

West Berkshire Schools' Forum	
Title of Report:	High Needs Budget Proposals 2015-16
Date of Meeting:	9th March 2015
Contact Officer(s)	Jane Seymour, Cathy Burnham
For Decision	

1. Background

- 1.1 This report sets out existing 2014-15 High Needs budgets and budget proposals for 2015-16.
- 1.2 Budget proposals for 2015-16 were originally considered by the Heads' Funding Group in November 2014 and again in January 2015.
- 1.3 Due to a number of factors including there being no increase in the High Needs Block, a smaller carry forward than in previous years and pressure in specific areas of expenditure, the HNB budgets proposed in November 2014 significantly exceeded HNB income.
- 1.4 Further work has been done to bring down budget projections where possible. In addition, a number of possible savings were put forward for consideration at the January meeting of the HFG, together with information on the impact of services and the potential consequences of making savings in specific areas.
- 1.5 HFG Members asked for additional information on the impact of services to inform decision making, which has been provided in this report.
- 1.6 This report does not deal with Pupil Referral Units which are the subject of a separate report.

2. Mainstream Schools - STATUTORY

- 2.1 There budget proposed for mainstream top ups has not changed since the November report to HFG.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15

90621	Mainstream top up (maintained)	572,830	509,980	509,980
90622	Mainstream top up (academies)	161,940	213,240	213,240
	TOTAL	734,770	723,220	723,220

3. Resourced Units attached to Mainstream Schools - STATUTORY

3.1 Resourced unit top up budget proposals have been reviewed and some anomalies have been identified. It has been possible to set revised 15-16 budgets which are lower than the 15-16 budgets proposed in November.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90584	Resource units place funding	512,500	535,833	500,000
90617	Resource units top up maintained	335,060	332,366	329,228
90026	Resource units top up academies	252,610	451,876	419,730

4. Special Schools - STATUTORY

4.1 More detailed work has been done on the special school place and top up requirements for 2015-16. It has been possible to set revised budgets which are lower than the original 15-16 proposed budgets.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90540	Special schools place funding (pre 16)	2,885,000	2,885,000	2,860,000
90539	Special schools top up funding	2,465,120	2,744,827	2,730,942

5. Non West Berkshire Mainstream, Resourced and Special Schools - STATUTORY

5.1 The non West Berkshire mainstream and resourced school top up budget proposals remain the same.

5.2 The non West Berkshire special school top up budget proposal has been reviewed. It has been possible to set a revised 15-16 budget which is lower than the 15-16 budget proposed in November.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90624	Non WBC mainstream top up	50,700	62,150	62,150
90618	Non WBC resource unit top up	15,300	27,860	27,860
90548	Non WBC special school top up	663,900	825,025	735,240

6. Non maintained and Independent Special Schools - STATUTORY

6.1 The proposed budget for non maintained and independent special school placements in 2015-16 was originally based on a number of assumptions including the possibility of several currently fragile placements breaking down and all current Tribunal cases being lost, that is, it was based on a fairly pessimistic view of likely new placements.

6.2 These assumptions have been reviewed and a revised figure has been identified which is lower than the original proposed budget.

6.3 There are some risks in setting the budget at this level as it is impossible to predict which pupils will need out of area placements, but the original budget proposed budget was based on a worst case scenario position which is probably unlikely to be reached.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90575	Non maintained special school top up			
90579	Independent special school top up			
	Combined budget	2,365,770	2,800,000	2,489,170

7. FE College Placements - STATUTORY

7.1 The proposed budget for FE College placements has not been changed since the November HFG report.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90580	FE College top up	1,345,340	990,040	990,040

