors in this document will be used to describe a child/young person's needs and the support and provision they require in Section 3 of the York Education, Health and Care Plan.

Descriptors of SEN and Specific Support Needs

- 18 The types of children and young people who are supported within York Special School settings include three broad areas of ability: moderate learning difficulties, severe learning difficulties and profound and multiple learning difficulties (these categories are identified in the SEND Code of Practice 2014, Section 6.30). Further details are contained in Annex 2.
- 19 Support for specific needs for each of the areas above are described under the following headings: (For further detail see Annex 2).

Support Area
Cognition & Learning
Social, Emotional and Mental Health
Communication & Interaction: which includes speech, language and communication needs and needs on the autistic spectrum
Sensory / Physical: Physical and Medical Needs
Sensory / Physical: Visual and Hearing Impairment
Sensory / Physical: Personal Care and Life Skills
Inclusion: where support is provided by special school staff to facilitate inclusion (i.e. not dual placements).

- 20 Element 3 funding will be allocated according to the support needs of individual learners. The needs of each child or young person is considered and recorded individually based on teacher assessed need. In order to develop the model the assessments were triangulated across the two schools.

Future Developments

- 21 The banding is now being adapted for Early Years and post maintained education settings to develop a comparable transparent threshold banding that supports high quality provision and fair and transparent allocation of funding.

Next Steps

- 22 In order to move to the new banding model for the two special schools in York, the next stage is to develop a financial model which attaches values to each of the support needs in the new banding methodology.
- 23 This will need to be tested against the current resource provided from the High Needs Block of the DSG to the two schools, as, although the distribution of funding between individual pupils will change under the new methodology, the principle that underpins the model is that the overall funding distributed will be the same as under the current method with the current cohort of pupils in the two schools.

Recommendations

- 24 The Forum are requested to comment on the progress of the implementation of the new Mainstream banding methodology, and approve the principles set out above for the application of the model to the funding of the two special schools in York, subject to a further report being brought to the Forum following the detailed financial modelling described above.

Contact Details Authors:	Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:				
<p>Jess Haslam Head of Disability and Special Educational Needs Children's Services, Education and Skills Tel: 01904 554322 email: jess.haslam@york.gov.uk</p> <p>Mike Barugh Principal Accountant Customer and Business Support Tel: 01904 554573 email: mike.barugh@york.gov.uk</p>	<p>Jon Stonehouse Director of Children's Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200</p> <p>Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100</p>		Report Approved	√	Date 25 June 2015
For further information please contact the author of the report					

Annex 1: **Overview of SEN banding thresholds** (CYP = Children and Young People) **October 2013**

