

# Milton Keynes Inclusion Strategy 2009 - 2011

	Page
Introduction	3
Definitions	3
National and Local Context	4
Vision	5
What is the challenge facing the Children's Trust?	7
What do we hope to achieve?	7
Principles into Practice	8
Themes	11
Monitoring and Evaluation	15

## **Aiming to be outstanding for all**

### **Introduction**

With the new Children and Young People's Plan and the current focus on performance across agencies, and particularly in schools in Milton Keynes, it is appropriate and relevant for the Children's Trust to have a revised Inclusion Strategy that supports the Children and Young People's Plan. This will allow progress to be made in a meaningful and purposeful way for all young people.

The strategy concerns all vulnerable children and all services across all partners who are involved with children and young people. However, it has a particular focus on children with learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD) and the educational outcomes for these children as that is a priority for the Children's Trust. It is important that partners seek to ensure that their own plans and strategies complement this document in order to create greater cohesion and common ways of working.

This strategy builds on the recently concluded Special Educational Needs (SEN) Review (May 2009) to provide a clear direction and identifies the framework within which the inclusion of children with learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD) can be planned and developed alongside all other learners. It is underpinned by a vision that will unite all partners within the Children's Trust in a shared enterprise for vulnerable children, young people and their families. It links to the Local Strategic Partnership priority of addressing the driving factors of social exclusion and developing inclusion opportunities for all residents, including children and young people. This strategy fulfils the local authority's duty to publish its policies on SEN and related information.

There is a detailed action plan that lays out precisely how the plan is to move forward and has specified the precise outcomes that should be observed when the inclusion strategy is effectively embedded.

### **Definitions**

Milton Keynes has adopted the Ofsted definition of vulnerable children. The two most vulnerable groups are looked after children (children in care) and children with learning difficulties and disabilities (LDD). Other priority groups of vulnerable children for Milton Keynes include young offenders, children in need (including Young Carers) and children with high mobility including Travellers. Underperforming groups can be categorised by a range of characteristics or risk factors which include gender, key stage, entitlement to free school meals, language acquisition and ethnicity. Of course, vulnerable groups can underperform when compared to their peers nationally or those in like Authorities (statistical neighbours).

Milton Keynes Children's Trust strategy on inclusion is based on the principles of presence, participation and achievement in all learning.

**Presence:** this is concerned with where children and young people are supported, and whether they are fully engaged. We believe that, wherever possible, children and young people should have their needs met locally and in an inclusive environment.

**Participation:** this concerns the quality of children and young people's experiences, whether they feel involved and valued, and the quality of services received by parents/carers. We will build on positive cultures, policies and practices which reflect and value the diverse needs of children and young people. Some groups and communities may feel alienated from the mainstream. We will seek flexible strategies to meet specific needs, for example, by providing on-site support to Gypsy, Roma and Traveller families who are unable to access permanent school places due to travelling.

**Achievement:** this concerns the achievement of improved outcomes within all settings. For example:

In school, we look across the whole curriculum, both inside and outside the school, setting or service. We do not measure this solely on test or exam results. We wish all children and young people to reach their highest personal and academic achievement, enabling them to contribute to the well-being of themselves, their communities and the wider world.

In youth organisations, we look at increased participation in positive activities, reductions in those not in employment, education or training (NEET), reductions in the numbers of young people offending, and greater involvement of young people in decision making about their own circumstances and in planning of services.

In health, we look at the range of personal health outcomes that will lead to a healthy and well developed adult life. We would want high levels of engagement of children and families in vaccination programmes, reduced levels of childhood obesity, improved outcomes for teenage pregnancy, and reduced numbers of young people involved with substance abuse.

In social care, we look at reductions in the number of vulnerable children involved in safeguarding procedures. We want to see children in care achieve their potential, becoming successful adults.

## **National and Local Context**

The national context for developing service support for children and young people is set out by the various government departments who regulate and guide the various agencies working with children and young people. These include:

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Race Relations Amendment Act (RRAA) 2000
- Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001
- Special Educational Needs Code of Practice 2001

- Every Child Matters 2003
- Removing barriers to achievement: the government's strategy for special educational needs 2004
- Every Disabled Child Matters (DOH/DfES) 2006
- Children's Act 2004
- National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services 2004
- Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2005
- Education and Inspection Act 2006
- Childcare Act 2006
- Aiming High for Disabled Children: better support for families 2007
- The Children's Plan: Building Brighter Futures 2007
- Early Identification, Assessment of Needs and Intervention – The Common Assessment Framework for children and young people. A guide for practitioners 2009
- Think Family Toolkit – Improving Support for Families at Risk 2009
- Your child, your schools, our future: building a 21<sup>st</sup> century school system 2009

The context for shaping services at a local level is drawn from active consultation with local families, and from the following documents:

- Milton Keynes Sustainable Community Strategy
- Milton Keynes Local Area Agreement (LAA)
- Milton Keynes Children and Young Peoples Plan 2009 -11
- NHS Milton Keynes Strategic Plan 2008 – 2013
- Milton Keynes PCT Operating Plan 2009 – 2010
- Aiming High Local Delivery Plan 2009
- CYPS Performance Improvement Plan (DCSF) 2009 – 2010

## **Vision**

The vision for all children and young people from the Children and Young People's Plan states:

**'All our children and young people are happy, safe, healthy and successful and achieve their full potential in the aspirational community of Milton Keynes.'**

The Children's Trust recognises that children are our future and are the next generation who will help ensure the success and prosperity of Milton Keynes. It is therefore important that we invest in their development and create an inclusive environment in which they can grow and prosper growing up healthy, safe from harm, free from poverty and supported to achieve their full potential enabling them to become active citizens of Milton Keynes.

In Milton Keynes, by inclusion we mean that all children, young people and staff are equally valued; that services are personalised so that each child or young person is able to achieve their best; and that the principles of presence, participation and achievement are followed. We will seek to promote inclusion at an early age whenever possible and in a location and service which has a positive impact on the child's life chances.

We will ensure that:

- All children are given the best possible start in life.
- Parents and carers are supported to nurture and develop their children within safe and secure families.
- High quality schools and services enable children and young people to learn well and to gain knowledge and skills to fulfil their ambitions.
- Children and young people play an active part in their community and feel safe and valued, living in stable homes, neighbourhoods and communities.

**Underpinning our vision is a set of standards that we will uphold when developing and delivering services for children and young people, which are:**

1. Comprehensive consultation and involvement in decision making which is flexible, honest and inclusive.
2. Being accessible and actively promoting equality, mutual respect and community cohesion.
3. Putting the needs of all children and young people and their families, particularly the disadvantaged and vulnerable, at the centre of all that we do.
4. Promoting personalised approaches to learning which inspire all children and young people to aim high and equip them with the knowledge and skills for life.
5. Preventing issues from arising and intervening at the earliest appropriate moment.
6. Planning activities in response to local need and keeping them under regular review.
7. Providing high quality information, advice and guidance to children, young people and families that helps them to make informed choices

8. Making every penny count to improve outcomes for children and young people.
9. Using open and transparent processes that build confident partnership.
10. Developing a confident, well-motivated and effective workforce who work together, determined to improve the life chances and opportunities of all children and young people.

### **What is the challenge facing the Children's Trust in achieving this vision?**

- Too often, there are fragmented connections between services charged with meeting the needs of the most vulnerable children and young people. Parents have said that they find this an added burden at a time which is often already difficult.
- Services have been reactive to the challenges of meeting these needs, particularly in schools and other educational settings. Feedback from young people and parents indicated significant differences between different settings.
- Our financial strategy is under-developed creating perverse incentives when trying to develop more inclusive settings. For example, this is indicated in educational settings by the number of statements that we hold.
- We are over-reliant on intervention through specialist support when trying to meet the diverse range of needs. For example, the pressure on specialist social care services is placing the budget under severe strain; there is a reliance on special schools and enhanced resourced provision (ERP), currently called departments, attached to mainstream schools.
- Some trends indicate that the current range of provision will be unsustainable; for example, reliance on non-maintained and independent schools.
- We have limited and, sometimes inaccurate, evidence on the impact of the provision that is funded
- The evidence that is more reliable indicates that higher levels of funding do not lead to improved outcomes. For example, we have high levels of residential provision in social care and education but are uncertain that this leads to more positive outcomes.

However, there is a high degree of commitment from all partners to work together to find sustainable solutions that will have the most positive outcomes in enhancing the life chances of all children and young people.

### **What do we hope to achieve as a result of this strategy?**

#### **For Children and Young People with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LDD)**

- Narrower gaps in attainment and progress between those learners identified as vulnerable and those who are not

- Funding that enables schools and settings to take more responsibility for their local community of learners without reliance on specialist intervention
- Increased skills and confidence in mainstream schools and settings to increase their capacity to support vulnerable learners
- A seamless continuum of provision to enable vulnerable children and young people to get the support they need when they need it
- Robust monitoring and evaluation to know the impact of any intervention and to achieve value for monitoring

### **For All Children and Young People**

- Improved outcomes for vulnerable and under-performing children and young people. This will include outcomes across the ECM agenda from reduced obesity levels, improved rates of re-offending, greater engagement in family support and play, to improved community cohesion.
- Improved leadership and strategic management to manage a cultural change towards more inclusive settings. This will include a full understanding of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and the implications of the Lamb Inquiry.
- Robust and developed partnership working between agencies, particularly between the local authority and the primary care trust as two key partners. For example, this will build on work in Early Years and work in response to Bercow (speech and language).
- Narrower gaps in outcomes and progress between those children identified as vulnerable and those who are not. This will build on work across agencies including health and social care, and will use 'Think Family' principles.
- Increased skills and confidence in local services and settings to increase their capacity to support vulnerable children and young people.
- Robust monitoring and evaluation to know the impact of any intervention and to achieve value for money. This includes the role of the Children's Trust and its sub-groups in addition to single agency monitoring that will also be happening.

### **Principles into Practice**

**Standards** - Milton Keynes Children's Trust expects all agencies and services to pursue excellence in the provision for all children and young people in order to ensure the highest possible standards. For example, in learning, the aspiration with regard to the most vulnerable or underperforming learners is to fully include the child or young person in that school or setting which has the greatest possible impact on their attainment and progress towards independence in life beyond school. The Children's Trust Partners will endeavour to identify and remove barriers to the presence, participation and achievement of vulnerable learners in these settings. Evidence shows that inclusive learning has the potential to improve learning for everyone, not just those who are vulnerable or at risk of marginalisation.

**Expectations** – We believe that outcomes will be improved where partners share realistically high expectations of all children and young people. All opportunities should be linked to challenge and aspiration.

**Location** – Wherever possible, children and young people should have their needs met in local universal provision. For example, in education, we think that there is much to be gained from staff in a range of schools, settings and services, together with children and their families, working in partnership to meet needs locally and share expertise and resources. To make the best use of resources, wherever possible, this should be on a multi-agency basis. This needs to include the use of children’s centres, health centres and other community buildings.

