

## Summary Sheet

### Name of Committee and Date of Committee Meeting

Cabinet and Commissioners Decision Making Meeting – 19 February 2018

### Report Title

Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND), Sufficiency and increase in educational provision - Phase 1

### Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

Yes

### Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Ian Thomas, Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services

### Report Authors

Paula Williams, Head of Inclusion

Dean Fenton, Head of School Planning, Admissions and Appeals

Steven Harrison, Strategic Commissioning Manager – CYPS

Robert Holsey (Children and Young People's Services Asset Manager - Regeneration and Environment)

### Ward(s) Affected

All

### Summary

This report outlines the outcome of the consultation and seeks approval in relation to the proposals to increase Special Educational Needs and Disability SEND provision across the Borough following the SEND Sufficiency report to Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017. Consultation was undertaken in line with the requirements of the Department for Education (DfE) – Special Provision Capital Fund guidance which states that Local Authorities need to plan how to invest their allocation and other funding to achieve the best outcomes for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities.

### Recommendations

1. That approval be given to the increase in educational provision for Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) across the Borough following consultation.
2. That approval be given to the projects that are to be linked to the Capital Programme within the Formal Budget & Council Tax 2018-19 report.

**List of Appendices Included**

Appendix 1 – Consultation summary

**Background Papers**

Report to Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 seeking approval to consult on proposals to increase capacity of provision across the Borough.

SEND Sufficiency report (appendix 1 to the above report)

**Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel**

No

**Council Approval Required**

No

**Exempt from the Press and Public**

No

**Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND), Sufficiency and increase in educational provision – phase 1**

**1. Recommendations**

- 1.1 That approval be given to the increase in educational provision for Special Education Needs and Disability (SEND) across the Borough following consultation.
- 1.2 That approval be given to the projects that are to be linked to the Capital Programme within the Formal Budget & Council Tax 2018-19 report.

**2. Background**

- 2.1 Approval was given by Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 to commence a period of consultation in relation to proposals to increase SEND capacity of provision across the Borough by 125 places by 2021.
- 2.2 The report outlined the growth in the general pupil population in recent years and the subsequent increased need for school places for pupils with a range of SEND needs.
- 2.3 The report further outlined that following completion of the SEND sufficiency report, an additional 125 SEND places will be needed across the Borough to meet current and expected future demand up to 2021. 75 places are required to reduce out of authority placements by half and 50 places to add additional capacity and provision within the Borough to support future increase in demand from population increase.
- 2.4 The implications of not having enough SEND provision in the Local Authority area are that there are rising numbers of Rotherham children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities having their needs met in provisions outside Rotherham. This means some of the most vulnerable children have to travel the furthest distance to school. The number of pupils currently placed outside the Local Authority is approximately 150 which fluctuates fortnightly as a result of Education, Health and Care Plans being finalised following panel decisions.
- 2.5 The Dedicated Schools Grant (High Needs Budget) is significantly overspent in this area. Indications are that there will continue to be significant increases in out of authority placements should 'in authority' capacity not be increased, leading to further demand on high needs funding allocation as 'out of authority' placements are significantly more expensive than 'in authority' placements.
- 2.6 The Table below outlines the proposed projects required to create the additional 125 places needed to accommodate current demand for SEND places and reduce the financial burden on the high needs funding allocation in future years. The table also outlines proposals for moving forward to create additional places post 2021 for anticipated future cohort number increases and also outlines the project costs.

## 2.7 Key to acronyms:

ASC	Autism Spectrum Condition
EY	Early Years
CLD	Complex Learning Difficulties
SEMH	Social, Emotional and Mental Health
SLD	Severe Learning Difficulties
HNB	High Needs Block funding

## Phase 1 – 2018 to 2021 SEND sufficiency of provision

Type of provision required and number of places	Location and rationale	Priority and Timeline for building works start	Cost and Funding Stream
10 primary ASC places	New Waverley Junior Academy  Outlined in prospectus seeking a sponsor	New school scheduled to open in September 2020	Part of the Waverley new school capital project
10 SLD places	Cherry Tree House / Nexus Trust  Building on existing expertise	High priority Year 1	£113k DfE Grant First £166k allocation
10 primary ASC places (replacement for Flanderwell)	Rowan Centre  Refurbishment of existing building  Building on existing expertise	High Priority Year 1	£50k DfE First £166k allocation
20 complex needs primary / secondary places	Abbey School Nexus Trust  x 2 classrooms  Building on existing expertise	High Priority Year 1	£3k DfE First £168k allocation £195k Capital Programme
15 High level SEMH therapeutic places (Primary and Secondary)	Rowan Centre  Refurbishment of existing building  Building on existing expertise	High Priority Year 1	£100k Capital Programme