	Funding	Descriptor	Responsibilities	Review
0	Mainstream Element 1 £4K (currently AWPU) Pre school Early Years Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CYP experiences needs which are managed well in a mainstream pre school/class with appropriate differentiation of task and teaching style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An experienced teacher/practitioner is employed as the accredited SENCO with time to fulfil duties The school is proactive in identifying needs and managers/SLT monitor that action is taken The key person/subject or class teacher is responsible for the learning and progress of the CYP and this is monitored by the managers/SLT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preschool/ school monitoring and review Including: Data analysis CYP Progress meetings: Lesson observation, work scrutiny, Parent Evenings.; AFL EYFA monitoring, learning journal, liaison with parents
1	Mainstream Element 1 £4K & Element 2 formula funding Pre school Early Years Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CYP has identified needs which are highlighted to all staff with advice on support strategies provided and monitored by the SENCO/SLT/Manager 	<p>As Band 0 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Universal CPD highlights responsibilities and provides guidance on teaching and learning for SEN Aspects for professional development are identified during Performance Management Practitioners/Teachers work in partnership with TAs to ensure that strategies are shared to enhance learning Observations on the progress of the CYP informs planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usual school/preschool monitoring Termly review by SENCO/SLT Provision is mapped and impact of support strategies are routinely evaluated. In EY IEP evaluated
2	Mainstream Element 1 £4K & Element 2- formula funding £6K (currently <12.5 hours TA) EY - pre school EY funding plus EY inclusion funding (< 12.5 hours)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CYP has identified needs which require additional specific provision and/or advice which might include a detailed time limited programme, intervention, personalised timetable and/or resources. Co-existence of secondary needs is usual. 	<p>As Band 0 + 1 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SENCOs monitor that advice from specialists is asked for and implemented Additional teachers or TAs/SEN support trained to deliver interventions or support programmes provide feedback to teachers/practitioner who are responsible for ensuring that this is reflected in their curriculum planning and delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from interventions is routinely provided to class/subject teacher/EY practitioners. Records e.g. IEP or Provision Map show impact of interventions and/or additional provision Next steps and time scales for further support agreed by SENCO/SLT or manager with parents
2b	ERP place for SpLD, SLCN, EY £10K place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CYP has a level of need that has been assessed as requiring a highly specialist intervention/teaching and provision which may include 1:1 and small group work 	<p>As Band 0 + 1 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist, highly skilled and trained staff take responsibility for devising, delivering & evaluating a personalised programme that accelerates learning Pre school/Mainstream staff are provided with strategies and advice and CPD opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement to be reviewed annually Expectation of return to mainstream school EY termly reviews
3	Mainstream Element 1 £4K & Element 2- (formula funding) 12.5 hrs or £6,200 & Element 3 (Top up funding via SENAP) EY funding plus EY inclusion funding (< 12.5 hours)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CYP has significant primary needs which impact on progress requiring long term involvement of educational and non-educational professionals as part of statutory assessment/EHC plan Possibly some complexity of other needs 	<p>As Band 0 + 1 +2 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The class/subject teacher/EY practitioner retains the overall responsibility for the curriculum delivery and progress of the CYP. Personalised learning objectives are differentiated for the TA/SEN support who has received guidance/training and/or coaching for this role SENCOs provide support to teacher/EY practitioner and TAs/SEN support and take responsibility for arranging appropriate specialist CPD and quality assuring the learning experience of the CYP 	<p>As Bands 0-2 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Annual Review/ EY 6 monthly review using a CYP and Family Centred Approach which will involve other Agencies. Teachers/EY practitioners and TAs/SEN support plan and review weekly
4 4 b	Mainstream Element 1 £4K + 12.5 hrs Element 2 Formula funding & Element 3 Or ERP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CYP will experience significant, complex persistent and enduring difficulties The CYP present with a range of issues and an accumulation of layered needs, which could include mental health, relationships, behavioural, physical, medical, sensory, communication & 	<p>As Band 0 + 1 +2 + 3 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated multi agency support by named person Robust monitoring systems ensure that the provision outlined in the statement/ EHC plan is delivered. The school reports annually to the LA 	<p>As Band 3 plus</p> <p>Child and family centred reviews are held with the appropriate education, health social and other agencies working with the CYP and family.</p>

		cognitive.		
5 5 b	Special School £10K & Element 3 Special School, specialist class, or package £10K & Element 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CYP experiences significant life long learning difficulties for which specialist provision is appropriate. These may be compounded by other co-existing needs • The CYP has highly significant and complex life long needs requiring intensive specialist provision. 	As Band 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Special School will co-ordinate multi agency involvement using a key working approach. 	As Band 4
6	Out of area independent specialist provider	All of the above but the CYP has such complex needs that their needs cannot be met in a school within York , i.e. they attend a non-maintained educational or residential placement (Out of Area). This may also include support for health and social care issues		

Annex 2: Descriptor of need

Moderate Learning Difficulties

Children and young people who attend Hob Moors and Applefields Schools with moderate learning difficulties will experience significant ongoing difficulties with their learning who may also have:

- low self esteem
- low levels of concentration
- speech, language and communication difficulties
- poor social skills which increase their vulnerability
- autism

they may also require support with self help, personal care and life skills.

In addition to the above some children and young people will have other significant needs that impact on their learning and behaviour such as:

- emotional wellbeing
- social development
- mental health
- sensory and / or physical impairment
- medical needs
- complex autism

A small number of children and young people may present the needs listed above and also present with behaviours that impact on the safety of others and themselves and cause significant barriers to learning which may include high levels of:

- non compliance
- extreme risk taking behaviour
- physical aggression
- issues with self regulation
- inappropriate sexualised behaviour

Severe Learning Difficulties

These children and young people will experience highly significant and complex learning difficulties which have a major impact on their participation in the whole school curriculum. In addition to specialist teaching provision support may be required for developing:

- mobility and coordination
- communication
- perception
- self-help and independence
- social skills
- behaviours for learning.

Some children and young people at this level may also experience other significant additional difficulties which may include one or more of the following:

- significant sensory impairment
- complex communication disorders
- significant care and welfare needs
- medical needs e.g. complex epilepsy which impacts on learning
- significantly impaired mobility skills e.g. hemiplegia
- challenging behaviours which require consistent and structured support
- significantly impaired social communication and a variety of obsessive and repetitious behaviours
- autism

There may be a few children and young people who have other exceptionally significant additional difficulties which require additional staffing resources to ensure:

- access to the curriculum
- their own and others safety
- appropriate support for their health and welfare

Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties

These children and young people are likely to remain within early intellectual developmental parameters for the whole of their school lives. The child or young person may have:

- significant physical impairments
- significant sensory impairment
- severe or complex medical conditions requiring medical interventions during the school day
- significant communication impairments requiring alternative and augmentative communication systems
- very high support needs for self help skills through to total dependence on adult support for all personal care
- autism

York Schools Forum

7 July 2015

Report of the Director Children's Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

SEN/HIGH NEEDS FUNDING COMPARISONS 2015/16

Summary

- 1 This report presents an analysis of SEN/High Needs funding allocated to schools in 2015/16 to fund support for pupils in mainstream settings.