**Diversity** – All partners recognise the benefits of having a diverse community of children and young people within each setting or service who value one another and the different contributions they can make.

**Equality** - The inclusion of children and young people with any additional need should not be considered in isolation. We share Ofsted’s view that ‘inclusion is more than a concern about any one group. It is about equal opportunities for all, whatever their age, gender, ethnicity, attainment and background. Inclusion could refer to any one or more groups.’

**Collaboration within a continuum of provision** – A broad range of universal, enhanced and specialist provision is vital to meeting the diverse needs of children and young people. Within this, specialist services and provision are key to meeting the needs of children with the most complex needs. They will enhance the Trust’s capacity to meet the needs of these children locally. All services should work more closely together across this continuum and within local clusters to maximise the effective use of resources and share best practice. These links should be formalised where specific services are offered to each other.

**Confidence** – Children’s Trust services should be responsive to the preferences of parents and children. Systems will be established to take these views into account. This will engender greater confidence in the ability of MK to meet the diverse range of needs of CYP in local settings. Another key component is to increase the confidence, skills and expertise of all staff to meet the more diverse needs of CYP and recognise the value of doing this.

**Engagement** – Children’s Trust services will need to engage with children and young people so that the ‘voice of the child’ is both heard and taken seriously. This will mean both engaging with hard to reach young people and using a variety of methods to gain their views and opinions. It is also recognised that effective engagement with parents and communities is essential in order to best support our children and young people. This includes an appreciation of their diverse backgrounds and experiences.

**Resource implications** – Revised funding arrangements will promote early identification and intervention, enabling more scope to be pro-active and

creative. In education, this means a revision of the existing formula away from the statutory assessment process and towards greater delegation to schools' budget. This redistribution of resources is anticipated to be from within existing budgets. In social care, the requirement to respond to individual situations with high levels of need places budgets under stress and affects the ability to move towards more preventative practice.

**The staged response** - The personal development of the whole child and young person is important.

To ensure that the needs of the whole child are appropriately addressed, we have adopted a shared framework and conceptual model for all work with children and young people. The conceptual model is a way of developing a shared understanding and explaining the Milton Keynes approach across all our services, to all practitioners and managers working with children and to children and families themselves. The model illustrates how we will respond to children and young people across four levels of need – Universal; Additional; Considerable; and Intensive. The indicators of possible need that follow, are intended to help practitioners to identify the level of need that a child or young person may have and to help the family get the right support:

At **Level One - Universal**, the child and their family have core needs that are best met through the provision of universal services - primarily health, school and community/ leisure services.

At **Level Two – Additional**, the child and family's needs can usually be met by the provision of extra help from one or two universal or targeted services. Children may be at School/Early Years Action or Action+. Discussion of the issues in an age appropriate way with the child and their family should take place and then a plan agreed. Where this involves two services, the discussion and the plan agreed are best recorded through the completion of a Common Assessment (CAF). The plan will identify the extra support to meet the additional needs. In the Early Years families and children will be best supported by the Early Support Programme. A Lead Professional (LP) or Team around the Child (TAC) meeting is not usually needed. The plan can be reviewed by the workers, child and family. Opportunities for disabled children; housing issues; behaviour problems at school; these are all indicators of where the CAF might be beneficially used at Level 2.

At **Level Three – Considerable**, the child and family's needs are more complex and a multi-agency/disciplinary approach will meet them best. Children are likely to be at School/Early Years Action+. Again, discussion with the child and family is the first step, followed by completion of a CAF. A Team around the Child (TAC) meeting may well be the best way to organise support and services and a Lead Professional may be needed to co-ordinate services. Risk of exclusion; concerns about child development; persistent non-school attendance; danger of offending; these may all be indicators of where the targeted approach using TAC and LP is best used.

At **Level Four – Intensive**, the child is likely to be at risk of significant harm or their development will be seriously impaired if services are not provided. Referral should be made to services with the power to undertake statutory non-voluntary intervention and services with specialist skills, such as Children’s Social Care, Specialist Child & Adolescent Mental Health Service (Sp CAMHS), and Youth Offending.

Everyone involved in Children’s Services will promote inclusion, avoiding disadvantage or discrimination, particularly for vulnerable groups at risk of underperforming. Being a member of one of these groups does not automatically mean that an individual is vulnerable or underperforms. Nevertheless, the risk factors are increased. It should be noted that some children may belong to several of these groups. Vulnerable groups can include young offenders, children with poor school attendance or excluded from school, refugees and asylum seekers, as well as children with learning difficulties and disabilities.

## **Themes**

The following themes will form the foundations for this inclusion strategy. They will form the basis of the high level action plans as an annex to this strategy.

### **Theme 1 Improving outcomes related to inclusion across all the ECM agenda**

It is essential that all parents, schools, settings and services know the outcomes for vulnerable and underperforming groups of children and young people (including children and young people with LDD and CiC). Everyone must ensure that policy and practice contributes to ‘narrowing the gap’ between the outcomes for these children and young people and all others.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 1.1 Improved attainment for children from vulnerable or underperforming groups at all key stages, and particularly at Key Stage 4 (SEN Review, CYPP, DCSF Imp Plan);
- 1.2 Accelerated progress for vulnerable and underperforming groups so that gaps in attainment between them and all other learners are narrowed and achievement is in line with national expectations (SEN Review, CYPP);
- 1.3 Improved attendance for children from vulnerable or underperforming groups at all key stages in all settings (SEN Review);
- 1.4 Reduction in the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) who come from vulnerable groups (CYPP);
- 1.5 Reduced offending and re-offending by ensuring that young offenders access appropriate mainstream services consistent with their needs and levels of risk. (CYPP, Youth Justice Plan YJP);
- 1.6 Improved outcomes across the ECM agenda by services considering how inclusive they are and building necessary developments into

- service plans e.g. youth services, play services, therapy services, etc (CYPP);
- 1.7 Improved joint working between Children and Young People's Services and the Primary Care Trust (CYPP).

## **Theme 2 Promoting effective earlier interventions**

All evidence shows that an effective early intervention should be helpful in preventing a more serious, higher tier intervention at a later date. Any intervention should support the child and the family, should be multi-agency, and wherever possible should be through mainstream settings.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 2.1 Greater numbers of children and young people will be supported more effectively through the use of CAF, lead professionals, key workers, Early Support Programme, team around the child and so on (CYPP);
- 2.2 Revised funding and accountability approach for schools and settings for children with special or additional needs, including English as an additional language (EAL) (SEN Review);
- 2.3 Reduced proportion of children and young people with statements of SEN (SEN Review);
- 2.4 Increased levels of delegation to schools to free them to act as soon as additional needs are identified (SEN Review);
- 2.5 A reorganisation of central targeted teams towards early intervention and away from statutory processes (SEN Review);
- 2.6 Improved outcomes for young children by partners with services for young children and their families looking to ensure they are as effective as possible.
- 2.7 The further development of the Family Nurse Programme supporting young, first-time parents and their children (PCT Op Plan, CYPP).

## **Theme 3 Increasing staff capacity to meet the needs of vulnerable children and young people in inclusive settings**

All schools, settings and services should be inclusive for children and young people from vulnerable and underperforming groups. To achieve this staff will want to have the confidence and competence to meet all those needs, including the most complex ones.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 3.1 More children with complex needs attend schools in Milton Keynes, with an increased proportion educated in mainstream schools (SEN Review);
- 3.2 A greater proportion of children with special or additional needs attend mainstream schools (SEN Review);

- 3.3 Multi-agency training will focus on issues where there is commonality across professional boundaries in relation to vulnerable children, such as safeguarding, H&S, equalities, DDA etc (CYPP);
- 3.4 All services across the ECM agenda will promote inclusive practice and will ensure that staff are supported in this (CYPP);
- 3.5 The promotion of leading teachers to model best practice and coach others in quality first teaching for a range of additional needs (SEN Review);
- 3.6 The establishment of leading schools to research and promote best practice to support a range of additional needs (SEN Review);
- 3.7 Established and fully accredited SENCO workforce (SEN Review);
- 3.8 Introduction of a quality mark to celebrate the establishment of inclusive settings (SEN Review).

#### **Theme 4 Develop a continuum of provision based on areas within Milton Keynes**

Inclusive services for children and their families, across all partners will be based as locally as possible. Universal services and, wherever possible, targeted services (Tier 1 and Tier 2 services) will operate in areas. Some targeted services and specialist services (Tier 3 and Tier 4 services) may have to operate on a Milton Keynes wide basis. Only in exceptional circumstances will services for vulnerable children and young people be provided outside Milton Keynes.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 4.1 The right balance of specialist, targeted and mainstream education provision to meet current and projected need for children with special or additional needs (SEN Review);
- 4.2 Effective use of residential provision across all children's services including schools, children's homes, short breaks, and other (CYPP, SEN Review);
- 4.3 An appropriate range of provision is available to meet the needs of children who present challenges through behaviour or attendance (CYPP, SEN Review);
- 4.4 An appropriate range of support is available to meet the needs of children and their families who present challenges through behaviour (CYPP)
- 4.5 A clearer rationale for the creation and development of enhanced resource provision in mainstream schools and settings (SEN Review);
- 4.6 Increased multi-agency working, not just in children's centres, but in other settings such as schools, youth centres, health centres, supplementary schools and community facilities (CYPP, DCSF Imp Plan);
- 4.7 Improved Tier 1 and Tier 4 provision for children and young people with mental health problems (PCT Op Plan);
- 4.8 More pro-active targeted services, supporting early identification and effective intervention (SEN Review).

## **Theme 5 Improve the continuity in pathways particularly through transitions**

It is important for children and their families to have clear signposts to support them. It is also important for staff to try and minimise changes that will cause additional pressure or add bureaucracy. This is true at all transitions and particularly so from 14 years upwards and the transition to adulthood.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 5.1 The 14-19 Entitlement is fully implemented including that for vulnerable and underperforming groups (CYPP, DCSF Imp Plan);
- 5.2 Working across partners, and with children and their families, information and guidance is clear, transparent, helpful and reflects cultural and language needs (CYPP);
- 5.3 Further developed transition processes so that children and parents are supported and agencies work together (SEN Review);
- 5.4 Further developed work of school nursing health advisers in increasing access to health advice and information (PCT Op Plan).

## **Theme 6 Building partnership support across agencies and with children and their families**

For services to be at their best there must be a culture of cooperation and partnership across agencies working with children and young people. Equally there must be open and honest partnership with children, young people and their families.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 6.1 Improved consultation and involvement of parents and carers, building on Parent Partnership, Aiming High for Disabled Children and other groups (CYPP);
- 6.2 Improved consultation and involvement of children and young people (CYPP);
- 6.3 Improved partnership working by ensuring that developments are in line with the recommendations of the Lamb Inquiry.

## **Theme 7 Ensuring the highest quality of leadership and management to support vulnerable children**

If all the above themes are to be achieved successfully, top quality leadership and management will be essential. This applies at all levels, in Children and Young People's Services, in health, in schools, in any organisation where there are young people, including vulnerable young people. This includes the delivery of statutory requirements and also the provision of quality data.