10 secondary ASC places	Wales High School x 1 classroom Building on existing expertise	Medium Priority Year 2	£200k DfE Second allocation £166k + £34k Capital Programme
10 EY transition places	Newman Special school Refurbishment of existing building Building on existing expertise	High Priority Year 1	200k Capital Programme
15 High Level SEMH therapeutic places (Primary and Secondary)	Aspire Refurbishment of setting Building on existing expertise	Medium Priority Year 2	£75k Capital Programme
10 Complex Needs primary / secondary places	Milton School x 1 classroom Building on existing expertise	Medium Priority Year 3	£200k DfE Grant Third allocation £166k + £34k Capital Programme
10 Complex LD/ASC places	The Willows School x 1 classroom Building on existing expertise	High Priority Year 1	£200k Capital Programme
5 possibly 10 commissioned places for highest level of SEMH provision	Private provider Sub -regional forum to offer security of place funding to the settings Commissioned specialist places	Medium Priority Year 2	Commissioned places from high needs funding
32 place SEMH special provision	CLPT Sub -regional forum to offer security of place funding to the settings Building on existing expertise within the Trust	Medium Priority Year 3	Local Authority to support a free school bid from Central Learning Partnership Trust to create a provision for the region

Post 16 provision Commissioned place provision	Private providers  Commissioned specialist places	High Priority Year 1	Commissioned places from high needs funding
Total funding			£500k – DfE Allocations (over 3 years)  £838k a bid for inclusion in the Capital programme

### 3. Key Issues

- 3.1 The increase in SEND provision within the Authority is necessary due to the increased pupil population since 2010 as outlined in section 2.1 of the report approved by Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017.
- 3.2 The creation of additional in borough provision will lead to a longer term saving on high needs funding as in borough placements cost on average £17.5k per annum as opposed to an out of authority placement which costs £35K on average but can rise significantly up to £60k and beyond per annum dependant on the type of provision required.
- 3.3 Due to a national rise in Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP's), the sufficiency plan will be reviewed annually. With this in mind a review of the current figures from the December 2016 report has taken place which revises the number of new SEND places required, upwards by 13 (to 138 places) as of December 2017. This will be reviewed and monitored annually to assist forward planning in relation to the phase 2 identification of additional provision needed from 2021 onwards.
- 3.4 Partnership working with schools and a government agenda to support mental health needs in schools, is likely to affect the ability of the education sector to better support children in schools. This will mean that in the coming years the volume of requests for EHCPs should reduce in this area, so affecting the number of planned special provision places needed.

### 4. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 4.1 The report approved by Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 considered options available including the recommended option to consult on proposals to increase provision in borough to ensure pupils are able to access high quality provision close to home reducing the longer term demands on the high needs block was approved.
- 4.2 Following a period of consultation, section 2.7 of this report details the recommended options to create in Borough solutions to the need for additional high quality SEND provision and also create longer term savings on the demands being placed on the high needs block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

4.3 Beyond the financial benefits to the high needs budget there are additional benefits to creating further high quality SEND provision within Rotherham:

- Less travelling for our most vulnerable children
- Greater involvement in quality assurance of provision
- The opportunity for dual placement and inclusive opportunities for young people with their locality mainstream school where appropriate

## 5. Consultation

5.1 As the individual projects outlined in section 2.7 of this report fall below the threshold for completion of 'prescribed alterations', under the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 a period of consultation with relevant stakeholders is required to be completed to ascertain the views and opinions of stakeholders on proposals. This is also required as part of the SEND grant funding allocation from DfE of £500K referenced in section 7.1 of this report and the consultation requirements set by DfE are outlined in the quoted guidance below in section 5.2 and 5.3 of the report.

