Ву:	Graham Badman, Managing Director, Children, Families and Education
	Mark Dance, Cabinet Member for Operations, Resources & Skills, CFE
	Chris Wells, Cabinet Member for Children, Families & Educational Standards, CFE
То:	Cabinet – 6 February 2008
Subject:	UNIT REVIEW (INCLUDING DESIGNATED AND SPECIALIST PROVISION AND VERY SEVERE AND COMPLEX NEED SUPPORT FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEED AT MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS)

Background

- 1. (1) The Unit Review seeks to ensure an equitable range and spread of resources and provision for children with Special Educational Needs in mainstream schools across the county. The Cabinet paper on 16 October 2006 set out the objectives and strategy of the Review. The Cabinet paper on 13 March 2007 set out in more detail the policy context for the Review and Members agreed the next stages including the consultation process for approving proposals for each area. Members approved the provision proposals in Phase One areas on 17 September 2007.
 - (2) This paper provides an update on the implementation of the Review following recent decisions by Cabinet Members and provides details of the outcomes of the first stage of consultations on Phase Two proposals countywide.

Planning and Development of provision

Phase One Clusters

2. (1) In Phase One, there are eight Clusters, Ashford, Shepway and four Clusters of North West Kent. Proposals for these Clusters formed the basis of a consultation process undertaken during the summer term and provision proposals were agreed by Cabinet on 17 September. Following representation from a number of schools, it was agreed by Cabinet in early November that implementation of the Unit Review strategy countywide would be delayed for a year during which time implementation of the Phase One proposals will proceed as a pilot. This will enable the Unit Review steering group to test out the policy within a defined geographical area and to evaluate the impact and response from schools.

- (2) The pilot in Phase One Clusters will focus on the following key elements of the Unit Review policy;
 - a) Provision planning arrangements in each Locality
 - b) Development of local multi-agency commissioning arrangements in Clusters within the context of the Local Children's Trusts and the Statutory SEN Code of practice
 - c) Relationships between Local Authority, Local Children's Services Partnerships and Lead school
 - d) Capacity building role of Lead school Alignment with existing specialist services and providers in the locality, in particular Special Schools
 - e) Outreach role of Lead school Responsibility for resources and for individual children in other schools

Phase Two Clusters

- (3) All remaining Clusters are part of Phase Two and continued progress has been made on provision proposals for these areas. A first set of proposals has formed the basis of a consultation process during November and December. Proposals for Phase Two provision have been presented with an implementation date of September 2009. Consultations took place in seven areas of the County with a public meeting in each area during the sixweek consultation period. Whilst issues and concerns were raised and addressed in each area, the response to the key elements of the policy was **positive**. Written responses show 59% support for the Unit Review proposals across the seven areas.
- (4) A summary of the outcome in each area and the key issues raised during the consultation is attached at Appendix One. A series of responses and actions are being prepared by the Steering Group in order to address the concerns raised by stakeholders, to improve the understanding of the policy and to reassure parents in particular.

Capital Implications of Phase Two proposals

Primary provision

3. (1) The majority of provision proposed in Phase Two for primary aged children is in schools where there are existing units. In the case of new provision, the schools concerned have capacity within the existing buildings and minor refurbishment of classroom space will be required. In some cases, space for provision is part of the Children's Centre developments within the school. In the case of two schools (Cage Green primary school in Tonbridge and West Malling primary school in Malling) with existing units referred to above, the condition of the current unit buildings is unsatisfactory and the capital implications are more significant. The preferred solution by both schools is a new build attached to the main part of the school.

Secondary provision

- (2) The majority of the new and existing provision in Phase Two for secondary aged children is proposed either in schools with current unit accommodation or in schools where there is a BSF. The required space for the proposed Lead school provision will be planned therefore within the overall BSF planning for the school buildings.
- (3) Initial calculations of the cost of the significant items referred to above are attached at Appendix Two. Detailed work is ongoing on the overall capital implications of Phase Two proposals and will be reported to KCC Cabinet in the summer prior to any final decisions on provision proposals for these areas.

Funding Proposals

- 4. (1) Proposals for new funding arrangements, which fit with the new structure of provision implicit in the Review strategy, have been developed by a working party established in April. In addition to the relevant CFE officers, the working party included members of the Schools Funding Forums, Headteachers and Teachers in Charge of current units and designations and Local Education Officer representation. These proposals were modeled and presented to all Lead schools and Special Schools during September and October. Feedback on the proposed formula was varied with some issues raised including the level of funding for new provision in the first few years, the indicators used to allocate funding and the inclusion of VSCN funding within the formula.
 - (2) Following the decision by Cabinet to delay consultation on the formula until Autumn 2009, it is proposed that the steering group will reconsider the funding proposals with the working party and taking account of feedback, present a revised proposal for consideration to the Schools Funding Forums next year.

Revised Timetable

5.