Background

- 2 At the last meeting on 13 April members of the forum raised a number of questions about, and discussed the various elements of, the mainstream school high needs funding allocations. As a result of these discussions the forum requested a further report setting out in detail the allocations to each school compared to known expenditure commitments.

Analysis of Funding

- 3 The table at Annex 1 details the various funding allocations for each school for 2015/16. This is then compared to the known high needs expenditure commitments identified for named pupils with an EHCP. The remaining funding represents the notional amount available to support the needs of all other pupils that do not meet the threshold for an EHCP and element 3 top-up funding.
- 4 Further details of each element of the funding allocation are set out in the following sections.

LMS Formula Allocation (Element 2)

- 5 This funding is notionally identified within each school's core formula funding allocation under the funding factors permitted by the Education Funding Agency (EFA). The amounts and proportions of each factor identified as SEN funding are:

Basic Entitlement (AWPU) Primary:	£90 (3.88%)
Basic Entitlement (AWPU) KS3:	£158 (4.45%)
Basic Entitlement (AWPU) KS4:	£158 (3.76%)
Deprivation (FSM) Primary:	£925 (43.20%)
Deprivation (FSM) Secondary:	£1,254 (57.66%)
Low Prior Attainment Primary:	£1,403 (100%)
Low Prior Attainment Secondary:	£1,557 (100%)

Lump Sum Primary: £24,000 (16%)

Lump Sum Secondary: £28,000 (16%)

- 6 When this funding was introduced under the EFA's revised funding arrangements in 2013/14 it replaced the following funding elements allocated under the LA's previous local funding formula, namely:

Additional Educational Needs

Non Statemented SEN

Statemented SEN

Personalised Learning

School Standards Grant – Personalisation (Mainstreamed)

High Needs Top-Up Funding for Named Pupils (Element 3)

- 7 This funding is allocated to schools for the high needs costs of individually named pupils with an EHCP where these costs exceed £6,000 per year. Schools receive funding for the difference between the actual cost for each pupil and the £6,000 threshold. As the needs of individual pupils can change during the year the figures at Annex 1 represent the latest position based on summer term data.

Additional Targeted High Needs Funding (Element 2 Supplement)

- 8 This funding is allocated to mainstream schools and academies to support the first £6,000 of costs for named pupils with an EHCP where the school is deemed to have attracted a higher than reasonably expected number of EHCP pupils. Previously schools were required to make bids against this contingency budget. However, from 2014/15 the LA has been required to allocate this on a transparent and predictable basis. The allocation methodology is as follows:

Funding will be allocated to schools based on the number of named pupils (excluding ERC pupils) triggering LA element 3 top up funding above an annually agreed threshold. Separate thresholds will be set for primary schools (1% for 2015/16) and secondary schools (2% for 2015/16). The calculations will be based on pupil number and high needs pupil data at the time of the preceding October Census (i.e. October 2014 for the 2015/16 financial year). Each fte EHCP pupil above the threshold will generate an additional £6,000 of funding for the school.

Example 1:

A primary school with 5 EHCP pupils triggering element 3 top-up funding and 250 pupils on roll at the October 2014 census:

$5 / 250 \times 100 = 2\%$ EHCP pupils

$2\% - 1\%$ primary threshold = 1% above the threshold

$1\% \times 250$ pupils = 2.5 pupils above the threshold

2.5 pupils \times £6,000 = £15,000 of additional funding

Example 2:

A secondary school with 25 EHCP pupils triggering element 3 top-up funding and 1,000 pupils on roll at the October 2014 census:

$25 / 1,000 \times 100 = 2.5\%$ EHCP pupils

$2.5\% - 2\%$ secondary threshold = 0.5% above the threshold

$0.5\% \times 1,000$ pupils = 5 pupils above the threshold

5 pupils x £6,000 = £30,000 of additional funding

Total Funding

- 9 This represents the notional amount allocated to each school to help support all of their high needs SEN pupils. It should be noted that, as with all formula funding, these allocations are not ring fenced to any particular purpose. Schools are expected to consider all of their funding sources and deploy these resources in the way that best meets the needs of all of the pupils in their school.
- 10 However, for information Annex 1 further considers the distribution of this notional SEN allocation by calculating the balance remaining after taking account of known expenditure commitments for named pupils. The resulting sum is the notional amount available to support all the SEN needs of the remaining pupils in the school. In theory, the distribution of this remaining notional sum should reflect the relative needs of the pupil population in each school.