Work in this area will focus on achieving the following outcomes:

- 7.1 The Inclusion Strategy is delivered through good leadership, working together with partners, providers, parents and children (CYPP);
- 7.2 The targets for the achievement of the statutory SEN assessment process are delivered (SEN Review, CYPP);
- 7.3 Improved quality data will support planning at authority, locality and service levels, and will enable better individual support programmes leading to better outcomes (SEN Review, CYPP);
- 7.4 Service plans are effective in directing future developments in provision (CYPP);
- 7.5 Partners committed to the strategy because of the credibility of the leadership (CYPP);
- 7.6 This strategy reviewed and planning for the next strategy undertaken in a timely and inclusive manner.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

All engaged in services for children and young people, including schools, settings and services, will need to monitor the impact of their inclusion policies. There should be a positive improvement in outcomes as a result of this work although a direct correlation can be difficult. Any self evaluation completed by a school, setting or service should make reference to the work on inclusive practices including evidence and data to support this.

Success is likely to be indicated by outcomes including the following:

- Greater levels of inclusion everywhere
- Greater levels of satisfaction from children and their families
- More involvement of children in decision making
- Improved outcomes for vulnerable children across all services
- Celebrations of personal achievements
- Celebrations of diversity
- Reduced reliance on statutory processes
- Reduced appeals and/or complaints for services for vulnerable children
- Improved confidence from children and families in meeting the needs of all vulnerable children
- External evaluations of settings and services are good for inclusion

This multi-agency inclusion strategy will be monitored against the 5 Every Child Matters outcomes through the Comprehensive Annual Assessment and the annual reviewing of the Children and Young People's Plan. The Children's Trust and the sub-boards will play a key role in monitoring this strategy and its implementation.

In addition partners will have their own monitoring arrangements. Milton Keynes Council, the PCT, the Police have their own arrangements for

performance management and the monitoring of services. In schools, School Improvement Partners (SIPs) will be required to make a judgement on the progress towards best practice in inclusion for vulnerable groups.

## **Glossary**

ASD	Autistic spectrum disorder
BFL	Behaviour for learning
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
BSF	Building Schools for the Future
CAF	Common Assessment Framework
CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service
CiC	Children in Care
CPD	Continuous professional development
CT	Children's Trust
CYP	Children and young people
CYPP	Children and Young People's Plan
CYPS	Children and Young People's Service, Milton Keynes Council
DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Family
DDA	Disability Discrimination Act
DfES	Department for Education and Schools (previous to DCSF)
DOH	Department of Health
DSG	Dedicated schools grant
EAL	English as an additional language
ECM	Every Child Matters
EET	Employment, education and training
EIP	Education improvement partnership
EMAS	Ethnic minority achievement service
EPS	Educational psychology service
ERP	Enhanced Resourced Provision
EWS	Education welfare service
EYIT	Early Years Inclusion Team
FE	Further education
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
GCSE inc E/M	General Certificate of Secondary Education including English and mathematics
H&S	Health and safety
HI	Hearing impairment
IDP	Inclusion development programme
INCO	Inclusion co-ordinator

KS1	Key Stage1, Years 1 - 2
KS2	Key Stage 2, Years 3 - 6
KS3	Key Stage 3, Years 7 - 9
KS4	Key Stage 4, Years 10 - 11
KS5	Key Stage 5, Post 16, Year 12 onwards
LAA	Local Authority Agreement
LAC	Looked After Children
LDD	Learning Difficulties and Disabilities
LLDD	Learners with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities
LP	Lead Professional
MLD	Moderate learning difficulties
NEET	Not in Employment, Education and Training
NI	National Indicator
NVQ	National vocational qualification
PBST	Primary behaviour support team
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PD	Physical disabilities
PEC	Personalised education centres
PMLD	Profound and multiple learning difficulties
PRU	Pupil referral unit
S52	Section 52, a financial statement submitted annually
SCD	Social communication disorder
SEAL	Social and Emotional Aspects of learning
SEBD	Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SENCO	Special educational needs co-ordinator
SENDIS	Special educational needs and disability inclusion service
SENDIST	Special educational needs and disability tribunal
SIP	School improvement partner
SLCN	Speech, language and communication needs
SLD	Severe learning difficulties
Sp & Lang	Speech and Language
SpLD	Specific learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia)
TA	Teaching assistant
TAC	Team around the Child
VI	Visual impairment
WBL	Work based learning
YJP	Youth Justice Plan
YOT	Youth Offending Team
YR	Reception year

**Milton Keynes Children's Trust**  
**Multi Agency Inclusion Strategy**  
**2009 – 2011**  
**Annex 1 – Data Pack**

## Introduction

The purpose of this annex of the Inclusion Strategy is to have all the relevant data in one section which can be updated as required without affecting all the rest of the documentation. It is acknowledged that this aspect of the strategy is still 'work in progress' as this contains the easily available public statistical data. For this to be a fully effective section further data from partners will need to be included and this will be done in the coming months.

Nevertheless, it will support the strategy as we move forward and see the improvement in outcomes that this strategy is intended to promote.

## Monitoring

This multi-agency inclusion strategy will be monitored against the 5 Every Child Matters outcomes through the Comprehensive Annual Assessment and the annual reviewing of the Children and Young People's Plan.

The following measures will be used to monitor the effectiveness of this inclusion strategy. They are performance indicators set by the government and it is possible to compare performance in Milton Keynes against national comparisons.

### Table of Relevant National Indicators

National Indicator	National Indicator Number	MK 2008-9	National 2008-9	MK target 2009-10	MK target 2010-11
Re-offending rate	NI 19				
Percentage of custodial sentences	NI 43				
Young offenders in EET	NI 45	66.5%	72.4%	75%	75%
Effectiveness of CAMHS (score out of 16)	NI 51	13	14	16	16

National Indicator	National Indicator Number	MK 2008-9	National 2008-9	MK target 2009-10	MK target 2010-11
Parental experience of services for disabled children	NI 54	n/a	n/a	Baseline to be set	To be agreed
Children who have experienced bullying	NI 69	47%	48%	45%	45%
19 year olds achieving Level 2+ NVQ	NI 79	67%	72.4%	72%	74.1%
19 year olds achieving Level 3+ NVQ	NI 80	40.1%	46.9%	44%	48%
Inequality gap in Level 3 qualification by age 19	NI 81	26.8%	24.7%	24.7%	24.7%
Inequality gap in Level 2 qualification by age 19	NI 82	53.4%	57.0%	54%	58%
Behaviour inc exclusions - Ofsted judgement	NI 86	83%		75%	
Secondary school persistent absence rate	NI 87	5.12%	5.6%	5.4%	5%
Percentage of extended schools	NI 88				
No. of Special Measures schools	NI 89a		--		
17 year-olds in education or training	NI 91				
Lowest 20% gap in Early Years outcomes	NI 92	32.5%	35.6%	33%	30%
KS2 Children in Care achieving L4 in English	NI 99	33.3%	46%	40%	40%
KS2 Children in Care achieving L4 in Maths	NI 100	16.7%	44%	40%	40%
KS4 Children in Care achieving 5+ GCSE A*-C inc English and Maths	NI 101	5.6%	13.9%	20%	20%
KS2 gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers	NI 102i	26.2%	22.4%	22%	20%
KS4 gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers	NI 102ii	28.2%	27.8%	24.5%	21%
Final statements of SEN within 26 weeks - excl exceptions	NI 103a	90.8%	n/a	95%	97%
Final statements of SEN within 26 weeks - incl exceptions	NI 103b	50.5%	n/a	65%	80%
KS2 SEN/non SEN gap achieving KS2 English	NI 104	52	51		

National Indicator	National Indicator Number	MK 2008-9	National 2008-9	MK target 2009-10	MK target 2010-11
and Maths threshold					
KS4 SEN/non SEN gap achieving 5+ A*-C GCSE at KS4 ( <i>including English and Maths</i> )	NI 105	46.1%	45.3%	42%	40%
Low income background young people into higher education	NI 106	21%	19%	22%	23%
KS2 attainment for all BME pupils	NI 107	66.9%	n/a	68%	70%
KS4 attainment for all BME pupils	NI 108	43%	n/a	48%	50%
BME 5+ GCSE A*-C inc E/M: Bangladeshi	NI 108a				
BME 5+ GCSE A*-C inc E/M: Black Caribbean	NI 108b				
BME 5+ GCSE A*-C inc E/M: Pakistani	NI 108c				
No. of children's centres (20 by 2009/10)	NI 109	75%	--	100%	100%
Participation in positive activities	NI 110	73.3%	69.5%	75%	77%
First time entrants to criminal justice	NI111	2008	1840	2007	2007
Under-18 conceptions: rate per 1000	NI 112	-23.6	-10.7	-32%	-41%
Permanent exclusions	NI 114	0.10%	0.11%	0.05%	0.04%
Substance misuse by young people	NI 115	11.8%	12.3%	10.1%	8.4%
Proportion of children in poverty	NI 116	15.9%	16.2%	13.3%	12%
Young people in NEET - age 16-18	NI 117	5.9%	6.7%	5.9%	5.1%
Take up of formal childcare by low-income families	NI 118	21.6%	17%	23%	24%
Care leavers aged 19 in suitable accommodation	NI 147	80%	88.4%	80%	80%
Care-leavers aged 19 in EET	NI 148	60%	64.9%	67%	70%

**Total number of children in maintained schools in Milton Keynes:**

	<b>January 2008</b>	<b>January 2009</b>
Nursery	137	103
Primary	21,084	21,511
Secondary	16,023	16,220
Special	596	618
Alternative Provision	209	189
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38,049</b>	<b>38,641</b>

**Children with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities in Milton Keynes maintained schools - January 2009**

*(Please note, these figures do not include alternative provision)*

	<b>0-5 Years (Nursery &amp; R)</b>		<b>Key Stage 1</b>		<b>Key Stage 2</b>	
	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
School/Early Years Action	95	2.2	499	8.4	1277	11.0
School/Early Years Action +	119	2.8	368	6.2	912	9.8
SEN Statements	74	1.7	119	2.0	336	3.1
Total registered LDD	288	6.8	986	16.6	2525	23.9
Other pupils	3966		4940		8875	
Total pupils	4254		5926		11554	

	Key Stage 3		Key Stage 4		16+ Years	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
School Action	1050	12.5	663	12.0	105	3.9
School Action +	711	8.4	386	7.0	38	1.4
SEN Statements	329	3.9	249	4.5	104	3.9
Total registered LDD	2090	24.8	1298	23.5	247	9.3
Other pupils	6328		4232		2419	
Total pupils	8418		5560		2666	

#### Children with (SEN) Statements – January 2009

	Mainstream	Special School	Total
0-5 Years	44	30	74
Key Stage 1	68	51	119
Key Stage 2	216	143	359
Key Stage 3	155	174	329
Key Stage 4	119	130	249
16+ Years	14	90	104
<b>Total</b>	616	618	1234