### 5.2 DfE - Special provision capital fund Guidance (extract):

*Local authorities need to plan how to invest their allocation and other funding to achieve the best outcomes for children and young people with SEN and disabilities.*

*Local authorities will need to:*

- **Consult with parents and carers.** *Effective engagement with parents and carers is crucial in building and implementing a strategy that develops support for changes. This helps local authorities ensure that services will meet the needs of children and families.*
- **Consult with schools, FE colleges and other institutions, which offer special educational provision.** *Local authorities should work with providers to identify how capital investment can best improve the quality of provision available for children and young people with EHC plans.*
- **Consider how to invest revenue and capital funding strategically** *to maximise the benefit of both in the context of the current infrastructure and programmes. This might include looking at how to expand participation in an existing learning programme by making capital adjustments so that children and young people with SEN and disabilities can also attend.*
- **Collaborate with other local authorities** *to form partnerships to work effectively across borders.*

### 5.3 DfE - Special provision capital fund Guidance (extract):

*Before receiving the SEND funding allocation, local authorities need to:*

- *Consult with parents and carers of children with SEN and disabilities and young people with SEN and disabilities.*
- *Work with education providers to agree how the capital can best be targeted.*

- *Fill in the short plan template, confirming that the requirement to consult with parents, carers and young people has been met and including information about the other groups that they have consulted.*
- *Publish a plan on their local offer page showing how they plan to invest their funding, before the deadline specified below.*

*Note:*

- *Where local authorities work collaboratively on projects, these must be listed on each local authorities' plan with an explanation of which other local authorities they have collaborated with and how.*
- *Where a project will both create additional places and improve facilities for current and future pupils, local authorities should show on the plan how much funding will be spent on each of the two objectives. This may involve estimating how much of the project's investment would go towards each of these two aims.*

*Local authorities do **not** need to send the completed form to the Department for Education.*

*Local authorities **should not** include costings where this would have a negative commercial impact. Where not all costings are included in the first publication of the plan, local authorities should re-publish the plan as soon as it is no longer commercially sensitive to publish this information.*

5.4 Consultation took place between 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and consultees included:

- SEND specialists including Autism Communication Team, Inclusion Support Services, Educational Psychology Service, Special School leadership, Mental Health Services and the Children's Disability Team.
- Focus / parent groups, specialist groups, Parents and Carers and children including - Rotherham Parents Forum, SEND Information and Advice Support Service, Rotherham Private, Voluntary and Independent Consortium, Young Person's Consultation Forum and Autism Stakeholders Group.
- Elected Members including Borough Councillors, Parish Councils and Members of Parliament for the three Rotherham Area constituencies:
- Schools, Further Education Colleges and private providers within the Borough.
- Neighbouring Local Authorities.
- Other interested parties and stakeholders.

5.5 The purpose of the consultation was to raise awareness of the proposal to increase the number of SEND school places and provide an opportunity to all interested stakeholders to contribute, with the aim of establishing any concerns and issues affecting the local community and the longer term development of the SEND provision.



- 5.6 The range of responses received during the consultation process were broadly very positive and supportive. Responses were received from The Parents forum, Young People's forum and 12 individual responses were received via email from Schools, members of the public, neighbouring local authority, private providers and specialist support service. The responses were used to inform the provision requirements and locations to maximise existing synergies and expertise.
- 5.7 Stakeholders were consulted directly via email as well as Parents Forum and Young Persons Forum. Responses were noted and included in the Consultation report at Appendix 1.

## 6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

### 6.1 Timeline for implementation (as set by DfE in their guidance)

<b>By Wednesday 14 March 2018</b>	Local authorities must publish the short plan on their local offer page (template provided)
<b>Summer 2018</b>	local authorities that have published the plan and consulted with parents, carers and young people will receive the first tranche of funding
<b>March 2019</b>	local authorities should update and republish their plan to show what they have spent on so far
<b>Summer 2019</b>	local authorities will receive the second tranche of funding
<b>March 2020</b>	local authorities should update and republish their plan again
<b>Summer 2020</b>	local authorities will receive the second tranche of funding
<b>March 2021</b>	local authorities should update and republish their plan a final time, to show how all money was eventually spent

- 6.2 Individual capital projects will be project managed by the Council's Asset Management Service with accountability for delivery to the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment.
- 6.3 Project implementation work with respective schools and Academy Trusts to implement the proposals will be led by Officers in Education and Skills and overseen by the Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services.

## 7. Financial and Procurement Implications

- 7.1 A new grant funding allocation of £500k in total has been allocated to the Council from the Department for Education and payable in 3 equal instalments for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years to support the development of SEND strategies and provision, subject to meeting the requirements to consult on and publish proposals as outlined above.
- 7.2 The total cost of the projects as detailed in paragraph 2.7 is £1,338k and this is forecast to be split between the three years £863k, £275k and £200k respectively. It should be noted that the initial indicative costs of £1.2m in the report to Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 has increased by £138k following more detailed analysis of individual projects. The £500k grant will be applied evenly across the three-year period leaving a shortfall of £696k, £108k and £34k, a total of £838k.