Recommendations

- 11 Members of the forum are asked to note and comment on the comparative data provided in Annex 1.

Contact Details Author:	Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:		
Richard Hartle Finance Manager: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk	Jon Stonehouse Director of Children's Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100		
	Report Approved	√	Date 25 June 2015
For further information please contact the author of the report			

Annex 1: High Needs / SEN Funding Comparisons 2016/16.

ANNEX 1 MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS SEN ALLOCATIONS 2015/16	LMS	High	Additional	TOTAL	Named	Amount	
	Formula	Needs	Targeted	SEN	Pupil	Available	
	Allocation	Top-up	High Needs	FUNDING	EHCP	For SEN of	
	(Element 2)	(Element 3)	(Element 2)	ALLOCATION	Costs	All Other Pupils	
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£/pupil
PRIMARY SCHOOLS							
Acomb Primary	108,653	9,681	0	118,334	21,681	96,653	391
Archbishop of York's CE Junior	124,642	12,401	3,000	140,043	26,901	113,142	455
Badger Hill Primary	81,264	20,062	7,800	109,126	38,062	71,064	423
Bishopthorpe Infant	88,681	6,045	0	94,726	12,045	82,681	452
Burton Green Primary	174,569	8,463	6,600	189,632	16,863	172,769	1,025
Carr Infant	160,363	4,034	0	164,396	9,034	155,363	631
Carr Junior	179,091	20,055	3,600	202,747	41,555	161,191	676
Clifton Green Primary	266,682	26,612	8,400	301,694	56,612	245,082	738
Clifton With Rawcliffe Primary	174,031	9,681	0	183,712	21,681	162,031	286
Copmanthorpe Primary	136,853	9,681	0	146,534	21,681	124,853	313
Dringhouses Primary	117,345	3,636	0	120,981	9,636	111,345	377
Dunnington Primary	73,986	0	0	73,986	0	73,986	303
Elvington Primary	61,201	0	0	61,201	0	61,201	437
Fishergate Primary	113,949	12,113	1,800	127,862	30,113	97,749	388
Haxby Road Primary	166,775	19,362	8,400	194,537	43,362	151,175	945
Headlands Primary	109,258	32,859	17,400	159,517	68,859	90,658	297
Hempland Primary	145,941	28,177	0	174,118	58,177	115,941	284
Heworth CE Primary	64,595	15,927	4,200	84,721	33,927	50,795	391
Hob Moor Primary	185,510	14,508	0	200,018	28,908	171,110	657
Huntington Primary	195,703	0	0	195,703	0	195,703	477
Knavesmire Primary	144,437	16,931	0	161,368	34,931	126,437	360
Lakeside Primary	149,540	9,681	0	159,221	21,681	137,540	430
Lord Deramore's Primary	82,002	12,113	0	94,115	30,113	64,002	308
Naburn CE Primary	52,124	0	0	52,124	0	52,124	636
New Earswick Primary	117,856	13,665	12,000	143,521	28,165	115,356	596
Osaldwick Primary	229,205	12,090	0	241,295	24,090	217,205	705
Our Lady Queen Of Martyrs RC Primary	145,167	17,328	0	162,496	34,328	128,167	313
Park Grove Primary	183,081	13,974	0	197,055	27,174	169,881	644
Poppleton Ousebank Primary	117,321	9,189	0	126,509	23,689	102,821	239
Poppleton Road Primary	217,176	17,198	0	234,374	42,198	192,176	492
Ralph Butterfield Primary	102,924	20,654	5,400	128,978	41,154	87,824	286
Robert Wilkinson Primary	228,445	15,590	0	244,035	34,890	209,145	356
Rufforth Primary	45,438	0	0	45,438	0	45,438	598
Scarcroft Primary	140,111	16,931	0	157,041	34,931	122,111	394
Skelton Primary	69,843	0	0	69,843	0	69,843	685
St. Aelred's RC Primary	115,290	0	0	115,290	0	115,290	630
St. Barnabas' CE Primary	102,539	0	0	102,539	0	102,539	707
St. George's RC Primary	127,547	0	0	127,547	0	127,547	693
St. Lawrence's CE Primary	160,723	10,734	4,800	176,257	25,234	151,023	762
St. Mary's CE Primary	58,890	0	0	58,890	0	58,890	550
St. Oswald's CE Primary	130,999	21,204	0	152,203	54,704	97,499	333
St. Paul's CE Primary	77,166	7,322	1,800	86,288	19,322	66,966	394
St. Wilfrid's RC Primary	144,509	9,681	0	154,190	21,681	132,509	493
Stockton on the Forest Primary	67,533	6,054	3,000	76,587	14,454	62,133	701
Tang Hall Primary	133,613	0	0	133,613	6,000	127,613	874
Westfield Primary	424,102	26,151	15,000	465,253	67,151	398,102	796
Wheldrake CE Primary	68,985	2,418	0	71,403	10,818	60,585	276
Wigginton Primary	111,149	9,878	0	121,027	20,878	100,149	337
Woodthorpe Primary	202,552	8,717	0	211,269	20,717	190,552	538
Yearsley Grove Primary	200,223	18,232	0	218,454	35,232	183,223	552
Primary Schools Total	6,879,581	549,029	103,200	7,531,811	1,212,629	6,319,181	25,625
SECONDARY SCHOOLS							
All Saints' RC School	451,744	61,798	0	513,542	140,098	373,444	426
Archbishop Holgate's CE School	629,380	56,658	0	686,038	173,358	512,680	535
Canon Lee School	449,247	19,371	0	468,618	45,771	422,847	733
Fulford School	461,463	70,280	0	531,743	193,380	338,363	332
Huntington School	630,593	22,867	0	653,461	60,867	592,593	514
Joseph Rowntree School	718,937	56,951	0	775,887	126,051	649,837	638
Manor CE School	536,561	94,031	30,000	660,592	221,131	439,461	472
Millthorpe School	572,230	32,020	0	604,249	85,520	518,730	558
York High School	738,518	70,868	0	809,386	157,968	651,418	820
Total All Secondary Schools	5,188,673	484,844	30,000	5,703,517	1,204,144	4,499,373	5,028
TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS	12,068,254	1,033,873	133,200	13,235,327	2,416,773	10,818,554	30,653