First stage consultation on Phase Two	November/December 2007
proposals	
Feedback to KCC Cabinet on outcome	6 February 2008
of Phase Two consultation	
Second stage consultation on Phase	May 2008
Two proposals	
Development of funding proposals	May/June 2008
including presentation to the Schools	
Funding Forum	
Update to KCC Cabinet on Phase Two	July 2008
consultations and Funding proposals	
Start of Phase One pilot	September 2008
Consultation on revised Funding	Autumn 2008
formula	
Final consideration and agreement by	January 2009
	,
Start of Unit Review countywide	September 2009
implementation	
Start of Phase One pilotConsultation on revised Funding formulaFinal consideration and agreement by KCC Cabinet on provision and funding proposals for implementation in September 2009Start of Unit Review countywide	

Recommendations:

- 6. Cabinet Members are asked to:
 - (a) NOTE the progress of the Unit Review and AGREE the changes to the timetable detailed at paragraph 5.
 - (b) NOTE the feedback and issues raised by stakeholders during the Phase Two consultation process detailed at Appendix 1.
 - (c) NOTE the potential capital implications of Phase Two proposals detailed at paragraph 3 and Appendix 2.

7. Background Papers:

Cabinet Report – Unit Review – 17 September 2007 Cabinet Report – Unit Review – 12 March 2007 Cabinet Report – Unit Review – 16 October 2006

8. Author Contact Details:

Nuala Ryder, Project Manager – Unit Review Commissioning Division (Specialist Services) Children, Families and Education Tel 01622 69**6683**

Unit Review - Outcome of Phase Two Consultation

1. Common Issues and concerns raised during the Phase Two consultation process

- Condition of existing unit buildings

In one area of Phase Two, the Tonbridge and Malling district, the dominant issue raised by parents, schools and other stakeholders was the condition of the existing unit accommodation at the West Malling Language Unit and the Cage Green Autism Unit. Parents of children attending these units said that while the support and resources provided by the staff was excellent, the unit accommodation was unsatisfactory. The management, Governors and staff of both schools' are committed to the Lead school concept and to developing their role in supporting children with Special Educational Needs in the future. However they believe that investment in the facilities at the school is required.

- <u>Resourcing of provision</u>

A major theme and discussion point throughout the consultation was the resourcing of the proposals. References were made in many responses and comments to the following areas that require consideration – capacity building role of Lead schools, Health Therapy services and training. As part of the Unit Review project, there are a number of established groups involving representation from Lead schools, Special Schools, the Specialist Teaching Service and the Health services with a focus on planning for each of these areas. The Unit Review steering group is acutely aware of the need to maintain the momentum of this work. It is vital to ensure that all planning is aligned with the wider review of therapy provision within the Health service, the planning of CFE specialist services as a whole and the development of local Children's Trusts.

- <u>Consultation process</u>

The following feedback was provided by stakeholders on the consultation process at public meetings. Parents/carers believed that the consultation document should be sent to a wider audience of parents directly. The consultation document was posted to parents of children in unit provision and was further circulated to all schools in each area. The Steering group will address this concern for future consultations by circulating hard copies to the wider group of all parents of children with statements in Kent. A number of stakeholders also felt that six weeks was insufficient period for the consultation and that in some cases insufficient notice was given of public meetings. The steering group will address this concern by extending the period of consultation in the future.

- Impact of the extended role on Unit staff and management

Parents of children currently in Unit provision in particular, raised concerns about the potential dilution of support to children in placements as a result of the additional expectation on staff to deliver support and develop capacity within other mainstream schools. The steering group has emphasised that provision from each Lead school will be developed gradually taking full account of the capacity and resources available. Lead schools will be working and planning in partnership with the Cluster team and other existing specialist providers of support to mainstream in the locality.

- <u>Alignment with other local specialist services</u>

Current providers of specialist support, in particular Special Schools, have raised their concerns regarding the future alignment and organisation of services within each locality. Existing specialist services with high levels of expertise and knowledge in outreach have issues with the term 'lead' being used to describe mainstream provision where in some cases, there is expertise in delivering support to children on site but not of delivering support to other schools. Providers are concerned about the potential shift in resources from existing centres of expertise like Special schools to the new 'Lead' schools. The planning of a coherent range of provision in each locality and arrangements for services to work together will be a key focus of the Phase One pilot. This will include joint planning with the relevant therapy services. The steering group includes representation from all providers and is working to ensure that this element of the policy is considered and implemented correctly. Further consideration will also be given to the resourcing of outreach provision to mainstream countywide.