- 7.3 The October Cabinet report also made reference to using £240k of funding from the Special Educational Needs capital grant allocation. However additional works required within the capital projects for the redevelopment of the SEND hub and SEMH provision mean that this allocation has now been fully utilised.
- 7.4 To address the £838k shortfall in funding, the Budget & Council Tax 2018-19 report to Cabinet and Council in February recommends that the scheme is added to the Capital Programme with the balance of funding to be met from corporate capital resources.
- 7.5 The projected annual savings on the High Needs budget made possible from this programme of spend is estimated to be in the region of £3.5m. These savings will offset spend allocated to the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) High Needs budget and will not fall on the Council's revenue budget. The savings will be achieved in two ways. Firstly, through reducing the need for high numbers of newly assessed children and young people to be educated outside Rotherham, and being able to offer high quality provision in borough. Secondly, for those children and young people currently placed in provision outside Rotherham, investigation with families about whether a child's needs can be better met in a Rotherham provision at annual review of the Education Health and Care plan. This will significantly reduce the escalating costs to the Dedicated Schools Grant High Needs budget.
- 7.6 The proposals would also have a positive impact on the Councils Home to School Transport budget and provision, as the proposals and the proposed changes to transport provision would reduce budget pressures as the increased number of places in borough, would reduce reliance on out of authority placement and the additional transport costs incurred.

## **8. Legal Implications**

- 8.1 None of the individual proposals meet the requirement threshold to complete a full prescribed alteration under, the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 (guidance dated April 2016). The regulations however require a minimum period of 4 weeks consultation with relevant stakeholders be undertaken when proposals are below the threshold.
- 8.2 The guidance is set out to ensure that alterations can be made quickly where they are needed; that Local Authorities and governing bodies do not take decisions that will have a negative impact on other schools in the area, and that changes can be implemented quickly and effectively where there is a strong case for doing so.

8.3 The specific proposals set out in this report are limited changes which fall outside of the statutory process. Despite this, however, part 4 of the guidance requires Local Authorities and / or governing bodies to adhere to the usual principles of public law. They must:

- act rationally;
- take into account all relevant and no irrelevant considerations; and
- follow a fair procedure.

8.4 Section 14 Education Act 1996 requires a local authority to have regard to securing SEN provision is made for pupils with SEN Needs. Following enactment of The Children and Families Act 2014, the local authority retains responsibility for commissioning services for vulnerable children and young people with SEN and to keep such provision for children and young people with SEN and disabilities under review including its sufficiency (s.315 Education Act 1996), and to promote wellbeing and improve quality, working in concert with parents, young people, and providers. The Act is clear that, when considering any re-organisation of provision, decision makers must be clear how they are satisfied that the proposed alternative arrangements will lead to improvements in the standard, quality and/or range of educational provision for children with SEN.

8.5 Consultation has taken place with relevant stakeholders and a summary of consultation outcomes has been published on the Local Offer website as a requirement by the DfE as part of the SEND grant funding allocation.

## **9. Human Resources Implications**

9.1 The proposals will create teaching and learning and support staff employment opportunities and recruitment to these posts will be required following Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council recruitment procedures for Local Authority maintained provision and Academy Trust recruitment procedures where proposals are linked to Academy status schools.

## **10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults**

10.1 The additional SEND places created within the borough will give more children and young people the opportunity to access high quality provision closer to home to meet their educational needs.

## **11. Equalities and Human Rights Implications**

11.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires that public bodies, in exercising their functions, have due regard to the need to:

- i. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other unlawful conduct under the Act,
- ii. advance equality of opportunity and
- iii. foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 11.2 An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken on the proposed increase in SEND provision. The assessment has not identified any potential for unlawful conduct or disproportionate impact and concludes that all opportunities to advance equality are being addressed. The increase in SEND provision within Rotherham will help to ensure sufficient provision for the increasing numbers of children within Rotherham and ensure that appropriate provision is made within mainstream education where this accords with parental preference. By acting to ensure children in Rotherham have access to a high quality school place, RMBC is promoting equality of opportunity for all children and young people.
- 11.3 The Council must ensure it meets its public law duties when making decisions, including meeting its public sector equality duty. It must consider all relevant information, disregard irrelevant information, act in accordance with the statutory requirements and make its decision in a fair and transparent manner. The Council has consulted on this strategy with the various interested parties cited above. When determining whether to approve the increase Cabinet must take account of these views.
- 11.4 The additional specialist provision will allow more parents and carers to access education for their child within the local area in future years, in an inclusive and innovative learning environment.