Schools Forum 7th July 2015

The Inclusion Review

Issue

The purpose of the inclusion review will be to ensure that resources are being used effectively to meet the needs of children with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) so that they can make good progress throughout their schooling and make secure transitions in to adult life. The review will involve various phases of activity which are being mapped in to a project plan and work stream for the academic year 2015-16. This will become a 5 year strategic plan which will transform our approaches to inclusion and will ensure that the reforms introduced in the Children and Families Act are fully and effectively implemented to improve outcomes for children with SEND.

A steering group of stakeholders/partners has been formed to take ownership of the process and outcomes of the review. The steering group met for the first time on 15th June 2015 to review and agree the draft terms of reference (attached) and to discuss the development of the project plan. The first phase of the review will focus on a benchmarking activity to establish a robust baseline to give clarity about current provision, use of resources and outcomes. This baseline data will then be used to inform the development of the project plan and next phase of the review. Initially the review will focus on current provision, use of resources and outcomes for children with social, emotional and well being needs. Concurrently to the development of the baseline data, there are plans to develop two pilot schemes in the West to support children with SEMH needs. The learning from these pilots will be evaluated and shared as part of the scope of this review to inform the development of future provision.

Regular progress reports and the outcomes of the review will be reported to both the School's Forum and the York Learning Partnership Board.

Attachments

Annex 1 – Inclusion review draft terms of reference

Action required

This paper is to provide Schools Forum with information about the progress of inclusion review.

Contact:

Name: Maxine Squire

Job title: Assistant Director, Education and Skills

01904 553007

maxine.squire@york.gov.uk

York Learning Partnership

Inclusion Review

Terms of Reference

The purpose of the inclusion review will be to ensure that The Local Authority and School Community work together to maximise the opportunity for early intervention and prevention and to support the achievement and progress of children where there are concerns for their social and emotional wellbeing. The review will examine the current configuration of services and the use of funding to support SEMH to ensure that there is greater clarity and accountability around the use and impact of resources.

In order to conduct the review a steering group of stakeholders/partners will be convened to take ownership of the process and outcomes of the review. The outcomes of the review will be reported to both the School's Forum and the York Learning Partnership Board.

Membership of the Steering Group

Eoin Rush, Assistant Director, Children's Specialist Services

Maxine Squire, Assistant Director, Education and Skills

Jess Haslam, Head of SEN Services

Richard Hartle, Head of Finance

Mark Ellis, Head of School Services

Tracey Ralph, Chair of the Schools Forum

David Ellis, Headteacher York High School

Tricia Head, Principal of the Danesgate Community

Cath Hindmarch, Principal of the Hob Moor Federation

George Gilmore, Headteacher Applefields School

Liz Godman, External Consultant

Sheffield Challenge Partner

Co-opted members as required

Key Drivers for the review:

- a) Children and Families Act 2014
- b) Emerging Local Area Led Accountability guidance / framework
- c) Budget
- d) Better Outcomes for children and young people
- e) New Ofsted SEN Inspection Framework (Inspections now look at inclusion levels)