#### Capacity and Numbers on Roll at Specialist Provision January 2009

<b>Provision</b>	<b>Capacity (Residential)</b>	<b>NOR</b> <i>(data from Jan 2009 School Census unless otherwise indicated)</i>
<b>Special Schools</b>		
Gatehouse School – SEBD, 11-16, boys, day and residential (res)	60 (18)	51
Redway School – SLD/PMLD, 2-19, mixed, day	107	99
Romans Field School – SEBD, 5-11, mixed, day and res	50 (25)	50
Slated Row School – MLD, 3-19, mixed, day	168	167
Walnuts School – SLCN/ ASD, 3-19, mixed, day and res	120 (23)	115
White Spire School –MLD, 3-19, mixed, day and res	140 (20)	136
<b>Schools with Enhanced resourced provision (Departments)</b>		
New Bradwell School – SCD/ASD, 4-11	15	8
Shepherdswell School – SCD/ASD, 4-7 Orchard School – SCD/ASD, 7-11	10	10
Stantonbury Campus – SCD/ASD, 11-18	6	6 (+6)
St Paul's Catholic School – SCD/ASD, 11-18	21	21 (+3)
Chestnuts Primary School – HI, 4-11	12	9
Stantonbury Campus – HI, 11-18	8	3
Giffard Park Primary School – MLD, 4-11	15	14
Falconhurst School – MLD, 4-11	10	4
Shepherdswell School – PD, 4-7 Orchard School – PD, 7-11	10	6
MK Academy – PD, 11-18	10	1
Two Mile Ash School – SpLD, 7-11	6	2
Caroline Haslett Primary School – Sp & Lang, 4-11	10	10
Simpson School – Sp & Lang, 4-11	10	10
Stantonbury Campus – Sp & Lang, 11-18	12	12 (+6)

<b>Provision</b>	<b>Capacity (Residential)</b>	<b>NOR</b> <i>(data from Jan 2009 School Census unless otherwise indicated)</i>
St Paul's Catholic School – VI, 11-18	10	10 (+1)
Cedars – Nursery, 3-5	7	5
Rickley Park – Nursery, 3-5	7	4
<b>Other Provision</b>		
South Personalised Education Centre (PEC) – PRU, 11-16 ( <i>sole registration only</i> )	70	47 (Nov 2009)
Central PEC – PRU, 11-16		82 (Nov 2009)
North Independent PEC – PRU, 11-16	60	(Nov 2009)
Primary PRU – 4-11	12	15 (Nov 2009)
Alternative Provision (SEN)	--	20

### Relevant Indicators from Local Plans

	2007/8		2008/9	
	MK	National	MK	National
<b>Educational Achievement</b>				
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving L4+ in English & Maths at the end of KS2	17%		30%	
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving 5+ A*-C GCSE at KS4 ( <i>including English and Maths</i> )	3.5%	9.4%	3.7%	11.7%
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving 2 levels of	71.4%	76.2%	71.8%	76.4%

	2007/8		2008/9	
	MK	National	MK	National
progress from KS1 to 2 in English				
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving 2 levels of progress from KS1 to 2 in Maths	59.0%	60.0%	61.1%	62.9%
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving 3 levels of progress from KS2 to 4 in English	39.4%	38.2%	34.9%	39.0%
Percentage of pupils with LDD achieving 3 levels of progress from KS2 to 4 in Maths	22.3%	26.8%	16.5%	28.1%
<b>Common Assessment Framework</b>				
Number of children for whom a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) has been undertaken	n/a	n/a	107	n/a
Number of staff trained in the use of CAF	n/a	n/a	543 between 1 <sup>st</sup> Sept 2008 and 31 August 2009	
Numbers of staff trained as lead professionals	n/a	n/a	543 between 1 <sup>st</sup> Sept 2008 and 31 August 2009	
<b>Resources – from 2009/2010 S52 Statement – costs are per pupil to allow comparisons</b>				
Notional SEN delegated to mainstream schools (amount per pupil 3-19)	£335	£276	£387	£270
Notional SEN budget as % of the individual school budget	9.0%	7.7%	10.2%	7.5%
LA retained specialist advisory & support services (amount per pupil 3-19)	£41	£29	£27	£28
Maintained Special Schools (Amount per pupil 3-19)	£257	£193	£283	£199

	2007/8		2008/9	
	MK	National	MK	National
Independent and Non Maintained Special Schools – planned expenditure (amount per pupil age 3-19)	£6	£33	£6	£35
<b>Statements of SEN</b>				
Number of new statements issued	154	...	260	...
Number of new statements issued to under 5s	38 (25.3%)	5,777 (25%)	39 (26%)	6,170 (26%)
Total number of statements maintained in January (including children placed out of borough)	1,234	...	1317	...
Percentage of 0-19 population with a statement	2.05%	1.91%	2.34%	1.87%
Appeals to SENDIST (appeals per 10,000)	2.14	4.11	2.87	4.5
<b>Central Targeted Services</b>				
Number of children with an open case with the Educational Psychology Service (EPS)	--	n/a	4350	n/a
Number of children with an open case with the Special Educational Needs and Disability Inclusion Service (SENDIS)	--	n/a	1119	n/a
Number of children with an open case with the Primary Behaviour Support Service	--	n/a	556	n/a
Number of children with an open case with the Early Years Inclusion Team	--	n/a	160	n/a
Number of children with an open case with the Ethnic Minority Achievement Service	--	n/a	319	n/a
Number of children with an open case with the Children with Disability Service	--	n/a	200	n/a
<b>Attendance and Exclusions</b>				
Overall attendance at primary schools (% half days attended)	95.17%	94.82%	95.09%	94.74%
Overall attendance at secondary schools	92.82%	92.14%	93.07%	92.66%

	2007/8		2008/9	
	MK	National	MK	National
Overall attendance at special schools	88.7%	89.4%	87.4%	
Permanent exclusions from primary schools	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%
Permanent exclusions from secondary schools	0.28%	0.22%	0.20%	0.21%
Permanent exclusions from special schools	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.19%
Fixed term exclusions from primary schools	1.09%	1.11%	0.86%	1.06%
Fixed term exclusions from secondary schools	9.85%	10.83%	8.74%	9.78%
Fixed term exclusions from special schools	12.48%	18.56%	9.09%	18.31%
<b>Schools</b>				
Proportion of schools with Ofsted grade of good or better in relation to LDD of schools inspected in the academic year	74%		77%	
Proportion of schools with the Healthy Schools Award ( <i>from master dataset, for Healthy School Status</i> )	58%		74%	79.7%
<b>Parents/Carers</b>				
Parent Partnership expenditure 2009/2010 – amount per pupil	£4.06	£2.65	£3.92	£3.00
Numbers of parents with open cases with Parent Partnership	--	--	315	--
Numbers of parents engaged with Aiming High for Disabled Children				
<b>14-19</b>				
Young people aged 16-18 with LDD in Education, employment or training (EET)	83.9%	86.3%	83.3%	76.4%
Children born to mothers aged 16 or below	9 (April 2008)		14 (March 2009)	

	2007/8		2008/9	
	MK	National	MK	National
Children born to mothers aged 17 to 19	165 (April 2008)		158 (March 2009)	

## Appendix 1

### Special Schools in Milton Keynes

#### **Current Context**

There are six special schools supported by Milton Keynes Council. These cover a range of different needs. The total number of funded placements has increased by 9.5% since 2005, from 589 to 645 in 2009. This is a significant increase. Nationally 1% of pupils attend maintained special schools, in MK that is 1.4%.

The tables below give information about the special schools based on the January 2009 pupil count. The descriptors used in the tables are as follows.

SEBD	Social, emotional and behavioural difficulties
MLD	Moderate learning difficulties
SLCN/ASD	Speech, language and communication need / Autistic spectrum disorder
SLD / PMLD	Severe learning difficulties / Profound and multiple learning difficulties

**Table 1**

#### **Special Schools maintained by Milton Keynes Council**

Name of Special School	Age range	Type	Residential Provision	Number on roll Jan 2009	Capacity 2009/10	
					Res	Total Day + Res
Romans Field	5-11	SEBD	Yes	50	25	50
White Spire	3-19	MLD	Yes	136	20	140
Slated Row	3-19	MLD	No	167	0	168
Gatehouse	11-16	SEBD	Yes	51	18	60
Walnuts	3-19	SLCN / ASD	Yes	115	23	120
Redway	2-19	SLD / PMLD	No	99	0	107
Total				618	86	645

**Table 2**  
**Distribution of MK resident pupils, at MK special schools, by year group**  
**(January 2009)**

Name of Special School	Nursery	Reception	KS1	KS2	KS3	KS4	KS5
		YR	Y1-2	Y3-6	Y7-9	Y10-11	Y12-14
Romans Field	0	0	7	42	0	0	0
White Spire	0	0	2	16	52	38	24
Slated Row	0	3	11	30	46	32	36
Gatehouse	0	0	0	0	25	23	0
Walnuts	0	7	18	26	24	16	10
Redway	12	7	8	23	16	13	13

**Table 3**  
**Funding of MK maintained Special Schools (S52 statement 2009/10)**

Name of Special School	Age range	Type	Number of places in formula 2009/10	2009/2010 Funding £	Funding per pupil £
Romans Field	5-11	SEBD	49	1,134,645	23,156
White Spire	3-19	MLD	136	1,931,723	14,204
Slated Row	3-19	MLD	166	2,053,256	12,369
Gatehouse	11-16	SEBD	52	1,432,439	27,546
Walnuts	3-19	SLCN / ASD	115	3,055,544	26,570
Redway	2-19	SLD / PMLD	98	2,290,353	23,371
Total			616	11,897,960	19,314

Note: Special school funding is part of the dedicated schools grant (DSG) and any changes have to be agreed by the Schools Forum. Any savings or growth are also contained within the DSG and do not affect wider council funding.

### **Aim of Special School Provision**

To:

1. Provide a centre of excellence for children whose level of need cannot be met in mainstream school or enhanced resourced provision (ERP)
2. Raise standards of achievement for all children
3. Raise standards in all schools by providing outreach support and training
4. Enable MK to meet the widest range of needs within MK and reduce reliance on out borough placements

5. Develop a long term vision in line with Building Schools for the Future (BSF)

## **Issues for Special Schools**

### **Learning Difficulties**

Children who have SLD/PMLD attend Redway as an all age school. The intention is to promote the highest possible standards and to ensure that there are the right numbers for the future. There is no residential provision.

Children with mild or moderate learning difficulties should attend the local mainstream school with advice as necessary from relevant specialists including those in the local special school.

Children may have a complex combination of needs including moderate learning difficulties, behaviour difficulties, language, physical and/or sensory needs. These children should attend mainstream school, ERP or special school. There should be no residential provision. This could be provided in a number of ways.

- Slated Row and White Spire could be re-designated for complex needs;
- rather than being all age they could become phase schools, one primary, and one secondary;
- there could be a number of smaller all age schools serving areas of the authority.

Whichever is the preferred way forward, a closer partnership, including consideration of a federation, of Slated Row and White Spire schools would be a good way to promote best practice. It could present a range of opportunities for the future.