## **12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates**

- 12.1 There will need to be further involvement and engagement with Planning Department, Asset Management Services, Transport services, SEND Specialist Services, Finance Section and Schools and Academies, who will all be engaged and involved in the development of the new provision. This will be overseen by the Strategic School Organisation Group and SEND Board, reporting to the Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services, Chief Executive and Elected Members as necessary and appropriate.

## **13. Risks and Mitigation**

- 13.1 There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered, since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. However, current provision is full or over-subscribed and this trend is set to continue, meaning that more pupils are being placed in provision out of authority increasing the financial burden on the High Needs Block.
- 13.2 Local Authorities are obliged, under the requirements of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013, to provide sufficient education places, promote diversity and increase parental preference.

**14. Accountable Officer(s)**

Ian Thomas, Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services

Approvals obtained on behalf of:-

	<b>Named Officer</b>	<b>Date</b>
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services	Michael Wildman	21.12.2017 31.01.2018
Assistant Director of Legal Services	Ruairi Wilson Neil Concannon	12.01.2018

Report Authors: Paula Williams (Head of Service – Inclusion Services)  
 Dean Fenton (Head of Service – School Planning, Admissions and Appeals)  
 Steven Harrison (Strategic Commissioning Manager – CYPS)  
 Robert Holsey (CYPS Asset Manager – Regeneration and Environment)

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-  
<http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Appendix 1****SEND Sufficiency Consultation Report****Overview****a) Area**

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council commissioned an independent organisation, SEND4CHANGE, to undertake a sufficiency exercise concerned with specialist provision for pupils with special educational needs and/or disability (SEND). Data was gathered by SEND4CHANGE in close collaboration with key officers of the Council from the Inclusion, Pupil Place Planning and School High Needs Finance teams. The main focus of the project has been to assist with projecting future demand for SEND educational provision in the Borough of Rotherham from 2017 to 2021.

**b) Introduction**

This consultation statement provides the details of the consultation process undertaken as part of the Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) proposal to increase the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) provision in the borough, as set out in the SEND Strategy 2017/18

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council have undertaken work on the SEND Sufficiency development program since April 2015 and have undertaken a range of consultation activities as outlined below.

The consultations elicited a range of responses which have all been recorded and considered as part of the development of the RMBC SEND Sufficiency program

**c) Consultation undertaken**

RMBC's aim was to involve all stakeholders internal, external and in the community as much as possible through this consultation stage and to engage as wide a range of people as possible.

- To involve all stakeholders internal, external and in the community as much as possible through this consultation stage and to engage as wide a range of people as possible using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques.
- To ensure that the consultation events take place at critical points in the process where decisions need to be made.

- To ensure that the results of consultation are fed back to local people and available as soon after the consultation events.
- As part of the requirement to consult and to publish details, a frequently asked questions page will also be added to the local offer site.

The purpose of the consultation was to raise awareness of the proposal to increase the number of SEND school places and provide an opportunity to all interested stakeholders to contribute; with the aim of establishing any concerns and issues affecting the local community and the longer term development of the SEND provision.

Consultation took place from 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 to 8<sup>th</sup> December 2017.

**d) Details of stakeholders consulted**

- SEND Specialists including; Autism Communication Team, Inclusion Support Services, Educational Psychology Service, Special School Leadership, Mental Health Services, Childrens Disability Team.
- Focus/Parent Groups, Specialist Groups and Parents 7 Carers including; Rotherham Parents Forum, SEND Information and Advice Support Service, Rotherham PVI Consortium, Young Person’s Consultation Forum, Autism Stakeholders Group
- Elected Members, MP’s, Parish Councils, Unions
- Schools/FE Colleges/ Private Providers
- Neighbouring Local Authorities and other interested parties

**e) How**

Stakeholders were consulted through various medium and events via the following:

Consultation Activity Date	Consult with	Consultation Method & Activities
27 <sup>th</sup> October 2017	SEND specialists: Autism Communication Team, Inclusion Support Services, Educational Psychology Service, Special School leadership, Mental Health Services, Children’s Disability Team	Email
23 <sup>rd</sup> October	Focus / parent groups, specialist groups, Parents and Carers:	Email - for information to RPCF; SENDIASS; VAR – ( Face to Face consultation with