Establishing the baseline for the review

The baseline for the review will be established by examining what is already in place and what the baseline data is telling us to establish a clear starting point for the review. This baseline data will include:

- Exclusions and managed moves data from the Behaviour and Attendance partnerships
- Achievement data (including attainment and progress for key groups), using national, regional and local benchmarks
- SEND data about cohort size and primary need
- Early help data
- Mental health referrals
- Social care data

Desired Outcomes of the review:

- More children and young people with SEMH issues are effectively supported in mainstream school settings with the intention that more of them stay on the rolls of mainstream schools
- The Local Authority and School Community work together to maximise the opportunity for early intervention and prevention to support the achievement and progress of children where there are concerns about their social and emotional wellbeing.
- Schools are supported to strengthen their range of in-school inclusion responses and arrangements to ensure that children are able to securely progress in to adult life.
- School colleagues report that they feel more confident and better supported / equipped to support children and young people with SEMH in their settings.

- School colleagues know how to access support for children and young people with SEMH issues.
- Support for school settings is provided within a standard response timescale
- Children and young people report that they are better able to manage their behaviour in school settings (perhaps measured in conjunction with SDQ)

Expected Outputs:

- There is a shared vision for the inclusion of children and young people across the Local Authority and School Community
- There is greater clarity around the use of the DSG to ensure that limited resources are used more effectively
- There is a 'meeting in the middle' between achievement and inclusion; recognising outcomes for children and young people in terms of academic progress (rather than attainment) as well as engagement.
- There are clear and agreed pathways for children and young people with SEMH (including learning needs analysis, referral, assessment, planning, review, transition, multi agency engagement)
- These pathways are described across a continuum of support from school level, ERP in school arrangements and out of school arrangements.
- Remodelled inreach and outreach support arrangements to increase capacity, confidence and skills across the school community, including systematically sharing best practice e.g. from Learning Support Units (LSUs)
- New evidence based enhanced resource provision for primary school children – that draws on the learning from the positively evaluated Nurture Group model and LSU models in secondary schools.

- Reviewed BAP arrangements for the City that are informed by and support the new approach to inclusion.
- Reviewed governance arrangements and roles across the LA and school community that ensure progress and compliance against the new vision/ strategy.
- Reviewed pathways will secure positive longer-term outcomes in terms of educational success, destinations and 'life skills'.

Key questions from stakeholders to be explored through the review:

- How is the DSG used to fund current services?
- What is the statutory role of the LA – what elements of SEN services have to be in place? What do models look like in other LAs?
- What accountability systems are in place and need to be in place? How do we assure cost effectiveness/value for money?
- What quality assurance protocols are in place and are these fit for purpose?
- Is communication with schools around the roles and responsibilities of LA and commissioned services effective?
- How are the views of stakeholders being used to inform the development of service models?

Title: Discussion paper for Schools Forum 7.7.15

Content: Inclusion review –KS3 pilot proposal and KS1 pilot proposal

Author: Tricia Head

Date: 24.6.15

Introduction

The Local Authority is putting together an inclusion review to be rolled out over the academic year 15/16. To contribute to this review I propose we pilot some targeted provision for Y9s and KS1 pupils in the West of the City over the academic year 15/16. The purpose would be to test out models of sustainable provision where the programmes are developed via a partnership offer. For the KS3 pilot this partnership would be between Danesgate and a secondary school. For the KS1 pilot this partnership would be between Danesgate and a Primary Cluster.

The cohorts to be supported in the pilots are at Outreach and Pupil Referral Unit threshold – ie. pupils who are currently accessing full time mainstream provision with in-school support but who are at risk of repeated fixed term or even permanent exclusion. The pilot is not for those pupils with more complex needs who would still be supported by Danesgate through the existing referral systems and continuum of provision.

What SEMH provision is available at present?

For primary schools there is Outreach provision paid for out of de-delegated funds or Danesgate based provision funded through place plus protocols. *Please see email to Primary Headteachers from September 2014 attached which gives more detail re the provision.*

For secondary schools there is Outreach provision which they can buy in or access to Danesgate provision funded through place plus protocols. The Danesgate provision has criteria which shows what level of programme or intervention a young person is likely to need. This criteria bands a young person's needs as at Pupil Referral Unit level or Education other than at School (EOTAS) level or at Enhanced Pathways (ERP) level. These criteria bands and the funding model that they relate to have been published widely and discussed many times at YEP (prior to the reforming of Schools Forum).

Identification of need that links to the pilots under discussion

KS1 – over 14/15 we have run a KS1 Kestrel out of our base at Tang Hall Primary School. This is over subscribed and a high proportion of pupils have been from West cluster schools.

