

Public Document Pack

CABINET DOCUMENTS FOR THE MEMBERS ROOM

Monday, 24th October, 2011
at 5.00 pm

MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THE
LISTED REPORTS

Contacts

Cabinet Administrator

Judy Cordell

Tel: 023 8083 2766

Email: judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk

MEMBERS ROOM DOCUMENTS

8 RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY INQUIRY REPORT ON PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

- Scrutiny inquiry final report

21 POTENTIAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES

- Outline Project Proposal
- Project Category Evaluation

Friday, 14 October 2011

HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Report of Scrutiny Panel A

PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS INQUIRY October 2010 to February 2011



Panel Membership:

Councillor Fitzgerald (Chair)
Councillor Mrs Damani
Councillor Kolker (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Morrell
Councillor Odgers
Councillor Turner
Councillor Willacy

Democratic Support Officer:

Sharon Pearson

Policy and Performance Analyst:

Dorota Goble

CONTENTS

Page

3	Executive Summary
4	Main issues from the inquiry
5	Summary of recommended actions
6	Introduction
8	The issues
8	The Changing National and Local Picture for SEN
11	Sharing Best Practice
14	Signposting and Supporting Services
13	Development and projected impact on the issue
15	Resourcing the actions
15	Measuring the outcomes

Appendices

17	1 Southampton Primary School SEN Breakdown
18	2 Southampton Primary School Free School Meal and SEN links
19	3 Key Performance Information
21	4 Terms of reference and outline plan
22	5 Summary of evidence

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. A recent Ofsted review reported that just over 1 in 5 pupils in England are identified as having Special Educational Needs (SEN). Nationally, these numbers have seen a steady increase over the last few years.
2. In Southampton's primary schools there are just less than 3,500 pupils children with SEN. The overall number of primary school pupils with SEN (at School Action, School Action Plus or with a Statement) has reduced although the proportion of all these pupils (21%) is still just above the national average. Conversely, the number of primary pupils who have a statement has increased, with the proportion (1.7%) below the national average. The primary school breakdown of SEN from 2007-2010 is attached in Appendix 1.
3. The Panel were shown that a disproportionate number of children currently identified with SEN are children who are eligible for free school meals (Appendix 2). They may also have other complex needs within their family or home environment, which are not easily resolved. The Panel felt that all primary school children would benefit from many of the techniques and best practice used for supporting children with special educational needs.
4. Overall performance and prospects for primary school children in Council-maintained schools is positive with the SEN attainment gap reducing steadily and the majority of inspections for primary schools have been 'good' for quality of learning (SEN). The Panel were shown that the outcomes in reading, writing and maths for primary school children with SEN, especially for those without a statement, have been improving, and compare well nationally and with our statistical neighbours (Appendix 3).
5. There is more of a challenge for Southampton primary school pupils with a SEN statement. Unfortunately for these children the attainment gap got worse and was below the national and statistical neighbour averages.
6. There are many far reaching changes currently being proposed or planned for education and health provision in the UK. The Panel recognised that although these were difficult times there were key elements of provision that should be prioritised including pooling budgets, joint working and protecting the most vulnerable children with complex needs, whilst recognising the link between SEN and deprivation.
7. The Panel noted that any achievements in improved outcomes for children with SEN required commitment from all: teachers, pupils and parents alike. Strong leadership from the head teacher made the crucial difference to the level of support for SEN and felt there could be greater consistency and a SEN ethos across the city.
8. Feedback from parents on their experience in relation to support for their child's special educational needs was mixed ranging from very positive to confusion, frustration and mistrust. It was felt that improved co-ordination, sign-posting and joint working of services could lead to improved experiences and life chances for children with SEN and their families.

MAIN ISSUES AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

9. Overall, the main issues from the inquiry were:
- The Strategy for Children and Young People and the SEN Strategy need to be updated;
 - Overall levels of pupils with SEN remain just above average;
 - Recognition of the links between children with SEN and deprivation;
 - A drive to identify significant savings and changes to the way services are provided for PCT and the Council;
 - Agencies were not always sharing best practice; and
 - Parent's feedback showed mixed perceptions and experiences – it can be hard for them to know what is going on, especially in transition stages.
10. The six recommendations from the inquiry, outlined in more detail with the issues after the introduction (Page 9 onwards), were:

Recommendation 1: With national changes to be implemented in education and health alongside the imminent SEN White Paper and given existing budget constraints, the focus should be on key actions and priorities to ensure that children in primary schools with the most complex needs are given the best life chances. These key actions and priorities are for all partners to:

- Ensure the Pupil Premium is used to support the most vulnerable children, recognising the link between SEN and deprivation;
- Continue the increased focus on early intervention and support;
- Maximise the joint potential of personalised budgets and pupil premium to work most effectively for those children with the most complex needs;
- Maintain the strengths of the social model for supporting children with SEN within the medical model for joint-working arrangements and
- Ensure the earliest possible update of the Children and Young People's Plan and SEN Strategy, including consideration of whether a single combined plan is appropriate.