2. Response to consultation by area

Proposed Lead Schools – Thanet					
	Primary	Secondary			
ASD	Hereson/Ellington				
SLCN	Hereson/Ellington				
SpLD	Hereson/Ellington				
HI		Hartsdown			
VI					
PD	Garlinge	Hartsdown			

Consultation Response - Thanet

	Yes	No	Total
Parents/carers	84	4	88
School Staff	9	0	9
Other	24	3	27
Total	117	7	124
	94%	6%	

Proposed Lead Schools - Canterbury				
	Primary	Secondary		
ASD	Joy Lane	The Abbey		
SLCN	Wincheap			
SpLD		Archbishops		
HI	Briary	Sittingbourne Community		
VI	Reculver	Archbishops		
PD	Pilgrim's Way Hampton	St Anselm's		

HI	Briar	У		Sittingbourne Community					Sittingbourne Community			
VI	Recu	lver		Archbishops								
PD	Pilgrim's Way Hampton			St Anselm's								
Consultat	tion Re	esponse	- Cant	erbury								
		Yes	No	Undecided	Total							
Parents/c	arers	11	2	2	15							
School Sta	aff	6	1		7							
Other		2	1		3							
Total		19	4	2	24							
		76%	18%	6%								

]	Primar	у		Secon	dary	
ASD		Joy Lane Minster on		Tl	The Abbey		
SLCN	Oaks	Minterne/The Oaks Bysing Wood			Sittingbourne Community College		
SpLD				W	Westlands		
HI	Briary	Briary		Si	Sittingbourne Community		
VI	Recul	ver		A	rchbishops		
PD	Westr	Westminster			vestlands		
Consult	ation Re	sponse Yes	e - Swal No	le	Undecided	Tata	
	/					Tota	
Parents,		4	11		1	16	
School S	Staff	2	5			7	
Other			4		1	5	

Consultation Response - Swale						
	Yes	No	Undecided	Total		
Parents/carers	4	11	1	16		
School Staff	2	5		7		
Other		4	1	5		
Total	6	20	2	28		
	21%	71%	8%			

Proposed Lead Schools - Maidstone				
	Primary	Secondary		
ASD	West Borough	Astor of Hever		
SLCN	West Malling	The Malling School		
SpLD		The Malling School		
HI	Molehill Copse	Maplesden Noakes		
VI	Cornwallis			
PD	Loose Junior	Senacre		

Consultation Response – Maidstone

	Yes	No
Parents/carers	6	
School Staff	8	
Other		
Total	14	0
	100%	

Proposed Lead	Schools – Tunbridge W	Vells/Cranbrook & Paddock Wood
& Sevenoaks S	outh	
	Primary	Secondary
ASD	Cage Green	
SLCN	West Malling	The Malling School
ASD/SLCN		Interaction Hub (Primary, Secondary & Special) Broom as Lead school
SpLD		The Malling School
HI	Slade	
VI		
PD		Hugh Christie

Consultation Response – Tunbridge Wells/Cranbrook &Paddock Wood/Sevenoaks SouthYesNoUndecidedTotal

	105	110	onacciaca	Iotai
Parents/carers	3	12	4	19
School Staff	17	7		24
Other	2	2		4
Total	22	21	4	
	47%	45%	8%	

Proposed Lead Schools – Tonbridge & Malling			
	Primary	Secondary	
ASD	Cage Green	The Malling School	
SLCN	West Malling	The Malling School	
SpLD		The Malling School	
HI	Slade	Maplesden Noakes	
	Molehill Copse		
VI	Cornwallis		
PD	East Peckham	Hugh Christie	
		Senacre	

Consultation Response – Tonbridge & Malling				
	Yes	No	Undecided	Total
Parents/carers	4	23	4	31
School Staff	7	36	2	45
Other	3	5	1	9
Total	14	64	7	85
	16%	76%	8%	

Proposed Lead Schools – Dover & Deal			
	Primary	Secondary	
ASD		Archer's Court	
SLCN	The Downs Priory Fields	Walmer	
SpLD		Walmer	
HI	Castle Hill Cheriton	Christchurch	
VI	Morehall	Pent Valley	
PD	Whitfield & Aspen	Castle Community School	

Consultation Response – Dover & Deal*				
	Yes	No	Undecided	Total
Parents/carers	3	1	0	4
School Staff	1	1	1	3
Other		1		1
Total	4	3	1	8
	50%	37%	13%	

T

*Due to the low response in the Dover consultation process, a second set of consultation documents have been circulated notifying stakeholders of a second public meeting to take place in January. Responses will be added to the report on the Dover consultation and made available to Cabinet Members as soon as possible.

Cabinet – 6 February 2008

<u>Unit Review</u>

Capital Implications of Phase Two proposals

Two major capital projects identified in Phase Two through the consultation on the Unit Review proposals are the necessity for new accommodation for the existing Units at Cage Green and West Malling primary schools.

Initial costings for new buildings providing their current accommodation have been estimated as follows;

_	Cage Green	£1.1 million
	 Autism Unit with capacity for 27 children 	

- West Malling Primary school
 - Language Unit with capacity for 24 children

£500,000

Both these estimates include professional fees. This expenditure could be viewed as not being a consequence of the Units Review but the need for an improvement to/modernisation of old and unsuitable facilities.

In formulating the Capital Programme for the period 2008-09 - 2010-11 Cabinet Members agreed that we would not have a new Modernisation Programme for at least the next 3 years. An alternative would be to replace the facilities with mobile accommodation, which would reduce this cost.