8. Language and Literacy Centres (LALs) – NON STATUTORY

- 8.1 This budget funds the primary LALs at Theale and Winchcombe schools. The LALs provide intensive literacy support for primary children with severe specific literacy difficulties. 48 places per year are available across the two LALs.
- 8.2 It would be possible to close one LAL as the teacher in charge has resigned and has not yet been replaced. This would achieve a saving of £67,300.
- 8.3 See Appendix 1 for information on the impact of LALs and the possible impact / risks if LAL provision were to be reduced and also Appendix 11 for detailed feedback from parents on the service.
- 8.4 Referrals for LAL places usually exceed places available by approximately 24 per year. For September 2015 we have identified 70 possible LAL candidates, so there would be an excess of referred pupils to places of 22 pupils if LAL capacity remains the same at 48 places. If one LAL is closed, there could be 70 referred pupils competing for just 24 places, leaving 46 children without LAL provision.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90555	Language and Literacy Centres	134,600	134,600	67,300	67,300

9. Specialist Inclusion Support Service – NON STATUTORY

- 9.1 This service provides outreach support from West Berkshire's special schools to mainstream schools to support the inclusion of children with learning and complex needs in their local mainstream schools.
- 9.2 This budget could be reduced by a proposed amount of £35,650 if either a lower level of service were to be offered or if schools paid for certain aspects of the service.
- 9.3 See Appendix 2 for information on the impact of the SISS Service and the possible impact / risks if SISS provision were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90585	Specialist Inclusion Support Service	105,650	105,650	70,000	35,650

10. Applied Behavioural Analysis (ABA) and Other Educational Programmes - STATUTORY

- 10.1 This budget supports a small number of statemented children for whom the Authority has agreed an ABA programme as part of their statement. ABA is an intensive intervention programme for children with autism which aims to modify behaviours which are typical of ASD in order to allow children to function more successfully in school and in society.
- 10.2 This budget also covers the cost of statemented children accessing other “miscellaneous” educational programmes, such as The Lighthouse Project etc where this is the most appropriate and cost effective way of meeting their needs.
- 10.3 The proposed budget for 2015-16 has not changed since the November HFG report. The predicted budget requirement is based on existing children with Statements of Special Educational needs who will still be in their placement in 2015-16 and therefore funding cannot be withdrawn or reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90240	Applied Behavioural Analysis	138,630	110,730	110,730

11. SEN Pre School Children – NON STATUTORY

- 11.1 This budget provides one to one support to enable children with SEN to access non maintained and voluntary pre- school settings.
- 11.2 If fewer children were supported or children were offered lower levels of support, it could be possible to make a reduction in this budget of £10,000.
- 11.3 See Appendix 3 for information on the impact of this funding and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90238	SEN Pre School Children	50,210	50,210	40,210	10,000

12. Cognition and Learning Team (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team) – NON STATUTORY

- 12.1 The Cognition and Learning Team (CALT) provides advice, support and training to mainstream schools to help them to meet the needs of children with SEN.
- 12.2 A reduction in this budget of £80,000 could be made by charging schools for certain aspects of the service and setting an income target.
- 12.3 See Appendix 4 for information on the impact of the Cognition and Learning Team and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced and charging were to be implemented.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90280	CALT Team	318,300	341,950	261,950	80,000

13. Sensory Impairment – STATUTORY / NON STATUTORY

- 13.1 Support for children with hearing, visual and multi sensory impairments is purchased from the Berkshire Sensory Consortium Service. This includes support from qualified teachers of HI and VI, audiology and mobility support. The service supports both statemented and non statemented children.
- 13.2 West Berkshire Council has a contract with the Sensory Consortium Service which is due for renewal in April 2016, so it is not possible to reduce this budget in 2015-16 but it may be possible to explore savings for 2016-17.
- 13.3 See Appendix 5 for information on the impact of the SCS and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

90290	Sensory Impairment	227,440	227,440	227,440
-------	--------------------	---------	---------	---------

14. Equipment for SEN Pupils - STATUTORY

- 14.1 This budget funds large items of equipment such as specialist chairs and communication aids for statemented pupils.
- 14.2 This budget could be reduced by £13,000 if equipment was only purchased for children attending mainstream and resourced schools and special schools were expected to fund these large items of equipment from their own budgets.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90565	Equipment for SEN pupils	38,470	33,000	20,000	13,000