Recommendation 2: Recognise and raise greater awareness of where schools are championing children with SEN and promote an inclusive ethos across the city through the sharing of best practice examples of the achievements of schools and children with SEN.

Recommendation 3: Ensure there is a continuum of support to meet each child's needs at different times and through different services. Consideration should be given to support all children, especially those with the most complex needs, through a multi agency approach with the Learning Disability Partnership Board and to include all key services such as health, education and social care.

Recommendation 4: Recognising the transition of the public health role to local authorities, Southampton City Council to consider developing a multi-agency ADHD strategy for the city with key partners.

Recommendation 5: Agree a cross-agency protocol for parent and child involvement to enable transparency in the options for an individual child's educational needs and ensure that communication is maintained between all agencies and families.

Recommendation 6: Consider a partnership approach to co-ordinate and signpost all SEN information, advice and services with one clear point of contact for:

- Providers, including Health and Schools – to include details of specialist and outreach support, key contacts, training opportunities and raising awareness of SEN achievement and best practice;
- Parents, families and children – links to support groups, advice on options, help choosing the right services to meet their child’s needs and an opportunity for parent’s and children, as armchair auditors, to make comments, compliments and complaints about their experiences.

INTRODUCTION

11. The Primary School Educational Attainment for Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) Inquiry was undertaken by Scrutiny Panel A over four meetings between October 2010 and March 2011.
12. The purpose of the Inquiry was to understand and consider how children of primary school age with Special Educational Needs, including children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), are supported by primary schools and the Primary Care Trust to achieve their maximum potential and prepare for secondary education. The Inquiry Terms of Reference are attached in Appendix 4.
13. The Education Act and SEN Code of Practice outline and define that where it is necessary to take some additional or different action to enable the pupil to learn more effectively, they should be considered to have Special Educational Needs.
14. All children and young people, including those with Special Educational Needs, deserve to be educated in the most empowering environment and in their local mainstream school whenever appropriate. In Southampton, at least 99% of pupils in city council-controlled primary schools are educated within its mainstream provision, with the remaining children supported in special schools for specific, complex and specialist needs.
15. The SEN Code of Practice promotes a common approach to identifying, assessing and providing for all children's Special Educational Needs. The Code advocates a continuum of provision – a graduated approach. Schools meet most children's learning needs through "differentiation" of the curriculum, which means teachers tailoring their approaches to suit individual pupils' different learning needs and styles.
16. Primary schools are guided on good literacy and mathematics teaching, involving a carefully planned blend of approaches that direct children's learning and challenge them to think, through the "Quality First" curriculum. If pupils require support that is additional to and different from this they may be placed at 'School Action'. If external agency support is required to enable the school to support the pupil's educational needs then a pupil will be placed at 'School Action Plus'.
17. A 'SEN Statement' will be made by the local authority if it decides that all of the special help a child needs cannot be provided from within the school's existing resources. These resources could include money, staff time and special equipment. The statement will describe all of the child's SEN and the special help the child will receive.
18. Provision and services for children with SEN in mainstream and special schools is available from Educational Psychology, School Standards, Outreach and other specialist teaching/advisory services (provided by local special schools and funded by the local authority), and the Southampton Parent Partnership service. The Primary Care Trust provides numerous services including Child and Adult Mental Health Services (CAMHS),

JIGSAW, speech and language therapy and specialist community services. Resource, SEN and multi-agency resource panels govern SEN placement and provision for the city.

19. During the Inquiry, the Panel considered background documents and presentations from the Children's Services and Learning Directorate, Children's Healthcare and Solent Healthcare, head teachers, and parent representatives. The issues and developments for primary school children with SEN were considered. The Panel members also visited 4 primary schools and an Early Year's Centre to experience first hand, how SEN support is provided in the city. Appendix 5 shows the full list of evidence.
20. The Panel have drawn together their conclusions and recommendations in this report in light of significant national changes expected over the next few years through Government White Papers and legislation for schools, SEN provision and health. They have also noted a number of local reviews within Southampton for services for children with disabilities and mental health problems. Overall, the Panel support the shift of emphasis for joint working and supporting the individual child.
21. Finally, the Panel would like to express their gratitude to all those who gave evidence or provided information to the inquiry for their continued honesty, insight and commitment to making a difference to primary school children with SEN.