### **Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties**

There are a number of challenges facing support for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD). Whilst the special schools for SEBD are important to this, it does need to be addressed as a whole and this is presented in the appendix on Behaviour.

As above, whichever is the preferred way forward, a closer partnership, including consideration of a federation, of these schools would be a good way to promote best practice. It could present a range of opportunities for the future. It may also be pertinent to change the age ranges of the schools with younger children not attending a special school at all and the secondary school looking at post 16 provision expansions if the 14-19 strategy demonstrates that this is required.

Both schools currently have residential provision. In the future, it is not expected that there would be residential provision for primary aged pupils although some limited secondary provision should be retained for those few who have it as a requirement in the statement and for urgent respite. There would not be any post 16 residential provision other than a limited availability for life skills training.

It is also anticipated that there would be provision for boys and girls in both schools. Although there is SEBD provision for a large majority of boys, no secondary provision for girls is a significant gap in provision currently.

### **Social and Communication Difficulties / Autistic Spectrum Disorder**

There is pressure on numbers at the Walnuts School. If the current trends continue, it will far exceed its ideal long term capacity of 120 pupils. Proposals in the ERP appendix should help as there would be more alternatives available.

Although decisions about placement should obviously depend on the individual child, in general children within the mainstream ability range with mild/moderate SCD/ASD would normally attend mainstream school with advice or ERP; children whose ability level is within the mainstream range with moderate/severe SCD/ASD would normally attend ERP or Walnuts; children whose ability level is not in the mainstream range with mild/moderate SCD/ASD would normally attend the appropriate special school. This may be the Walnuts or it may be a school for complex needs; children whose ability level is not in the mainstream range with moderate/severe SCD/ASD would normally attend the Walnuts special school; children in the ability range for Redway would normally attend there even if additional ASD, with support from Walnuts.

The Walnuts has residential provision and there would need to be a continuation of a level of residential provision for those young people who have it written into their statement, including 52 week placements. Some other limited provision should be retained.

### **Post 16 Provision**

From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 local authorities are responsible for the commissioning and delivery of education and training for young people aged 16 – 25 where they have specified additional needs. This falls within the responsibility of the 14 – 19 Partnership.

Special Schools, except Gatehouse, go up to the age of 19 years. As stated above, this sits within the remit of the 14-19 partnership that will have to agree that they are happy with the continuum of provision.

Young people at Redway should normally stay at the school until 19 with the school providing opportunities to access wider provision as appropriate for the individual.

There will be post 16 SEN provision at other secondary special schools, secondary mainstream schools, the MK College and training providers to give a wide range of opportunities for young people with additional needs, across the entire ability band. The 14-19 partnership will need to agree the programmes and ensure that they have wide coverage and do not overlap. Students should be able to access that which is appropriate to their needs. There should not be residential provision for post 16 students other than a limited life skills training provision.

No agreements for out-borough places should normally go beyond year 11 and the expectation should be that young people would be able to find appropriate provision in MK.

### **The case for change**

The case for change is persuasive for the following reasons:

- There is insufficient evidence to indicate that outcomes for children are consistently high across all schools.
- There is underuse of some provision and pressure for places elsewhere. This leads to more requests for places outside Milton Keynes.
- There is a need for additional capacity for more complex children and for the designation to represent the type of children who should attend
- The role of special schools and their relationship with enhanced resourced provision and mainstream schools needs to be specified to ensure common practice and to ease movement of pupils where appropriate
- The role of special schools and/or support services in providing advice, guidance and training needs to be clarified
- An appropriate mix of schools needs to be in place to meet the expected needs in the future
- Each special school should be developed as a stable and effective establishment judged good or better by Ofsted through greater partnership
- The special schools need to be in a position to take advantage of Building Schools for the Future and Primary Strategy for Change in terms of co-location opportunities

### **Option 1      Modify the special school provision with no closures**

To:

- 1. Redway**
  - no change
- 2. White Spire and Slated Row**
  - Learners with mild moderate learning difficulties have their needs met in mainstream
  - A reduction in the primary phase with consideration of primary provision being retained at one school only
  - closer partnership, including consideration of federation
  - re-designation as schools for complex needs
  - either remain all age or split primary/secondary
  - outreach role to support local schools
  - no residential provision
  - extended day provision to provide extended services to 8.00pm
- 3. Gatehouse and Romans Field**
  - closer partnership, including consideration of federation
  - Romans Field becomes KS2 and KS3 but retain the same place number

- Gatehouse becomes KS4 and reduce place number to 30
- possible extension of provision to KS5. This must be considered alongside the 14-19 strategy
- Gatehouse takes boys and girls
- outreach role to support local schools
- limited secondary residential provision including urgent respite needs
- extended day provision to provide extended services to 8.00pm

#### **4. The Walnuts**

- limit growth to 120
- outreach role to support local schools
- some residential provision including 52 week
- extended day provision

#### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Does not involve any closure therefore least disruption
3. Builds on the strengths of schools
4. Achieves consistent practice across schools
5. Sustainable into the future
6. Some economies could be achievable over time
7. Could achieve some savings on out of authority placements

#### **Disadvantages**

1. Some schools may have concerns
2. Requires phase wide changes
3. It will take some time to fully achieve
4. It requires greater expertise and confidence in mainstream schools
5. Requires developments in mainstream specialist provision (ERP)

#### **Resource Implications**

As shown in table 3, the total cost of the special schools is £11.9m. The average cost of a place is nearly £20K. It is not anticipated that there will be financial implications resulting from these proposals as the schools will all still be funded through the special school formula. However, there will be challenges to individual schools as place numbers reduce with a consequent reduction in overall budgets. Any changes to the formula would need to be agreed by the Schools Forum.

#### **Option 2 Reduce the number of special schools**

To:

1. **Redway**
  - no change
2. **White Spire and Slated Row**
  - create a single school for complex needs
  - this could operate on the existing sites
  - this could have 2 all age sites, or split primary/secondary, or have 3 or more smaller facilities

- outreach role to support local schools
- no residential provision
- extended day provision

### **3. Gatehouse and Romans Field**

- create a single SEBD school
- this could operate on the existing sites and have 2 all age sites, or split with one site KS2 and KS3 and the other KS4 and possibly KS5
- limited secondary residential provision including urgent respite needs
- extended day provision

### **4. The Walnuts**

- limit growth to 120
- outreach role to support local schools
- some residential provision including 52 week
- extended day provision

#### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Sustainable long term solution
3. Could achieve savings over current costs

#### **Disadvantages**

1. School closures can cause significant disruption
2. Statutory procedures are needed allowing time for conflict
3. Greater level of staffing implications
4. Significant building implications

#### **Resource Implications**

As shown in table 3, the total cost of the special schools is £11.9m. The average cost of a place is nearly £20K.

This option would reduce the number of special schools to four, which will release £440k from fixed allocations. Additional funding would need to be provided to single schools operating off a split site, although the amount needed is likely to be less than the amount released. Any funding that remains would be recycled within the DSG.

#### **Options considered but not recommended**

- Reduce to a minimum or close all special schools and move to full inclusion
- Develop additional special schools and transfer funding from mainstream provision to fund

**Residential Provision**

**Current Context**

Milton Keynes maintains 6 special schools, 4 of which have residential provision. This is a very significant resource for any local authority and substantially greater than our regional or statistical neighbours.

There are a number of anomalies associated with this provision.

1. There is no policy for residential provision that has directed this development.
2. All pupils within the special schools are subject to a statement of SEN. Very few have the requirement for residential provision within their statements.
3. On any 1 night, there is considerable over capacity across the phase.
4. The existence of residential provision has not reduced requests for out of authority placements when comparing MK against itself over time or against its regional and statistical neighbours.
5. There is no secure evaluation framework that demonstrates the impact of residential provision on standards.

**Table 1  
Residential places and costs in MK special schools 2009/2010**

<b>Special Schools</b>	<b>No of residential places</b>	<b>Total residential budget £</b>	<b>Residential place cost £</b>
Gatehouse	18	194,368	10,798
Romans Field	25	219,301	8,772
The Walnuts	23	629,529	27,371
White Spire	20	189,226	9,461
Average residential cost MK			14,331

With under-usage the actual cost per place is considerably higher than that shown

**Table 2  
Year on year change in number and cost of residential places**

	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b>		<b>2008/09</b>		<b>2009/10</b>	
<b>Number of residential places</b>	79	0%	98	+24%	86	-12%	86	0%
<b>Value of residential place / allocation</b>	8,062	+9%	7,662	-5%	13,663	+78%	14,331	+5%

**Table 3  
Residential and Out Borough places for other South East Local  
Authorities 2008/2009**

Local Authority	Number of Funded Special School Places	Number of Funded Residential Places	% Residential Places	Out of Authority placements as % of Statemented CYP	
				Current	New
Milton Keynes	627	86	13.7%	4.6%	5.8%
Southampton	410	0	0	8.4%	n/a
Cambridgeshire	896	20	2.2%	4.1%	2.5%
Bedfordshire	966	0	0	3.7%	n/a
East Sussex	1027	65	6.4%	10%	5%
Slough	294	0	0	3.9%	0%
Medway	593	0	0	5.8%	3.7%
Hertfordshire	2131	122	5.7%	6.0%	2.2%
Surrey	1649	163	9.9%	8.7%	2.8%
Kent	2683	241	9%	4.6%	4.7%

It can be seen that MK has a high level of residential provision and yet is also high on out borough placements

### **Usage of Residential Provision**

Gatehouse, Romans Field and White Spire have provision for up to 4 nights per week, Monday night to Thursday night. This is for 38 weeks per year, term time only. If the children on the most recent returns took up their allocations of nights, the usages would be approximately 30% for Gatehouse, with the other two schools slightly lower.

Walnuts is different as it offers a number of 52 week placements at 7 nights per week, and 38 week placements at 7 nights per week. They also offer the 4 nights per week, 38 week, term time provision. Thus it is not a direct comparison with the other schools as the proportion of bed usage is much higher.

### **Purpose of Residential Provision**

Residential provision can be justified if it:

1. Provides specialist environment to meet the needs of the most vulnerable learners.
2. Has a significantly positive impact on standards.
3. Effectively prepares the most vulnerable learners to become independent adults in the world beyond education.
4. Enables MK to meet the full range of learners' needs in a local setting.

### **The case for change**

The case for change is persuasive for the following reasons:

- There is insufficient evidence that the current use of residential provision is having a positive impact on standards in a way that could not be achieved with extended day activities
- There is also insufficient evidence of a positive impact on outcomes such as the proportion of young people not in employment, education or training (NEET) who have SEN, or a reduction in children and young people in public care.
- Very few children have the need for residential provision in their statement.
- The current provision is, in too many cases, expensive and underused with unclear criteria about who should have access to the beds.
- There is no statutory requirement to maintain residential provision
- Having high levels of residential provision has not resulted in a reduction for requests for out of authority places
- Less provision with clearer criteria for use and measured for impact will serve MK needs much better.