The impact of KS1 Kestrel can be evidenced from the work we have done over 14/15 with pupils successfully returning to school after (on average) 1.5 terms of part time provision.

Over 14/15 we saw referrals coming to the Danesgate Outreach team from Nursery pupils. These pupils will be KS1 in 2015/16 and will need support to develop pro social behaviours to enable them to be successful in Reception. Over 14/15 we also saw a pattern of referrals linked to the transition from Reception to Y1. The move from a nursery style approach in Reception to the behaviours for learning needed for the routines and expectations in Y1 can lead to significant dysregulation in certain pupils.

KS3 – there is less uniformity across secondary school in terms of referral patterns but what has been emerging is that those schools who have a reliance on a KS3 Learning or Behaviour Support Unit (BSU) can usually manage to support pupils in Y7 and Y8 but that the older key stage 3 pupils become disengaged and need a different approach than what may have worked for them up to the middle to end of Y8. There is also a concern that progress dips over Y9 for these students. The breadth of these issues needs to be addressed through a mixed diet that allows for engagement, self esteem building but also an enhanced curriculum offer and outstanding teaching with strategies in most cases for speech, language and communication needs (SLCN) as well as social, emotional and mental health needs (SEMH). This pilot would allow us to test out different ways of running the Y9 year for BSUs which may be more successful for older KS3 pupils and may help to address the needs of students who lose their school place in Y9.

Key elements of the pilots:

- Partnership resourcing to build in sustainability (part school or cluster, part Danesgate, part Schools Forum support grant)
- Allow for staff training – both at teacher and TA level.
- Quality assurance of teaching, learning and achievement and associated curriculum development.
- Cohort criteria – pupils whose needs should be able to be met in home school with the right programme (6 pupils per pilot)
- Cohort case studies to be produced to identify any multi agency gaps to clarify the link between family needs and the ability for a young person to thrive in school.
- Cohort case studies also to show the impact of education on LA's Early Help agenda linked to bullet point above.

Provisional budget plan

KS1 West Kestrel

Venue	£4K	Cluster
Teacher	0.5 FTE = £20K	Cluster
HLTA	0.5 FTE = £13.5K	Danesgate
TA2	1 FTE = £17K	
Resources	£0.5 K	Cluster
Infrastructure/Management	£4K	Danesgate/Cluster
Transport	n/a	
Totals	£59K	£17K needed from Schools Forum bid
Contributions	Cluster = £26.5K	
	Danesgate = £15.5K	
	Other = £17K	

Y9 Engagement & Achievement pilot

Venue	£4K	Secondary school
Teacher	0.4 FTE = £18K	Secondary school
TA2	1 FTE = £17K	Danesgate
Alt provision	£31,500 (3 days per week on rolling programme £50 per day per student)	£31, 500
Resources	£0.5 K	Secondary school
Infrastructure/Management/Quality assurance of AP	£6K	Danesgate/Secondary school
Transport	n/a	
Totals	£77K	£31.5K needed from Schools Forum bid
Contributions	YHS = £25.5K	
	Danesgate = £20K	
	Other =£31.5K	

Total pilot funding gap = £48.5K

York Schools Forum

7 July 2015

Report of the Director Children’s Services, Education & Skills and the Director of Customer & Business Support Services

SCHOOL BUDGET DE-DELEGATIONS FOR 2016/17

Summary

- 1 This report reminds the forum of the current status of de-delegated budgets, and asks the forum to consider if there is any further information they will require in order for a formal decision to be made on each de-delegation at the next meeting of the forum in September.

Current 2015/16 De-Delegations

- 2 For 2015/16 the forum has agreed to de-delegate the following central budgets and services back to the LA.

Centrally Held Budgets		Centrally Funded Services	
	£000		£000
Schools General Contingency	76	FSM Eligibility Assessment Service	52
Teachers’ Panel	53	Traveller Education Service	171
		Behaviour Support Outreach Service (Primary Schools Only)	174

- 3 The following paragraphs provide more detail on the current position for each de-delegation.

Schools General Contingency

- 4 This small budget has been used in the past by the LA to support significant but unexpected expenditure in some schools on an exceptional basis. The current de-delegation is set at £4 per pupil. Examples from previous years include:
 - Significant legal costs supporting employment tribunals.
 - Funding of compromise agreements in certain circumstances.
 - Backfill costs following the suspension of a headteacher.
 - Uninsured continuing education costs following a school fire.

Teachers Panel

- 5 The teachers’ panel arrangement is the primary mechanism for the LA, on behalf of schools, to consult with teaching staff across the city. Each trade union is

represented on the panel, with the bulk of the budget being spent on funding the salaries of panel members, or backfill arrangements in the individual home schools of the panel members.