THE ISSUES

Changing National and Local Picture for SEN

22. Southampton's Children and Young People's Plan 2009-12 and the SEN Strategy 2007-10 set out Southampton's priorities and approach to promoting the inclusion of children and young people with SEN within mainstream education and providing them with the best life chances.
23. Although the Panel concluded these strategies clearly identify the issues and outline opportunities to improve the outcomes for children with SEN, there were many external developments that also need to be considered. The Panel recognised that updated strategies would follow Government legislation but the Panel urged that these strategies be updated as soon as is practically possible once a clear way forward emerged both locally within Southampton and nationally.
24. Amongst many legislative proposals there are primarily three key bills that will impact on children with SEN:
 - i. **The Schools White Paper: *The Importance of Teaching***: This aims to improve standards for teaching in particular through changes to training and funding for SEN, greater autonomy of schools to tackle SEN, and improved reporting of how well children, who are eligible for pupil premium, do in their basic skills.
 - ii. **The SEN and Disability Green Paper: *Support and Aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability*** identifies the increasing trend to categorise children with SEN and makes wide-ranging proposals to reform the SEN system. These include a single combined 'Education, Health and Care Plan', additional funding through the pupil premium and greater control for parents of children with SEN.
 - iii. **The NHS White Paper: *'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS'* and the Public Health White Paper: *'Health Lives, Healthy People'*** proposed a fundamental transformation of the health agenda through new commissioning arrangements and provider arrangements; New public health budgets and a stronger focus on early years identification, vulnerable groups and expanding use of personalised budgets.
25. The panel would like to see the above legislation would be implemented swiftly to improve outcomes for all children, especially those with special educational needs. There was particular support for a single combined plan which the Panel believed would reduce frustrations for children with SEN and their parents. This would also indicate clear links between deprivation and SEN alongside maximising the opportunities for all children, including those with SEN.
26. There was concern expressed that although the numbers of children identified at School Action and School Action Plus in Southampton primary schools had reduced over the last few years (Appendix 1) the overall proportion of pupils with SEN remained above the national average. The Panel felt that the above proposals would help to turn this curve alongside a greater focus on added value and learning needs.

27. The Panel saw compelling evidence linking deprivation and children with SEN in Southampton schools, where children eligible for free school meals are disproportionately represented within children with SEN (Appendix 2). Given the many complex issues these children may face, both at school and at home, the Panel felt there should be a greater focus on the outcomes for these children by ensuring that the forthcoming Pupil Premium is used effectively to support the most vulnerable children. The panel believe that proposes for early intervention and support will particularly serve to improve the life chances for these children.
28. The Panel also recognized that the 16 community budget pilot schemes, which focus on families with complex needs, are likely to become the focus of attention as the way to bring transformational change. This new model of public service delivery involves bottom up service design and allows multi skilled teams to work across organisational boundaries to find innovative solutions.
29. There are also key local services reviews underway in Southampton
- **CAMHS – Saucepans Team** provides a multi-agency single point of contact for children experiencing emotional, behavioural and mental health issues. Review outcomes include clearer service criteria and a revised care pathway for children with ADHD;
 - **Speech Language and Therapy** – treatment for children with significant speech, language and swallowing difficulties; and
 - **Services for children and young people with disability review** aims to support more children in their local communities. This will be achieved through better aligned health, social care and education systems including the development of a specialist hub, a lead professional for children with moderate to severe disabilities, coaching to promote inclusion, proactive use of the Common Assessment Framework, and a continued focus on early identification and support.
30. Inevitably, the significant costs and resources devoted to supporting children with Special Educational Needs and disabilities will add further pressure over the next few years following the impact of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review 2010. Southampton City Council and the Southampton PCT, key providers for children with SEN and disabilities, need to identify significant savings in the next few years alongside the potential stress points of setting up and implementing numerous changes to the way they support all children, as well as those with special educational needs and disabilities.
31. The Panel supports an increased focus on early intervention for all children and that the shift of emphasis for both education and health services will require much greater collaboration and pooled budgets for all relevant agencies. Due to the limited resources and greater focus on those who are most deprived or vulnerable, the Panel believe it is vital that agencies maximise the potential of pooling personalised budgets and the pupil premium to work most effectively for those with the most complex needs.

32. The Panel heard that children were more likely to be identified with SEN at primary school when the demands of the curriculum require them to spend more time sitting and listening rather than engaged in more active learning activities at pre-school. There was, however, evidence that Surestart projects were having a positive impact (e.g. on attainment levels at the end of the foundation stage). The Panel felt that the earliest identification meant that the right support can be set up for a child to ensure they are not disadvantaged.
33. The national proposals for greater joint working, the local authority role in Public Health and the single combined assessments through education, care and health plans suggest that services will need to be more aligned to a medical approach to SEN and disability rather than a social, interactive approach.
34. The social model thinking looks to remove socially created barriers in attitude, organisation, environment or prejudice to help the child develop whereas the medical model uses the impairment of the child to define them and assumes the label will remain or be normalised.
35. The Panel, however, saw persuasive evidence that there were many benefits of the social model to both society and the child and family. The Panel believe that joint working arrangements and collaborative working should ensure that future arrangements and processes harness the strengths of the social model to minimise labelling and maximise the inclusion of the child within society through removing barriers.
36. Overall, the Panel understood that as a result of these challenges there is clearly much work already underway both at a national and local level to improve the processes, support and services for children with SEN. However, given the limited resources and changes that were to be implemented over the next few years they felt that there were some key elements that should be protected and prioritised.