<b>2017</b>	Rotherham Parents Forum, SEND Information and Advice Support Service, Rotherham PVI Consortium Young Person's Consultation Forum, Autism Stakeholders Group	parents and young people sent to CYP Consortium 'Different But Equal Board'  Request made to SENDIASS for a child friendly version.
<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017</b>	Elected Members, MP's, Parish Councils, Unions	Email sent  Members All  MPs  Parish Councils – with follow up letter to Committee Services.  Unions email sent via Committee Service
<b>23<sup>RD</sup> October 2017</b>	Schools All / FE Colleges / Private providers/ Diocesan colleagues	Email - Schools All mainstream  FE colleges and private providers  Early Years providers – SENT to Nursery School settings and Children's Centres
<b>26<sup>th</sup> October 2017</b>	Neighbouring Local Authorities	
<b>26<sup>TH</sup> October 2017</b>	Other interested parties and stakeholders	SEND Local Offer
<b>29<sup>th</sup> November</b>	Parent Carer Forum	Consultation event

**Consultation Responses**

The responses from this consultation and focus groups were collated and are captured below:

**12 Email responses** received from the following areas:

2 Professionals

1 Provider

4 Schools

4 Public

1 Other – Local Authority

The SENDIASS Consultation involved **45 young people aged 3 to 19 (and 23 accompanying parents or staff)** at:

School (8 children, 4 parents, 4 staff members)

School (22 children, 4 staff members)

Resource (6 children)

Telephone consultations (4 children, 4 parents)

SEND Youth Forum Meeting (5 children, 3 parents, 4 staff members)

A separate report has been produced.

Parent Carer Forum Consultation

**10 Parents (including members from Parents Forum)**

The following responses were recorded from the above;

*'Firstly, I think it that having a plan around sufficiency, and that it is so well structured is excellent.*

*I would urge that taken into account is staff specialism and ensuring all the right therapeutic services are commissioned to support with regard to the provision is also taken into account. Having specialist speech and language therapists, occupational therapists and educational psychology support can make a massive difference and ensure that needs can be considered holistically by a robust team around the child. When new local specialist provision has been opened in the past this has not always been the case and some of our provisions have needed to close – my view is this has been a factor.*

*I would cite ..... as a good example of a holistic approach working; the external specialist support and specialism from staff has been thought about carefully. There is also real commitment to partnership with families and creative, sensitive outreach.*

*I do feel these are vital factors to be incorporated into the new provisions.'*

*'Fantastic news!'*

*'I am writing to support the proposals for the additional places across Rotherham so that we can better meet the needs of students in the borough. This makes economical sense for the LA but more importantly social and emotional sense for the children and their families.'*

*'Youth and community leaders are paid far too much'*

*'It is a good idea to have more local educational provision.'*

*'However the information only mentions locations and 'types' of provision but there are many other important considerations in my view.*

*One of the (important) things on offer in many of the independent out of area schools in which our local children and young people are placed (out of area) are appropriately trained therapists (sensory trained occupational therapists, general occupational therapists, speech and language therapists, psychologists to name a few). If these new provisions do not have these staff (even if not on site all time they will need to be enough capacity to visit each site regularly) as well as teachers and TA's, then they will not be replacing like for like provision, and these in area 'units' will not be providing all of what the young people need. The type of support and advice provided in the independent schools will not be available from the NHS provision (OT, SALT, psychologist) in our area.*

*I hope that if the units are attached to mainstream schools, then the budgets will be protected and not absorbed into everyday running of the whole school; and also that children will not be forced into mainstream classrooms before they are ready.*

*I also wonder about post 16 provision. This is an area for which there is very little available at present, particularly for those with more complex needs.*

*Consideration also needs to be given to the design of the new provisions and I hope that input will be sought from children, young people and families as well as local practitioners e.g. autism communication team as to what would be a more suitable environment for someone with e.g. autism'*

*'There doesn't seem to be any provision for physically disabled children who need 1 to 1 support in mainstream settings. The Academy chains are making it impossible for children within this group to have the correct provision and support within a mainstream setting. No one is overseeing the inadequate provision provided or even policing it as the Education authority have no jurisdiction over the Academies. Because of this mainstream schools are failing Disabled children even though EHCP plans are in place as they are not being adhered to. Sadly I speak from personal experience and believe this is another group of children who are being failed as mainstream schools battle to keep funding for these children separate to other funding so they can spend on what they want.'*