#### **Option 1      Reduction in some residential provision in special schools**

To:

1. Retain appropriate provision at The Walnuts School but discourage further growth and focus provision on pupils from MK.
2. End residential provision at White Spire School.
3. Retain up to 5 places at The Gatehouse School for life skills/ independent living training.
4. Maintain up to 5 places at Romans Field School.
5. Use current funding for residential provision to support extended learning opportunities at the special schools to 8pm.

#### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Effective use of resources.
3. Greater opportunity to have an impact on learning and so on standards.
4. Provision is now in line with assessed needs identified within the statements.
5. Provision in line with the values of the Inclusion Strategy.

#### **Disadvantages**

1. Possible concern from schools.
2. Costs arising out of staff restructuring.
3. Limits the ability of MK to reduce out of authority budgets.

#### **Resource Implications**

Closing the residential provision at Romans Field would release £220k pa, retaining 5 places would release up to £175K. Closing the provision at White Spire would release £190k pa. Reducing the provision at Gatehouse could release up to £150k pa that could be recycled within the DSG. The funding formula for residential provision would need to be revised to take account of

the changing circumstances.

If this resulted in any increase in out of authority placement, which should be unlikely, this would need to be funded from this.

Appropriate staffing ratios would need to be devised for extended school provision and the cost met from the released resource. Nevertheless it is anticipated that the extended day provision would be able to be provided well within this resource.

## **Option 2 Minimise residential provision**

To:

1. End all residential provision other than the minimum appropriate residential provision at The Walnuts School.
2. Use current funding as an interim measure whilst special schools reorganise staffing accordingly.
3. In longer term, use residential expenditure to fund other elements of the Inclusion strategy.

### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Provision will be in line with assessed needs of learners.
3. Provision will be more closely aligned to the values of the Inclusion Strategy.
4. Better value for money.
5. A significant resource becomes available to fund other specialist provision especially in mainstream.

### **Disadvantages**

1. Reduces our residential capacity
2. Limits our potential to reduce out of authority placements.
3. Possible concern from schools.

### **Resource Implications**

If all residential provision was closed this would release £1.2M pa, although recoupment funding for other authority residential pupils in MK schools would be reduced to zero. If only residential provision at Walnuts was to remain open then this would release at least £600k pa. However, it is intended that much of this resource, at least in the first instance, would remain with the schools to develop extended services.

## **Options considered but not recommended**

- Expand residential provision to reduce out-authority placements
- End all residential provision

**Behaviour**

**Current Context**

The SEN Review and Inclusion Strategy have revealed concerns relating to behaviour as the single, most pressing issue as perceived by school leadership teams. This is particularly true for schools in the primary phase. This is consistent with the views of heads, staff and parents nationally. However, this does not match with exclusion data where MK is consistently on an improving trend.

**Table 1 Current data on fixed and permanent exclusions**

	2007/2008		2008/2009	
	MK	National	MK	National
Permanent exclusions from primary schools	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%
Permanent exclusions from secondary schools	0.28%	0.22%	0.20%	0.21%
Permanent exclusions from special schools	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.19%
Fixed term exclusions from primary schools	1.09%	1.11%	0.86%	1.06%
Fixed term exclusions from secondary schools	9.85%	10.83%	8.74%	9.78%
Fixed term exclusions from special schools	12.48%	18.56%	9.09%	18.31%

**Current provision**

1. Secondary Behaviour Partnership – this is a group involving all the secondary schools and it deals with children who need a managed move, children at risk of exclusion, alternative provision, attendance at the PECs
2. Personalised Education Centres (PECs) – these are registered as secondary PRUs and offer short term provision to permanently excluded pupils and those at risk of exclusion
3. The Gatehouse School – secondary school for boys up to the age of 16 with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD)
4. Education Improvement Partnership (EIP) – this involves a number of schools and is a residual part of the former Excellence in Cities programme
5. Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)/short stay school – this is provision for primary pupils who are permanently excluded or at risk of exclusion

6. Romans Field School – primary SEBD school, mixed but predominantly boys
7. Primary Behaviour Support Team (PBST) – a central team to give advice and guidance to primary schools who need help with particular challenging pupils

## **Issues for Behaviour Provision**

### **Early Years**

For children with behaviour difficulties, needs should normally be met in local provision with advice from the Early Years Inclusion Team. Wherever possible, the behaviour should be addressed as a family issue with a multi agency approach. Children's Centres should play a key role in this process, building on strong family links and their ability to achieve good reach into communities.

### **Primary**

At KS1 most behaviour issues should be addressed in the local school with advice from PBST. It is not expected that children would be in a special school in KS1. If a child is permanently excluded in KS1, which would be very unusual, the child would attend the Primary PRU with expectation of quick re-integration. At KS1 locally based nurture groups or similar provision could be a good and appropriate approach.

The Primary PRU is under the responsibility of the Romans Field School. Consideration should be given to combining the PBST with the primary PRU with a focus on KS1. Romans Field School thus has responsibility for all primary behaviour outreach and support.

At KS2, most issues are resolved locally with advice from the special school. Children may be admitted to the special school if appropriate. Excluded pupils are still expected to return to mainstream school following time in the PRU. The PRU should not be a holding room for the special school.

The role and function of the additionally funded provision at Southwood School needs to be clarified, and either built into the continuum as an enhanced resource provision (ERP) or school funded. Consideration can be given to whether additional KS2 ERP for behaviour would be advantageous.

### **Secondary**

At KS3 all secondary schools have their own internal systems for addressing behaviour and attendance issues so there is no need for ERP. The threshold for needing alternatives should be higher.

There does need to be some turn around provision through the PECs with a return to mainstream for those young people at risk of or excluded from school. The older a pupil is, the harder it can be to return a permanently excluded student to mainstream school. Alternative programmes with the PEC/ special school/ alternative providers should provide appropriate alternative pathways for the most disengaged young people.

Special school provision will be needed at KS3 for boys and girls with limited residential provision.

At KS4 we need special school provision for boys and girls, again with limited residential provision. We also need a wider range of options post 14 for mainstream students which rely on a partnership with the PECs and special school to enrich alternative pathways. There are training providers skilled with these young people who need to be part of the mix.

The role of the Behaviour Partnership is clarified through the Compact, with a much clearer specification and accountability with monitoring of impact and outcomes. The same needs to apply to the role of the EIP and where it fits into this framework.

### **Special schools**

The future of the SEBD special schools sits at the heart of this provision. Consideration should be given to modifying arrangements at both the primary and secondary schools so that, together, they offer stable provision of a high quality that meets the diverse and complex needs of young people.

The options for the future are also included in separate appendices (Appendix 2, 3) relating to these schools including proposals that the current primary provision would continue into KS3 with a radically different approach for KS4 and KS5, but with a close partnership, including consideration of a federated leadership arrangements.

There is currently no SEBD secondary special school provision for girls. Thus any requirement has to be sourced out of Milton Keynes. Whilst the ratio of boys to girls will always present a challenge, the proposals here and in Appendix 1 will ensure that there is appropriate provision for girls of secondary age within Milton Keynes.

There should be no primary residential and limited secondary residential provision only. There should be no post 16 residential provision with the exception of life skills training.

### **Post 16**

There are limited post 16 opportunities specifically suitable for students identified with SEBD. The emerging 14-19 strategy should provide a coherent approach that takes account of the needs and aspirations of all learners. The secondary special school can take a lead, in partnership with the college and work based learning (WBL) providers so that the students who seek further learning and training opportunities can have programmes that are appropriate and which they will want to follow. An alternative could be to create a borough wide specialist resource within the FE college for young people with SEBD.

### **The case for change**

The case for change is persuasive for the following reasons:

- Almost every school raises behaviour as a current issue and would like to see improvement in support for challenging behaviour
- Outcomes for children and young people with challenging behaviour are not at a high enough standard in some schools and settings

- By the time it becomes an issue in schools and settings, poor behaviour is often entrenched. Earlier and younger intervention is essential, with family engagement
- Parts of the current provision is not perceived to be as good as it should be by schools, by parents and by others
- The provision is not sufficiently consistent and coherent. Access to services and schools is not clear enough.
- Better alignment across the specialist provision will enable the significant needs of the most complex to be met.
- Behaviour partnership only exists at secondary level, no equivalent exists for primary schools

### **Option 1 Modified specialist provision**

To:

1. Reduce Gatehouse and Romans Field residential provision and limit population to 50 day places per school.
2. Federate Romans Field and the PRU through the leadership of the Head at Romans Field School.
3. Locate PBST at PRU to strengthen the outreach / reintegration role of the PRU.
4. Gain greater commitment to managed moves and the fair access policy within the primary phase.

#### **Advantages**

1. Builds on the strengths of a relatively effective system.
2. Creates greater coherence within the separate aspects of provision.
3. Links special schools into supporting reintegration.
4. Affordable.

#### **Disadvantages**

1. Does not bring significant change to an issue that is perceived to be problematic.
2. Does not emphasise early intervention
3. Places too much emphasis on specialist support.

#### **Resource Implications**

This will be achieved within existing budgets. The reduction in the purchased places at the secondary school would release £144K and the release of some funding from changing residential provision would release a further £300K. However, the immediate redeployment of some of this funding towards developing extended services means that this budget would not be released into the wider SEN budget for future investment for some time. Any formula changes as a result of the changes at the special schools would have to be agreed by the Schools Forum as this sits within the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSG).

## **Option 2 Early intervention and increased support to mainstream**

To:

1. Create a series of nurture groups or similar in KS1 across each cluster.
2. Refocus PBST towards early identification and intervention and relocate with the PRU.
3. Enhance intervention by the secondment of outstanding practitioners into the team or the creation of leading teachers with a remit to coach others in partner schools.
4. Consider the creation of KS2 ERP for behaviour
5. Refocus Romans Field towards KS2 and 3 but retain the number of day places at 50.
6. Create specialist KS4 provision at Gatehouse and reduce the number of day places to 30.
7. Consider creating KS5 provision at Gatehouse. This should be in line with the 14-19 strategy.
8. Develop primary clusters of schools to work alongside Targeted Support teams through an area delivery model.
9. Fund restorative practice across the primary phase.
10. Enhance training opportunities for mainstream staff through national programmes such as Inclusion Development Programme (IDP), Social and Emotional Approaches to Learning (SEAL), Family SEAL.
11. Pilot the use of Family Liaison Officers to build stronger links with hard-to-reach families.
12. Promote improved systems within primary schools such as withdrawal/exclusion areas to reduce fixed and permanent exclusions.

### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. In line with the Inclusion Strategy.
3. Focuses on prevention / intervention before problem becomes embedded.
4. Strengthens mainstream schools' ability to deal with their own problems.

### **Disadvantages**

1. Some schools won't support initiative because they want their problems removed.
2. Takes time to be effective.
3. Requires new investment.

### **Resource Implications**

Any formula changes as a result of the changes at the special schools would have to be agreed by the Schools Forum as this sits within the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB). The additional costs of this option, in the order of 500K, may, over time, be partially offset by the savings in reducing numbers at Gatehouse School. The Schools Forum would be asked to consider investment to bring about the changes in the immediate term.