Recommendation 1: With national changes to be implemented in education and health alongside the imminent SEN White Paper and given existing budget constraints, the focus should be on key actions and priorities to ensure that children in primary schools with the most complex needs are given the best life chances. These key actions and priorities are for all partners to:

- Ensure the Pupil Premium is used to support the most vulnerable children, recognising the link between SEN and deprivation;
- Continue the increased focus on early intervention and support;
- Maximise the joint potential of personalised budgets and pupil premium to work most effectively for those children with the most complex needs;
- Maintain the strengths of the social model for supporting children with SEN within the medical model for joint-working arrangements and
- Ensure the earliest possible update of the Children and Young People's Plan and SEN Strategy, including consideration of whether a single combined plan is appropriate.

Sharing Best Practice

37. The grades for the progress of learners with SEN and learning difficulties and disabilities following Ofsted inspections in Southampton primary schools has been consistently “good” for the last three years.
38. Recent performance has seen improvements in the Key Stage 1 SEN attainment gap in both mathematics and reading, although there is room for improvement for pupils with statements (Appendix 3).
39. School visits made by the councillors upheld these judgements, but also demonstrated how a school’s whole ethos and commitment from staff, children and parents can work to support children with SEN and give them the best start in life. This may range from being greeted at the school gate, the offer of breakfast or a healthy snack, a time out zone, visual sign-posting or a learning plan tailored to each individual child’s needs which enables them to learn and develop at their own pace.
40. The Panel also considered the individual inspection judgements from 34 schools over the last two years to assess the overall quality of SEN teaching as a benchmark for the city. The results were generally positive with nearly two thirds of primary schools judged as good (53%) or outstanding (9%).
41. However, with over a third of the primary schools judged as satisfactory, and only 3 schools achieving an outstanding result in this area, there is a need to improve the sharing of best practice for SEN support more widely across the city.
42. This perceived inconsistency is also supported by parents’ feedback which showed extreme positive and negative experiences of the support for their child with SEN.
43. Although there were no schools deemed to be inadequate in the quality of learning for SEN, the Panel felt there was room to improve outcomes for all children, and especially those with SEN, through increased promotion of the ethos of inclusion and a greater focus on training for SEN across the board. In addition, there was a perception that some schools were not as committed, or could opt out, to ensuring inclusion and supporting children with SEN.
44. The far-reaching commitment, systems and support in place at the schools visited by the Panel members were a credit to the schools, showing how they help all children to learn and grow to the best of their ability and leave their troubles at the school gate. It was felt this was particularly important for children with SEN, as many may live with chaotic or difficult home lives, poverty or the risk of violence everyday. The Panel believes the efforts and outcomes of schools that champion the needs of children with SEN should be better recognised and promoted within the city.

45. The facilities and set up at the city's only special school for primary pupils with learning difficulties, Springwell, were exemplary. The Panel recognised, however, that resource constraints and the preference for mainstream education for most children meant that places were always going to be limited. They were heartened, however, by the outreach work and training that is already provided to mainstream schools and likely to be extended following the National Leader in Education status recently awarded to the head teacher.
46. The Panel also supported the proposals in the Schools White Paper and the SEN Green Paper to develop better mechanisms for recording and reporting on the outcomes of children with SEN and those receiving the pupil premium. They felt this would provide a clearer picture of where schools are performing well for children with learning needs.
47. Springwell School, and many other schools leading in supporting children with SEN in Southampton, are achieving excellent standards and quality of learning for children with SEN and disability. They should be celebrated as a best practice models for others schools in the city. The Panel believe so much more could be achieved by the application of many of the innovative and often simple techniques. This would not only help those with SEN and learning needs but also enhance the experience and benefit all children at primary schools.

Recommendation 2: Recognise and raise greater awareness of where schools are championing children with SEN and promote an inclusive ethos across the city through the sharing of best practice examples of the achievements of schools and children with SEN.

48. The Panel were concerned about evidence they received from Southampton Parent Partnership who often (but not always) hear parents report that they are confused by the different messages they receive from the various professionals they come across. Although these were the views of parents who were in some way dissatisfied, the Panel felt that the mixed perceptions and experiences of families of children with SEN was an important issue to address.
49. The Government papers outlined above consistently highlight the need for greater collaboration and joint working as a way forward for tackling assessments, support and services for children with SEN. The Panel recognised the role of the Multi-Agency Resource Panel (MARP) to agree placements and funding for children with the most complex needs and felt that the new proposals for a single assessment process could lead the way for a multi-agency approach for all children with SEN to be considered.
50. The Jigsaw service which provides a 'one stop shop' for parents, children and practitioners to have one point of contact to access specialist services for learning difficulties and/or autism with challenging behaviour was also cited as a best practice example and a potential model to follow.