- 6 This de-delegation was the subject of significant discussions during the 2014/15 budget setting process. As a result the forum agreed an approach to reducing the level of de-delegation by approximately 50% by the start of the 2015/16 academic year. To deliver this the teacher's panel have reviewed the time allocations for each trade union that are funded from the de-delegated budget. The table below sets out the agreed reductions in allocations from the 2013/14 academic year to the 2015/16 academic year.

Teachers Panel Backfill Funding 2013-16

	2013/14 Academic Year	2014/15 Academic Year	2015/16 Academic Year
ATL	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0.20 fte
NASUWT	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0,20 fte
NUT	0.40 fte	0.30 fte	0.20 fte
NAHT	6 Days pa	4 Days pa	3 Days pa
ASCL	6 Days pa	4 Days pa	3 Days pa
Unison	0.75 fte	0.50 fte	0.40 fte
GMB	0.09 fte	0.06 fte	0.04 fte
Panel Secretary	0.35 fte	0.25 fte	0.20 fte
Estimated Cost	£86,980	£63,170	£44,740

- 7 The figures above equate to a funding requirement for the 2015/16 financial year of £53,100, or the equivalent of £2.79 per pupil. This would then reduce further to an estimated £44,740 for the 2016/17 financial year (£2.38 per pupil).

Free School Meal Eligibility Assessment Services

- 8 The FSM eligibility service is provided as part of the overall School Services Team (with the team also covering a range of work from management of the admissions process to organising all of the city's home to school transport arrangements which are not subject to de-delegation).
- 9 Given the nature of the service this is not something that the LA believes could be broken down into smaller elements. Schools will need to either agree to de-delegation so that they can continue to access the service in the current way, or retain the funding themselves but accept that access to the service will then no longer be available. As the identification of one extra FSM pupil would generate c£3.5k in additional funding for a school, the annual de-delegation amounts (£23.77 per primary FSM pupil / £46.70 per secondary FSM pupil) are considered modest compared to the potential additional funding.

Traveller Education Service

- 10 This is another service that has been subject to significant discussion and debate in previous years. This resulted in the ceasing of the de-delegation for the EAL service

but an agreement to support de-delegation for a traveller only service until the end of the 2015/16 financial year. The current de-delegation amounts are:

Primary: £4.41 per pupil
 £16.57 per FSM pupil
 £10.90 per LPA pupil

Secondary: £6.13 per pupil
 £28.85 per FSM pupil
 £12.82 per LPA pupil

Behaviour Support Outreach Service

- 11 The service is provided to primary schools through the Danesgate Community and is often referred to as the Danesgate Outreach Service. Under its current central de-delegated form it is provided to schools in addition to the Danesgate provision for individually named pupils. The current de-delegation amounts are:

£3.09 per pupil
 £51.53 per FSM pupil
 £34.07 per LPA pupil

Recommendations

- 12 Members of the forum are asked to consider what additional information, if any, they will require in advance of making formal decisions on de-delegations for 2016/17 at the next meeting of the forum in September.

<p>Contact Details Author:</p>	<p>Chief Officers Responsible for the Report:</p>		
<p>Richard Hartle Finance Manager: Adults, Children and Education Tel: 01904 554225 email: richard.hartle@york.gov.uk</p>	<p>Jon Stonehouse Director of Children’s Services, Education & Skills Tel: 01904 554200 Ian Floyd Director of Customer and Business Support Services Tel: 01904 551100</p>		
	<p>Report Approved</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>Date 25 June 2015</p>
<p>For further information please contact the author of the report</p>			

YORK SCHOOLS FORUM FORWARD PLAN			
Title & Description	Report Type	Author	Meeting Date
SEN Inclusion Review A report back on the work of the review group.	Information/ Consultation	Maxine Squire	22 September 2015
School Outturn Balances 2014/15 Presentation of school balances as at 31 March 2015 and consideration of any clawback of funding from individual schools proposed under the LMS scheme.	Information/ Decision	Paul Shepherd	22 September 2015
DSG & Schools Budget Monitoring Report 2015/16 Monitoring of income and expenditure including a consideration of the projected outturn position for 2015/16.	Consultation/ Decision	Richard Hartle	22 September 2015
De-Delegated Budgets for 2016/17 Final confirmation of the services and budgets to be de-delegated for 2016/17.	Decision	Richard Hartle	22 September 2015
DSG & Schools Budget 2016/17 First consideration of the 2016/17 budget position and consequent implications.	Consultation/ Decision	Richard Hartle	22 September 2015
DSG & Schools Budget 2016/17 Final consideration of the 2016/17 budget prior to the setting of individual school budgets.	Consultation/ Decision	Richard Hartle	14 December 2015