**Options considered but not recommended**

- Expansion of specialist provision, including more places in special schools, PRUs and PECs

**Enhanced Resourced Provision (SEN Departments)**

**Current Context**

Milton Keynes maintains a range of primary and secondary Enhanced Resourced Provision (ERP) as part of the continuum of provision. In Milton Keynes these have been known as Departments.

This supports the principles within the Inclusion Strategy by providing additional resource integrated into or attached to mainstream settings. This contributes to a differentiated range of educational settings to meet the diverse needs of learners. ERP allows pupils to integrate with their peers when that is appropriate whilst retaining the ability to have specialist provision when that is more appropriate. It eases the pressure on separate specialist school provision that would be the only option for those struggling to be successfully included in ordinary classrooms.

However, these are some anomalies within this provision:

1. There is no current policy to direct the development of ERP.
2. The range of provision does not fully meet current needs and is unlikely to meet future needs.
3. There is significant inconsistency between schools in what they provide and how they organise themselves.
4. Some schools have been chosen to host the provision out of expediency rather than because they are the most appropriate settings.
5. Some schools have more than one ERP.
6. The primary ERP and the matching secondary ERP are not always in linked schools and the provision is not always geographically advantageous.
7. Some schools' admissions policies make it harder to fully access the provision funded.
8. The existence of ERP can have a negative effect on some schools with regard to standards achieved overall, public perception of the school and ongoing stability.
9. There is not clear data on the impact of ERP on outcomes for children and young people (CYP) in the provision and in the wider school community.

Table 1, below, gives the current provision in Milton Keynes. The descriptors of the categories of need used in the table are given here.

SCD/ASD	Social Communication Disorder/ Autistic Spectrum Disorder
PD	Physical Disability
HI	Hearing Impaired
VI	Visually Impaired
MLD	Moderate Learning Difficulties
Sp & Lang	Speech and Language Disorder
SpLD	Specific Learning Difficulties

**Table 1 Current range of provision, capacity, use and cost**

<b>Schools with Departments (Enhanced resourced provision, ERP)</b>	<b>Places Funded</b>	<b>No on Roll (Jan 09)</b>	<b>2009/10 Total Cost £</b>	<b>Cost per place £</b>
<b>Secondary</b>				
Stantonbury Campus – SCD/ASD, 11-18	6	6(+6)*	90,672	15,112
Stantonbury Campus – HI, 11-18	8	3	83,548	10,444
Stantonbury Campus – Sp & Lang, 11-18	12	12(+6)*	97,109	8,092
St Paul's Catholic School – SCD/ASD, 11-18	21	21(+3)*	335,021	15,953
St Paul's Catholic School – VI, 11-18	10	10(+1)*	187,756	18,776
MK Academy – PD, 11-18	10	1	83,883	8,388
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>53 (16)</b>	<b>877,989</b>	<b>13,104</b>
<b>Primary</b>				
Shepherdswell School – SCD/ASD, 4-7 Orchard School – SCD/ASD, 7-11	10	10	150,825	15,083
Shepherdswell School – PD, 4-7 Orchard School – PD, 7-11	10	6	190,545	19,055
New Bradwell School – SCD/ASD, 4-11	15	8	224,136	14,942
Chestnuts Primary School – HI, 4-11	12	9	195,068	16,256
Giffard Park Primary School – MLD, 4-11	15	14	138,077	9,205
Falconhurst School – MLD, 4-11	10	4	97,866	9,787
Caroline Haslett Primary School – Sp & Lang, 4-11	10	10	97,866	9,787
Simpson School – Sp & Lang, 4-11	10	10	97,866	9,787
Two Mile Ash School – SpLD, 7-11	6	2	60,114	10,019
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>1,252,363</b>	<b>12,779</b>
<b>Nursery</b>				
Cedars – Nursery, 3-5	7	5	72,469	10,353
Rickley Park – Nursery, 3-5	7	4	72,469	10,353
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>144,938</b>	<b>10,353</b>

\* The additional pupils are funded individually

## **Aims of ERP Provision**

To:

1. Meet a broader range of needs within local mainstream settings.
2. Concentrate specialist skill, knowledge and expertise in a single setting to become a centre of excellence within the local area.
3. Raise standards for those with SEN by enhancing a school's capacity to meet those needs.
4. Extend the expertise of the staff within the ERP to have positive benefit to all pupils within the school.

## **Issues for ERP Provision**

### **1. Secondary**

#### **Social Communication Disorder/ Autistic Spectrum Disorder**

There is pressure on the system at secondary age in the ASD spectrum. If pressure on Walnuts School and the pressure to go outside MK is to be reduced, then the ERP at secondary needs to be sufficient and focussed. There needs to be provision for high functioning children with ASD who need the small group work that ERP can provide with the subject specialism that a mainstream secondary school can provide.

There may also be an advantage in having different ERP for children with ASD who act out or who have a major communication difficulty. This would mean additional provision beyond that already there with current provision more tightly defined. There must be strong links with Walnuts School so that the possibility of movement along the continuum becomes more realistic and that there is consistent and common practice in all provision.

#### **Physical/Sensory**

Retain specialist VI and HI provision into the future. Projected numbers need to be checked to ensure that there is appropriate capacity. Consideration should be given to merging the ERP and the related support service in order to gain maximum economies of scale, consistency of practice and a single source of support.

For children with physical disabilities who are otherwise able to access the mainstream curriculum, consideration should be given to closing the current underused provision and supporting children in their nearest local accessible school, with the intention that all schools should become more accessible as resources allow. Building Schools for the Future should have a major impact on this.

#### **Speech and Language**

The specialist provision for children with speech and language disorder should be retained. The advantages of scale, in terms of working particularly with speech therapists, make this ERP an effective provision. The needs into the future should be examined to ensure the numbers are appropriate.

## **2. Primary**

### **Social Communication Disorder/ Autistic Spectrum Disorder**

There is a need for clarity of provision in this ERP as for secondary, 3 ERPs with defined needs could meet a wider range of needs from those who need such provision and could go some way to easing wider pressures on special schools. As with secondary, there would need to be strong links with other ASD provision.

### **Physical/ Sensory**

The HI provision in primary should be retained. There is an advantage in having this specialist provision in one place. Future numbers need to be monitored to match provision to need. Links with other HI provision and services needs to be strong.

The VI position is different. Children have attended local primary schools and it has been possible to support children in that way without dedicated ERP. There is no current pressure for provision and it is not expected to change. The situation for PD should reflect that for VI with children attending a local school and any support being focussed there. Consideration should be given to closing the existing ERP and using the resource more widely.

### **Speech and Language**

The specialist provision for children with speech and language disorder should be retained. The advantages of scale, in terms of working particularly with speech therapists, make this ERP an effective provision. The needs into the future should be examined to ensure the numbers are appropriate.

### **Learning Difficulties**

Children with MLD would normally be attending their local school and would not normally need a statement of SEN. The current MLD provision needs to be altered to cater for complex needs. This would be children with a combination of needs, possibly learning difficulties but also some language or ASD or behaviour needs. A number of ERP around the borough could ensure some specialist provision reasonably local to everyone, with some responsibility for outreach.

The current underused provision for Specific Learning Difficulties should be closed and children supported in their local schools with advice from a specialist SpLD teacher.

In the longer term, as confidence across all schools increases, there should be less reliance on provision such as this and some rationalisation may be needed. However this cannot happen until the agreed proposal in Appendix 5 on mainstream support is acted upon and fully embedded.

### **Behaviour**

If we are to achieve early intervention in this area, it would be very helpful to have a number of KS1 nurture or behaviour for learning (BFL) groups around the authority so that there is one reasonably local to all who need it. This would link with a change of age to Romans Field School and movement of the Primary Behaviour Support Team to join with the Primary PRU staff with a focus on prevention.

There is some provision for KS2 children with SEBD at Southwood School. However it is not an official ERP and is not recorded in the same way. If KS2 ERP for behaviour is considered advantageous, then the school should be invited to become an official ERP.

When all the changes in mainstream support and in behaviour support are in place and are fully built into all schools and settings, there should be a reduced need for additional provision outside the local school. When this stage is reached, some rationalisation may be needed.

### **Nursery**

The two nursery classes should be retained and used for assessment purposes.

### **The case for change**

The case for change is persuasive for the following reasons:

- The current provision is not demonstrating sufficient value for money. It is expensive, particularly when some provision is underused, and there is insufficient evidence of positive outcomes
- There needs to be a wider range of ERP in primary and secondary schools in order to respond to pressure in some areas of SEN and to fill gaps in provision.
- There is no consistency in practice between ERP in different schools, and between ERP and special schools. This does not help parents and children or aid movement between provisions.
- There is no clear specification which sets out what a school must provide and what is expected in return for having an ERP in the school. This will include:
  - a. facilities
  - b. staffing
  - c. admissions
  - d. relationship with other provision
  - e. capacity in relation to the size of the school
- There needs to be an evaluation framework should be introduced to demonstrate the impact of the ERP on standards. This should include judgements about:
  - a. The progress and attainment of pupils in the ERP compared to those in the rest of the school.
  - b. Comparison of the effectiveness of ERP in different schools catering for a similar range of needs.
- There needs to be particular consideration given to Ofsted judgements about the school, and any judgements made through the School Improvement Framework when confirming the location of ERP
- Until all schools are able to meet a greater range of additional needs, provision for high incidence SEN will continue to be needed, although it may be able to be reduced in the long term.
- ERP for low incidence and the more specialist SEN is going to be needed for the foreseeable future.

### **Option 1 Broadening the scope and location of Enhanced Resourced Provision including value for money, and support provision in the local school in the longer term**

To:

1. Increase the number of secondary schools with ERP by 2011.
2. Introduce more specialist ASD provision in secondary schools.
3. Place ERP where there is demonstrable expertise.
4. Remove ERP from schools judged a cause for concern.
5. Increase provision in early years and KS1, particularly for those with SEBD – nurture groups or similar.
6. Consider whether to create ERP for behaviour at KS2
7. Build capacity for there to be outreach to the immediate community of schools.
8. Ensure each ERP is led by a qualified specialist.
9. Ensure no mainstream school has a population with greater than 5% of statemented pupils through having ERP.
10. Review formula for ERP to ensure value for money.
11. As confidence and skill develops further in mainstream skills, increasingly support high incidence SEN in local schools.
12. In the longer term this should lead to a rationalisation of ERP provision as more children are supported locally.
13. The most specialist ERP provision would remain

#### **Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. A wider range of resource to meet the changing needs of MK.
3. Less pressure on a small number of schools.
4. More capacity to support schools to retain individual pupils with SEN.
5. A greater partnership between schools to meet needs locally.
6. Access to schools with effective learning and teaching.
7. Less likelihood that the ERP will undermine the school.
8. Steady progression in line with the principles of the Inclusion Strategy

#### **Disadvantages**

1. The challenge to schools in considering taking ERP.
2. Increase revenue costs.
3. Likely capital costs.
4. It will take time to grow the expertise both in schools with ERP and in the wider mainstream schools
5. Potentially reduces the options on the continuum of provision

#### **Resource Implications**

The current revenue costs for ERP of £2.3m is within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Creation of additional provision would have a revenue cost. At average funding a 10 place ERP would cost about £130K at 2009/10 prices. If more children do attend their local school this would affect the level of resource needed for ERP. Funding children individually is likely to cost more. This would have to be agreed by the School Forum as it would be contained within the DSG. However it may be offset by the reduction in pressure on the

out of authority special school budget.