Recommendation 3: Ensure there is a continuum of support to meet each child's needs at different times and through different services. Consideration should be given to support all children, especially those with the most complex needs, through a multi agency approach with the Learning Disability Partnership Board and to include all key services such as health, education and social care.

51. The SEN Strategy recognised that the provision for children with both learning and behavioural difficulties is not well developed despite the fact that behavioural, emotional and social difficulty is the second highest educational need (5% of pupils) in primary schools in Southampton, the highest being moderate learning difficulties (14% of pupils). This was supported by comments from head teachers, the PCT and the ADHD Awareness Group.
52. The proposed CAMHS model for the Saucepans Team has identified the need for improvements in this area and will implement a revised care pathway for children and young people with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and Attention Deficit Hypersensitivity Disorder (ADHD) to improve support and outcomes.
53. The Panel heard evidence that the complexity and confusion often experienced by children with SEN and their parents is compounded with ADHD and ASD as the parents or other family members may also suffer from this hereditary condition. Where this condition occurs in a family the panel were advised there may also be domestic violence, drug misuse and other health problems prevalent.
54. There are limited local support networks and the Southampton ADHD Awareness Group outlined to the panel that the problems faced by these families would be reduced by a multi-agency strategy for ADHD. This would enable a collaborative approach of services to enhance the life chances for children diagnosed with ADHD and to work together to reduce the stigma attached to ADHD.

Recommendation 4: Recognising the transition of the public health role to local authorities, Southampton City Council to consider developing a multi-agency ADHD strategy for the city with key partners.

Signposting and Supporting Services

55. The Panel received feedback from parents, through the Southampton Parent Partnership, and children with SEN, stating that it is hard for them when they do not know what is going on or during transition stages. Although some feel they are given a chance to be involved this is by no means consistent across all schools in Southampton. Many parents feel they do not know about decisions or plans to support their child's special needs.
56. Government proposals are moving towards greater involvement and control of parents and children in future decisions, funding through the pupil premium and individual care plans to support their children's special educational needs. There are also proposals to set out clear information on the achievements for children at the lower end of the school attainment and those receiving the pupil premium which will give a clearer overall picture of how schools are performing and greater parental choice for their child.
57. Changes to commissioning and provision of services will inevitably follow over the next few years with increased potential for schools and practitioners to lead on improvements for quality of learning. The changes and provision for SEN should to be more clearly signposted so that practitioners involved in a child's development have a clear understanding of the services and support available.
58. Professionals will need to ensure mechanisms are in place to support parents to make informed decisions and enable them to engage in the development of their child's combined 'Education, Health and Care Plan'.
59. The Panel support a cross agency approach to involving parents in their child's care. Although the Panel understand the complexities of developing this within the diminishing role of local authorities and changing provision in education and health provision they felt that it is the most effective and fundamental way forward within existing budget constraints. Its implementation will also meet legislative proposals in the next few years.

Recommendation 5: Agree a cross-agency protocol for parent and child involvement to enable transparency in the options for an individual child's educational needs and ensure that communication is maintained between all agencies and families.

Recommendation 6: Consider a partnership approach to co-ordinate and signpost all SEN information, advice and services with one clear point of contact for:

- Providers, including Health and Schools – to include details of specialist and outreach support, key contacts, training opportunities and raising awareness of SEN achievement and best practice;
- Parents, families and children – links to support groups, advice on options, help choosing the right services to meet their child's needs and an opportunity for parent's and children, as armchair auditors, to make comments, compliments and complaints about their experiences.

DEVELOPMENT AND PROJECTED IMPACT ON THE ISSUE

60. Local reviews on disabilities and mental health provision and expected Government legislation alongside reducing and changing funding arrangements for schools and pupil premiums are all expected to have a significant impact on schools and SEN provision.
61. The increased emphasis on joint working and a focus on individual outcomes should see improvements for the most vulnerable children and families with complex needs.
62. Once changes in Government policies are clear a review of the Southampton SEN Strategy will need to be undertaken as a priority. This should aim to ensure that key issues and opportunities for children with SEN and disabilities are developed into a clear and resourced action plan.
63. The recommendations within this report aim to ensure that, within the changing climate for schools and health, vulnerable children remain a priority and primarily seek to make the system for supporting children with SEN more accessible and less confusing for parents and children.
64. They also aim to ensure that achievements for children with SEN are more widely recognised and harnessed to improve all primary school children's potential through sharing and learning of best practice.

RESOURCING THE ACTIONS



65. Significant costs are associated with supporting children with Special Educational Needs as shown in the Children's Services and Learning budget set out in Appendix 6.
66. It was difficult to specifically identify SEN budgets for the Primary Care Trust as they commission services that work across a range of setting with a range of children.
67. At this current time the recommendations from this inquiry do not have any additional financial implications on the Council and its partners. Although it should be noted that Government White Papers are expected to impact on the way schools and support for children with SEN is funded but it is difficult to predict budgets will be allocated in future.
68. The Panel believe that the recommendations within the report could be progressed by re-focussing council officer and partner's time and existing work programmes.