*'The overall response from participants to the proposals was positive. All participants thought increasing the number of places within Rotherham was good and necessary, and that the proposal of increasing provision in a number of locations throughout the borough had some benefits. Some wondered if less locations, with more children at each, might improve access staff expertise, and to friendship groups (in and out of school) which was the priority for almost all participants.*

*Whilst we expected the topic of transport to the settings to be a major factor, this was rarely raised. Young people did feel that a long journey should be avoided where possible, but were pragmatic about the need to travel to the right school, and therefore this subject does not feature significantly in the report.*

*Participants volunteered their opinions and ideas willingly. Art activities enabled young people with limited verbal capacity to contribute. Participants in general seemed to enjoy the opportunity to communicate their ideas directly to the local authority and were impressed that they were able to ask questions with a promise of an answer.*

*For some children and young people, this consultation may have been their first taste of being asked to share their opinions and thoughts about something such as SEND provision. As such, there were some comments such as "I do think we should have animals but they won't really do it." Some young people showed an awareness of financial and practical restrictions, making comments like "I have loads of ideas, but they will just do whatever's cheapest."*

*The young participants had high aspirations for themselves, and wanted their schools to be places where they might be encouraged to believe their ambitions were possible. The atmosphere was one of hope that this might happen, and an acceptance that this might not. "Don't just say it. Do it"*

*'..... have read the information about supporting children with additional needs and extending their support.*

*The info only seems to relate to children who are of full time school age and does not include or discuss children who are in Early Years. Is there a reason for this?'*

*'The proposals below are an outline and do not constitute the full detail to do with the proposals by ..... to support RMBC with the Sufficiency Plan. We see the value of additional provision in Rotherham based on a site with 70 years of experience and staff fully trained and adaptable. There is a need to retain and extend our provision and we also see the opportunity to widen the scope for pupils to mix and support each other and to be able to develop staff to meet internally a wider level of need and externally to advise and support educational provision to assist them with the challenges in their setting.*

*Newman has pioneered the value, efficiency and quality of additional provision within a Specialist setting. The ..... is not only a high quality, well managed provision but it is also efficiently run and integrated with the main school at ..... School. It provides Rotherham with an exemplar provision and for ..... School it also provides a chance to make a difference with the educational provision across the school, shared expertise in behavioural management and an inclusive approach which is having a major impact on pupil development in both areas of the school. The ..... I believe it would work better and more efficiently if we were able to offer a separate Primary provision for up to 10 places for Complex Needs/ASC adjacent to the current building and run as with ..... within the school setting, but also separate to ensure pupil safety and familiarity. Within this additional provision I think there is capacity to extend beyond 20 the numbers for ....., within a remodelling of provision on site.*

*I think the sufficiency report for EYFS places is off the mark with 10 places, however more importantly it is off the mark in not addressing the process change around placement that is required. .... is keen to build upon its excellent EYFS provision and we would welcome a revised brief not only to extend provision to include the additional 10 additional places but to have an assessment role for a number of young people on a short term basis with eventual signposting to either mainstream (with on-going support and outreach) to MLD Special School with an established relationship with ..... for example or for continuity in ..... School. The proposed EYFS provision would be in the ..... which is a separate building and would facilitate quality continuous provision inside and outside. It would offer a separate entrance and would allow a separation between a Special School offer and one similar to a PVI type setting. I have worked with an assessment model before*

and believe linking with ..... at RMBC we can offer outstanding, integrated and personalised provision. It would also facilitate the opportunity to move our existing provision from the inadequate area and changing facilities to a fit for purpose building.

Post 16 and post 19.

..... has traditionally accepted young people from a variety of schools whose needs do not fit within an FE provision model. I am committed to developing positive and dynamic 16-25 provision in Rotherham for the long term needs of Employability and Independent Living. Far too many of our young people see the answer to out of area or part-time repetition at FE Colleges in provision which does nothing to provide good outcomes for their adult life in terms of work or independent housing. I would aim for ..... to be the centre of a partnership to facilitate provision with outstanding outcomes for young people. The partnership goal would be to ensure that our young people are always less dependent and where possible fully independent. Costing will always be less if economies of scale are accepted. Therefore the proposal would include MLD, SLD, ASC as well as some PMLD pupils. The provision would be for about 70 16-19 year olds and about 50 19-25 year olds, costings would be at the levels within a school setting or slightly higher if staffing levels are higher for a particular activity. It would include a ..... Supported Internship model and would have strong links to the adult disability team for independent living skills. In addition the provision would include both a social centre for pupils to support their social life and out of college activities and would also enable parents to visit to get advice, support and signposting if and when required. Using ESFA funding the Element 1 and 2 costs would be paid and would represent excellent value for money. I personally have experience in establishing a 19-25 Employability College, a ..... model and working with adult social care to reduce dependency in independent living.