### **Option 2 Close Enhanced Resourced Provision and support provision in the local school**

To:

1. Increase the level of funding to maintain single placements in local settings.
2. Use the current ERP funding to support this.
3. Run down ERP and don't renew.

#### **Advantages**

1. In line with the principles of the Inclusion Strategy.
2. Ensures the entire school community takes responsibility for the diverse needs of MK CYP.
3. Prevents a few schools being overwhelmed by SEN.

#### **Disadvantages**

1. Polarises provision as either a mainstream class or special school with nothing in between.
2. Dilutes expertise.
3. Likely to put greater pressure on specialist provision with an increase in out of county and special school places.

#### **Resource Implications**

The revenue costs for the support is within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The closure of all ERP would release £2.3m although maintaining the same number of children individually is likely to cost more. The number of children and young people currently catered for within ERP is shown in the table above. Consideration should be given to the likelihood of additional pressure on £2.3m to meet the needs of these pupils in standalone provision. The Schools Forum would need to agree all financial proposals as this would result in changes to the funding formula.

#### **Options considered but not recommended**

- Close or reduce SEN Departments and transfer funding to special schools
- Reduce the number of SEN Departments but increase the capacity of the remainder

**Mainstream School**

**Current Context**

Most children with special or additional needs attend their local school. A number of children with statements of SEN attend mainstream school, but DCSF data indicates that a higher proportion of MK children and young people than nationally attend maintained special schools (1.54% compared to 1.2%)

There are many children at school action and school action+ who attend mainstream school. Details are given below.

**Table 1**  
**Children with statements in mainstream school – January 2008 and 2009**

	2007/2008			2008/2009		
	Mainstream	Special School	Total	Mainstream	Special School	Total
0-5 Years	44	30	74	43	29	72
Key Stage 1	68	51	119	68	50	118
Key Stage 2	216	143	359	216	152	368
Key Stage 3	155	174	329	161	190	359
Key Stage 4	119	130	249	127	157	276
16+ Years	14	90	104	18	94	112
<b>Total</b>	616	618	1234	633	662	1305

A few children may not be included as they were not on a school roll through awaiting a place, home tuition or similar

**Table 2**  
**Percentage of children with SEN/LDD in primary and secondary schools (DCSF October 2009 SEN Data Set)**

Primary	% SEN Pupils with Statements		% SEN Pupils School Action Plus		% SEN Pupils School Action		Total % SEN Pupils	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
<b>England</b>	1.4	1.4	6.2	6.4	11.9	11.8	19.5	19.7
<b>Milton Keynes</b>	1.3	1.5	6.5	7.6	9.1	8.7	16.9	17.8

Secondary	% SEN Pupils with Statements		% SEN Pupils School Action Plus		% SEN Pupils School Action		Total % SEN Pupils	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
<b>England</b>	2.0	2.0	5.7	6.2	12.7	12.8	19.8	21.0
<b>Milton Keynes</b>	1.7	1.8	5.2	7.0	10.0	11.2	16.9	19.9

The table above demonstrates that the identification of pupils with SEN overall in both within the primary and secondary phase is below the national average.

Schools and settings are funded to provide support to children with special or additional needs. This does not just include additional staffing, resources or reasonable adjustments that need to be made. It also requires schools to ensure that all staff have an appropriate level of knowledge about inclusion, personalisation, equalities etc. School development plans should include opportunities for staff development to continually improve practice. The SENCO will be at the centre of much of this work but it impacts on all staff and all children.

The Authority also maintains a number of services for schools to help them support children with SEN.

- Education Psychology Service (EPS)
- Special Educational Needs Disability Inclusion Service (SENDIS)
- Primary Behaviour Support Team (PBST)
- Early Years Inclusion Team (EYIT)

### **Aims for Mainstream Schools**

To:

1. Meet a wider range of needs within a local mainstream school or setting
2. Develop confidence and skill across the whole workforce in meeting a wider range of needs
3. Raise standards of attainment and achievement for all children with SEN
4. Narrow the gap between children and young people (CYP) with SEN/LDD and all other learners

### **Issues for Mainstream Schools**

#### **Training for School Staff**

All the evidence shows that good inclusive practice is helpful for all pupils not just those with additional needs. Good inclusive schools ensure that there is a range of training opportunities for all staff in the area of equalities and inclusion. They monitor and evaluate the impact of interventions for pupils

with SEN/LDD just as rigorously as they would for other aspects of school improvement.

Effective teaching will help all pupils progress including those with SEN. The drive within the wider School Improvement Framework seeks to improve all teaching with greater proportions of lessons graded good or better; with the development of Quality First teaching; and with a wider all schools drive on raising standards. This will improve outcomes for children with additional needs.

All teachers, and all other staff, need an understanding of inclusion, personalisation and the expectations of the Local Authority, the Lamb Inquiry, the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), and other legislation. Given how little time is devoted to this in initial training now, it is for schools to make up the shortfall.

All staff need a reasonable level of knowledge, certain staff need a second level and SEN Co-ordinators, Inclusion Co-ordinators, and some others need a higher level of knowledge and understanding. There would also need to be some specialist teaching assistant training.

Models of training support need to be worked up and offered to schools. These models could be in house or externally brokered but must be high quality delivered by credible professionals. Training should be available in a variety of ways including the use of 'best practice' leading schools and leading teachers sharing their knowledge, as well as more traditional training.

The authority needs to act as a central source of information, enabling schools to lead their own improvement rather than delivering everything ourselves. Schools would need to build the necessary resource into their School Development Plan.

For SENCOs there is the new National Standards award which every new SENCO must get. There should be a rolling CPD programme for SENCOs building on the termly meetings. Discussion with the various co-ordinators should identify needs and enable programmes to be developed.

### **Quality Marks**

For schools that want to demonstrate their inclusivity, a quality mark would give a demonstrable indication that the features of an inclusive school are there and are evidenced. Consideration should be given to the national quality mark schemes before deciding whether to create one specifically for MK.

### **Support Services**

The future role of support services needs to be made much clearer. That includes all 4 of the services listed above. Contained within the appendices are proposals for various parts of the services which, if accepted, would change SENDIS and the PBST. PBST could merge with or strengthen its partnership with the Primary PRU. The HI and VI teams in SENDIS could formalise their partnership with their respective secondary ERP. ASD support

staff could reorganise similarly with specialist provision. The remainder of SENDIS and the EPS would need to look at their funding models. EPS already has an income target which it manages to achieve successfully.

Consideration should be given to combining EPS, EYIT, and SENDIS into a single service, providing a statutory role as required but increasingly focused on preventative work. The new service would easily fit into an area based solution if that is the preferred model for the future.

### **The case for change**

The case for change is persuasive for the following reasons:

- There is insufficient impact on 'Narrowing the Gap' in standards and progress achieved between learners with SEN/LDD and the rest of their cohort within the schools and across Milton Keynes
- The total numbers of children at the various stages of school action, school action plus and statements is increasing more than the national rate in MK with not enough positive evidence on outcomes
- Every school should have a thorough understanding of the DDA and the duties and responsibilities that places on schools, including their requirements to meet the needs of children from within their own resources.
- The support and challenge to schools needs to ensure that inclusion has a high focus in school improvement involving school improvement partners (SIPs) as necessary.
- Concerns about the skills and confidence of the wider mainstream workforce mean that there needs to be:
  - a. Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programme to support schools
  - b. experienced and well qualified leaders are appointed, including teachers, SENCOs and teaching assistants (TA)
  - c. improved pupil tracking to support teachers
  - d. Innovative ideas concerning workforce reform to support the inclusion agenda
- All guidance for schools and parents needs to be fully up to date and sufficiently explicit so that parents know what they are entitled to expect from a school, and schools know what they are entitled to expect from the authority.

<b>Option 1      Enhance inclusive practice with no change to support services</b>
--

To:

1. Actively promote the need for inclusive practices
2. Create a range of professional development opportunities, in house and external, at a variety of levels of expertise to support schools
3. Actively monitor the compliance of schools and settings in relation to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act
4. Positively promote and encourage the use of a Quality Mark for

#### Inclusion

5. Continue with the targeted support services for SEN/LDD as they are currently organised
6. Continue with the current arrangements for supporting schools in their SEN/LDD work , including support for SENCOs
7. Update guidance for schools and for parents

#### Advantages

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Increases access to mainstream settings for children with SEN/LDD
3. Improves the quality of teaching and learning
4. Strengthens the continuum of provision needed
5. Maintains stability and continuity

#### Disadvantages

1. It will not do enough to narrow the gap for learners with SEN/LDD
2. It gives insufficient support to schools for their wider responsibilities
3. It is not a sustainable way forward
4. It does not give the necessary impetus to work on inclusion

#### Resource Implications

It is not expected that this option would result in any changes, although any funding changes would be managed within the DSG.

### **Option 2 Enhance inclusive practice with reformed support services**

To:

1. Actively promote the need for inclusive practices
2. Create a range of professional development opportunities, in house and external, at a variety of levels of expertise to support schools
3. Actively monitor the compliance of schools and settings in relation to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act
4. Positively promote and encourage the use of a Quality Mark for Inclusion
5. Reform SENDIS including
  - Aligned practice with other central teams
  - Explicitly stated relationship of HI staff to HI ERP
  - Explicitly stated relationship of VI staff to VI ERP
  - Explicitly stated relationship of ASD staff ERP and special schools
6. Link PBST to the Primary PRU to create outreach
7. Consider combining SENDIS, EPS and EYIT into a single service, developing area based solutions
8. Create a local area model with multi-disciplinary teams
9. Use outstanding practitioners, through secondment or otherwise, to promote best practice across local settings
10. Revise the guidance for schools and parents

**Advantages**

1. Positive impact on outcomes for children and young people
2. Increases access to mainstream settings for children with SEN/LDD
3. Improves the quality of teaching and learning
4. Strengthens the continuum of provision needed
5. Will increase both skill and confidence in schools to meet a wider variety of needs
6. Clarifies all the accountabilities and expectations
7. Strengthens the links between support services, schools and other provision
8. Allows the support services to focus on prevention

**Disadvantages**

1. Some schools may not engage with this work
2. Good practice can be lost when there are significant changes
3. Good coordination needs to be in place when support staff are school based

**Resource Implications**

Any funding changes would be managed within the DSG following a more detailed analysis of the range of costs.

**Options considered but not recommended**

- Remove all discretionary support for schools
- Promote greater use of separate specialist provision