MEASURING THE IMPACT OF CHANGE

69. The Panel felt that there is already an extensive set of measures established to monitor the progress of children with special educational needs. They believe that these should remain a focus to ensure a consistent view of improvements over time.
70. The Panel, however, also welcome Government proposals to improve the measurement of progress for children at the lower end of the spectrum of attainment, to provide a more holistic view of the school and specifically of improvements for the most vulnerable children.
71. The Panel believes that a review of the SEN strategy and the Children and Young People's Plan should be undertaken as soon as is practical once legislation becomes clearer. This will ensure support for children with SEN and vulnerable children will be as up to date as possible and enable new measures to be introduced in a timely way.
72. Finally, the recommendations within the report that seek to increase and improve parent involvement in the SEN system should ensure that their children's needs are better met. To that end, the perception and feedback of parents and children through the Southampton Parent Partnership should continue to be a focus.

APPENDIX 1

Southampton Primary School SEN Breakdown




APPENDIX 2


Southampton Primary School Free School Meal and SEN links

January 2010: Primary School SEN:Free School Meal break down

No Special Needs (SEN) or Free School Meals (FSM):
9717 pupils (62%)



Primary School Pupils with SEN and eligible for Free School Meals (January 2010)



Total number of primary pupils (YR – Y6) at (A) School Action, (N) No SEN identified, (P) School Action Plus and with (S) a Statement with and without FSM (January 2010)

APPENDIX 3

Key performance information for Primary School SEN


Key Stage 2 Provisional Data 2010 (Released July 2010- excluding boycotted schools unless stated otherwise)

English and Maths L4+	2008	2009	2010	2009 Statistical Neighbour	2009 National
LA (excluding boycotted schools)			70%		
LA Average	65%	64%		68.7%	72%
SALTs Target			75%		

English and Maths L4+	2008	2009	2010	Difference 2010-2008 (rounded)	2009 Statistical Neighbour	2009 National
FSM	46%	45%	58.3%	12%	50%	53.3%
Non FSM	70%	68%	73.2%	3%	73%	75.5%
FSM Gap	24.6 %	23%	14.9%	-10%	23%	22.3%
Girls	69%	68%	72.6%	4%	71%	75%
Boys	61%	61%	67.2%	6%	66%	70%
Gender Gap	8%	7%	5.4%	-3%	5%	5%
Non SEN	82%	78%	83.2%	1%	83%	
SEN without statement	26%	24%	46.2%	20%	30%	
SEN with statement	8%	10%	2.3%	-6%	10%	

	2008	2009	2010	2009 Statistical Neighbours	2009 National
English 2 Levels Progress	76%	76%	79%	81%	82%
English 2 Levels Progress SALTs Target		86%	87%		
Maths 2 Levels Progress	75%	74%	80%	79%	81%
Maths 2 Levels Progress SALTs Target		82%	82%		

NI104 - Attainment Gap SEN/non SEN Key Stage 2 inc Eng and Maths



APPENDIX 4

Terms of Reference and Inquiry Plan

Primary School Educational Attainment for Children with Special Needs Inquiry

1. **Scrutiny Inquiry Panel:** Scrutiny Panel A
2. **Membership:** Councillors Fitzgerald (Chair), Kolker (Vice Chair), Damani, Morrell, Odgers, Thomas and Willacy.
3. **Purpose:** To understand and consider how children of primary school age with Special Educational Needs (SEN), including children with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) are supported by primary schools and the Primary Care Trust to achieve their maximum potential and prepare for secondary education.
4. **Objectives:**
 - a. To understand what special needs in primary schools are and how these are currently identified and supported. Does this comprehensively cover all the special needs of children in primary school, including children diagnosed with ADHD?
 - b. To understand the difference between the medical, educational and social models for special needs of children;
 - c. To review the current attainment levels for children with Special Educational Needs and consider if any clear gaps exist in any particular need or area;
 - d. To consider the local context of service provision and identify any best practice or barriers that exist to service provision now and potentially in the future; and
 - e. To reflect on the experiences of parents and children with special needs going through the primary school system and how their experience may be improved.
5. **Methodology and Consultation:**
 - a. Undertake desktop research, including Ofsted reports and national organisations undertaking work on this issue to clarify the definition of special needs
 - b. Identify best practice
 - c. Seek stakeholder views
 - d. Conduct interviews with cabinet member leading on issues related to educational attainment and special needs, Executive Director for Children's Services and Learning, Heads of Services and other relevant officers.
6. **Proposed Timetable:** 4 meetings from October 2010 to March 2011.

7. Inquiry Plan

Meeting 1: 7th October 2010

- Introduction to how children with Special Educational Needs are identified and supported in the primary school system;
- To explain the current service provision through Southampton City Council and other agencies such as PCT; and
- To outline local context of service provision current performance with trends, national context and highlighting any problem areas in relation to particular special needs or areas.