In conclusion the offer of ..... to develop EYFS provision, to extend and expand ..... and to lead and co-ordinate 16-25 provision meets the needs of RMBC and offers tremendous value for money for the HNB. It would build on current practice and skills and offer pupils and parents security. It would mean that we could work with RMBC to enhance the building environment to better meet the current pupils as well as expand to meet the new needs of the pupils. We have set out three areas, but we feel that the approach of the school and the Governors mean we are happy to engage in a dialogue to see whether the needs of RMBC and the opportunities at ..... could go beyond the outline case of these three areas.'

'It is certainly clear that specialist provision for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities in Rotherham is oversubscribed with places in high demand. We recognise this at ..... and would be happy to contribute towards future planning to ensure sufficient places are available to those pupils who require specialist provision. The benefit of extending a current provision is that pupils would benefit from the outstanding elements of an established provision, such as experienced and skilled staff. .... could offer to increase pupil places by 17% to create an additional 20 places for pupils with ASD and/or complex needs. This would require an initial capital investment for building costs and continued funding in line with current/proposed school funding. On the ..... we have large playground spaces, with large grassed areas and a substantial field that is mainly only used through the spring and summer months due to the ground often being damp. These spaces could potentially be utilized better. In addition to the above suggestions we would also like to move the..... After a recent site visit and discussions with an independent buildings

*manager we identified potential areas of school that could either be built around or where new buildings could be added. Potentially the two developments could both alleviate the difficulties of a split site school and help to accommodate some of the growth in numbers of pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities. .... School is keen to work with RMBC to improve local capacity to meet the needs of a growing population. We are happy to discuss these proposals further if they offer any possible solutions to the provision required as identified in the sufficiency plan. '*

*'Sounds great to have more childrens services. However my concern is that having a son (12) who has been diagnosed asd by Rotherham camhs and discharged because they can only offer a diagnose service, there is no other clear provision for help and support within the borough..... How is situation to change so my son gets his means met? '*

Parents Carer Forum Consultation made a number of points that they wanted to be taken into consideration as work on improving and increasing SEND provision progressed. These were;

- *There is a legacy of scepticism from some parents due to past experiences but they want to work closely with the Local Authority to improve provision moving forward*
- *There should be more challenge to and accountability from mainstream schools and colleges who are not delivering a graduated response for all types of need.*
- *Schools receiving funding for special education should be held accountable for that funding*
- *There is a need for more training as parents feel that some mainstream teachers do not understand the needs of SEND children, in some cases, the basic knowledge of a need is absent.*
- *There needs to be a culture change around education so that inclusive schools are recognised for their work, in the same way that schools are recognised for their work to improve academic standards*
- *There is a strong feeling amongst parents that the system within mainstream needs to change or the need for specialist places will continue to rise.*
- *Children should be able to access provision which ensures they can reach their academic potential, even if they have additional or special needs.*
- *Would like to do a piece of work that investigates what improved and 'good' SEND provision would look like for parents and children.*
- *There is no mention of bespoke packages in the plan to increase places and how they fit in*
- *There was no description in the plan of what staffing in the increased provision will look like*
- *Access to therapies is vital for schools to put in place for children*
- *There was agreement in the room that more provision is needed for children and young people with autism who are able.*
- *Too much of an increase in special provision will look like segregation rather than inclusion*
- *Parents stated they would be happy with less 'special' provision if the offer within mainstream was of higher quality.*

- *There needs to be more work on the post 16 offer which is felt to be very poor in Rotherham by parents*
- *Parents need to know the LA is listening to their concerns about mainstream education*
- *Is there any scope for schools who provide good inclusive education to be financially rewarded?*
- *There is no mention of any additional provision for severe dyslexia*
- *We need to consider how the use of personal budgets can contribute to a better offer*
- *Parents wished to express their concern over the challenges faced by mainstream schools in relation to academic outcomes, and the difficulty this can cause when trying to be inclusive.*
- *We should use this opportunity to replicate good practice within and outside the LA to ensure children can access quality in borough.*
- *There is an acknowledgement from parents that to make the culture change that is needed to improve the whole system will take some time but they are keen to work together to do this.*