Attending the meeting:

Cllr Paul Holmes	Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Safeguarding
Lesley Hobbs	Principal officer, Prevention and Inclusion
Julie Wharton	SEN Inspector
Julia Katherine	Principal Educational Psychologist
Jamie Schofield	Service Manager - Children's Disabilities
Paul Nugent	Head of Standards

Meeting 2: 4th November 2010

- School's perspective - to identify examples of best practice and barriers to supporting children with special needs in primary schools;
- Child's perspective - case study example/s of secondary school children who have been through the SCC primary school system;
- Parent's perspective – positives / difficulties experienced and perceived gaps in support;
- Community perspective – how does the current perspective/process support the needs of the community as a whole including critical links to services such as Housing and Transport?

Attending the meeting:

Lesley Hobbs	Principal Officer, Prevention and Inclusion
Parent representation	Through Parent Partnership (Mencap)
Donna Chapman	NHS Commissioner for Children's Healthcare
Aileen McNaughton	Associate Director for Children and Families in Solent Healthcare
Lisa Osborn	Chair, Southampton ADHD awareness/support
Paul Nugent	Head of Standards
Julie Wharton	SEN Inspector
Jackie Partridge	Springwell School, Head teacher
Liz Filer	Bassett Green Primary School, Head teacher

Meeting 3: 19th January 2011

- Direction and future priorities of the city council;
- Potential impact of changes in Government policy and funding;
- The future of SEN and other special needs such as ADHD; and
- Consider any outstanding issues from previous meetings

Attending the meeting:

Lesley Hobbs	Principal officer, Prevention and Inclusion
Paul Nugent	Head of Standards
Julie Wharton	SEN Inspector

Meeting 4: 3rd March 2011

- To agree recommendations and draft final report
- To cover any outstanding issues from previous meetings if appropriate

APPENDIX 5

Summary of Evidence

Background documents:

1. Southampton Children and Young People's Plan 2009-2012
2. Southampton Strategy for Special Educational Needs
3. Ofsted Special Educational Needs and Disability Review
4. NI104 SEN Attainment gap performance to 2009
5. Southampton descriptors for School Action
6. Southampton descriptors for School Action Plus
7. Outcomes from the National Strategies visit to Southampton Autumn 2010
8. Ofsted Inspection judgements for primary schools 2009-10
9. Ofsted Inspection judgements for primary schools 2009-10
10. Key Stage 2 Provisional Data 2010
11. Key Stage 1 Achievements in maths, reading and writing
12. Southampton ADHD Awareness Group – outcomes for children diagnosed with ADHD
13. The consultation document from the Green Paper: Children And Young People With Special Educational Needs And Disabilities - Call For Views
14. Breakdown of Southampton City School pupils with and without special needs against children receiving free school meals.
15. Engagement paper for children and young people: Achieving Equity and Excellence for Children.
16. SEN Green Paper and briefing notes

Presentations

Meeting date	Presentation title	Presenters
7 October 2010	Introduction to the primary school educational attainment for children with special education needs	Lesley Hobbs, Principal Officer, Commissioning Julie Wharton, Lead Adviser Vulnerable Pupils Julia Katherine, Principal Educational Psychologist Jamie Schofield, Service Manager, Solent Healthcare
4 November 2010	Outline of SEN at Bassett Green Primary School Outline of SEN at Springwell School Role and desired outcomes for the Southampton ADHD Awareness Group Feedback from parents through Southampton Parent Partnership 2 short videos of children with SEN talking about their experiences	Liz Filer, Head teacher Jackie Partridge, Head teacher Lisa Osborn, Chair, Southampton ADHD Awareness and Support Group Alex Isles – Parent Partnership (Mencap) Gwen Harrison – Parent Partnership (Mencap)
19 January 2011	NHS Southampton support for children with SEN and future changes Potential changes in the future provision for children with SEN	Donna Chapman, NHS Commissioner for Children's Healthcare Julie Wharton, Lead Adviser Vulnerable Pupils Julia Katherine, Principal Educational Psychologist

APPENDIX 6

Breakdown of Children's Services and Learning SEN Budget

	2006-07	2011-12
	£000s	£000s
Additional funding for statements in mainstream schools	743	1,292
Early Years SEN	263	226
Payments to independent schools	1,502	1,775
SEN home to school transport	1,636	1,677
Psychology service (Now working within locality teams)	902	779
Delegated SEN funding – primary	3,616	4,073
Delegated SEN funding – secondary	2,464	2,869
Special Schools	5,439	7,588
Specialist SEN provision in mainstream schools – primary	329	346
Specialist SEN provision in mainstream schools – secondary	190	115
Parent partnership service	56	60
SEN administration, assessment and coordination	969	493
	18,109	21,293

OUTLINE PROJECT PROPOSAL (OPP)

Project Title: CESP - International Way Energy Savings initiative

Release (Draft/Final)	Draft
Version Number	1
Date	14/10/2011
Author of OPP	G.Miller
Portfolio	Housing
Directorate	Environment
Division	Housing

The sections below should be completed after the appropriate Member of COMT has approved the OPP and a Project Sponsor and Project Manager has been identified. The OPP and Project Categorisation Tool should then be sent to the Council's Project Management Office (PMO) for registration on SharePoint.

Project Manager	TBC
Project Sponsor	G.Miller
Project Type	Gold
Approved by	

1. PROJECT OUTLINE

The proposal being submitted would see the 4 blocks at International Way (Oslo, Havre, Copenhagen and Hampton) all benefitting from external insulation, new double glazed windows and balcony doors and new gas fired communal heating and hot water services, therefore reducing energy costs to all tenants and leaseholders; significantly improving the appearance of the buildings and extending the structural life of the buildings.

As part of these works the existing external "eternet" asbestos panels will be removed and disposed of in accordance with HSE guidelines, therefore removing the risk of any future Health & Safety issues.

2. STRATEGIC FIT/CHANGE IMPERATIVES

Principal Aims

Tick one or more of the following:

X	To improve efficiency <i>ie: can demonstrate cashable savings for a minimum period of 3 years</i>
X	To support a Member led initiative <i>ie: intended to satisfy a Portfolio requirement</i>
X	To meet legal, statutory or policy requirements <i>ie: reasons unconnected with business performance</i>
	Included in the Corporate Improvement Plan
X	Included in a Business Plan
X	To be delivered with council partners
<i>Insert Programme name and any sub-programmes</i>	Part of a Programme

3. STAKEHOLDERS

3.1. Key Stakeholders

Describe who will benefit from the project and how.

Stakeholder: Tenants and visitors within the Weston area

Impact: Homes will be modernised, energy efficient and safe for occupation

3.2. Council Wards

Will the project significantly impact upon a particular Ward?

Tenants and visitors within the Weston area

Ward affected: Impact:

Homes will be modernised, energy efficient and safe for occupation

3.3. Project Dependencies

Will the project be significantly impacted by, or will it significantly impact upon, other programmes or projects? Please identify the programme/s/project/s.

Programme/Project: N/A

Impact:

4. ESTIMATED TIMESCALES

Project Start Date: 07/11/2011

Project End Date: 28/12/2012

5. ESTIMATED TOTAL COST

£9M BUT SCC contribution = £3M including Fees

6. FUNDING

Explain proposals to fund the project. This may be for example, through allocated Capita days / external grant / Portfolio capital / Divisional or Directorate revenue.

6.1. Funding source

*£6M+ is being funded by the CESP grant initiative
£3M from SCC is Funding within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA)*

6.2. Internal resource requirements

Property and Procurement. Legal, & Finance

6.3. Feasibility funding request

Amount required: £ N/A

7. KEY ACTIONS

What key actions need to occur to implement the project?

- Obtain Scheme approval
- Consult with Tenants/Leaseholders
- Formulate and sign legal contract
- Approve Designs
- Obtain planning permission
- Agree programme of works
- Continue consultation
- Monitor and report monthly to Capital Board via Sharepoint
- Completion of works
- Celebrate/promote completion
- Contract review

8. KEY RISKS

Are there any key risks (in terms of impact and/or likelihood) that could have a significant impact on the successful delivery of the project?

- Scheme approval not obtained
- Refusal by tenant/leaseholder
- Contract negotiation issues

- Timescales slipping
- Over-run of programme
- Continued spell of bad weather

9. ATTACHMENTS


*Please attach completed Project Categorisation Tool – **Gold***

Project Category Evaluation

Project Title: CESP - International Way Energy Savings Initiative

Instructions

1. Click on each of the blue boxes and choose one of the 4 options from the drop down menu.
2. Note total score and category of project.
3. Print off copy for project file.



**SOUTHAMPTON
CITY COUNCIL®**

Selection	^%	Score
d. Over £2M	30%	30
d. Above £139,892 / £3,497,312 (note 1)	10%	10
d. Very High	20%	20
c. High	20%	15
c. High	20%	15
<Comment>		
	100%	90

70 or above	Gold
50 to 69	Silver
Below 50	Bronze

Project Number

Notes

1. The lower limit of £139,892 refers to supplies and services and the higher limit of £3,497,312 to works. The amounts relate to 200,000 and 5,000,000 Euros respectively

Other Important Impact Assessments:
Where required and necessary, please complete the following impact assessments for the proposed project work:

- 1: Equality Impact Assessment
- 2: Sustainability Impact Assessment
- 3: Crime and Order Impact Assessment

Senior Executive's Discretion (Member of COMIT)

Project Value

Procurement Profile - External Spend

Project Profile (political priority / public / reputational/ stakeholder buy-in)

Risk to Achievability (time / cost / resources / opposition/ immovable deadlines)

Complexity (Joint arrangements etc)

This page is intentionally left blank