15. Engaging Potential - STATUTORY

- 15.1 Engaging Potential is a commissioned service providing alternative educational packages for 14 young people in Key Stage 4 with statements for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties whose needs cannot be met in any other provision. An increase in this budget was agreed during 2014-15 because of the need for the project to employ more specialist teaching staff as the group dynamics are such that several students need to be taught on a one to one basis rather than in small groups. Premises costs have also increased since the project was moved to more suitable accommodation.
- 15.2 West Berkshire Council's contract with Engaging Potential has been varied to reflect the higher level of funding agreed in 2013-14. It is therefore not possible to reduce this budget prior to July 2015 when the current contract is due for renewal.
- 15.3 The tendering process is currently underway for a new contract starting in August 2015 which may create opportunities for negotiating a lower price.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90577	SEN Commissioned Provision	459,110	540,260	540,260

16. ASD Advisory Service – NON STATUTORY

- 16.1 The ASD Advisory Service provides advice, support and training for mainstream schools on meeting the needs of children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder.
- 16.2 It is not recommended that any reductions are made in this budget due to the significant increase in ASD diagnosis and the pressure for specialist placements for children with ASD.
- 16.3 See Appendix 6 for information on the impact of the ASD Service and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90830	ASD Advisory Service	119,950	127,940	127,940

17. Early Intervention – NON STATUTORY

- 17.1 This budget funds the Early Years Language Project. The project supports early intervention for children in pre schools, Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1 with speech and language difficulties, including training for staff in settings and schools and for parents.
- 17.2 Whilst the project has been well received over a number of years, its provision is not a statutory requirement so the project could be ceased if funds are not available for it to continue.
- 17.3 For historical reasons, a proportion of the salary of one of the ASD advisory teachers is charged to this budget, amounting to £7,550 per annum. This sum needs to be retained and vired to the ASD Service budget (see section 16 of this report above).
- 17.4 A saving of £19,300 could be made if the Early Years Language Project were to cease.
- 17.5 There would be no redundancy costs as project staff are on temporary contracts.
- 17.6 See Appendix 7 for information on the impact of the Early Years Language project and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be lost.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
-------------	-------------	----------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

90957	Early Intervention	33,510	26,850	0	19,300
-------	--------------------	--------	--------	---	--------

18. SEN Inclusion – NON STATUTORY

18.1 This budget supplements the Cognition and Learning Team budget (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team).

18.2 No changes to this specific budget are proposed, though a savings target for the main CALT team budget is included in Section 12 of this report.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
90965	SEN Inclusion	28,780	29,320	29,320

19. Medical Support – NON STATUTORY

19.1 This budget has historically been used to fund support for children in mainstream schools with medical needs.

19.2 There were no requests from schools for funding from this budget last year.

19.3 It is proposed that the budget is deleted.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Jan 15	Possible saving
	Medical Support	0 (in DSG)	5,000	0	5,000

20. Therapy Services – STATUTORY

20.1 Therapy Services for children with SEN who have speech therapy or occupational therapy in their Statements are currently funded from the Education Service budget.

20.2 A report was brought to the Heads' Funding Group and the Schools' Forum in November / December to request that therapy services be funded from DSG, in line with the practice in the majority of Local Authorities, given the need for significant savings in the Education Service budget.

20.3 It is not recommended that there is any reduction in this budget as therapy services are provided by the Authority solely to children who have

the need for a service stipulated and quantified in their Statement, and therefore any reduction in service would be unlawful and likely to lead to litigation including judicial reviews.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15
	Therapy Services	0 (in DSG)	315,430	315,430

21. PRU Outreach – NON STATUTORY

- 21.1 The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy / outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the Reintegration Service and are starting to attend a mainstream school.
- 21.2 Savings could be made to this budget if schools were prepared to support pupils on reintegration into their schools, or reduce the number of outreach sessions they received.
- 21.3 See Appendix 8 for information on the impact of the PRU Outreach Service and the possible impact / risks if this service were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90582	PRU Outreach Service	197,000	197,000	117,000	80,000

22. Home Tuition – STATUTORY

- 22.1 The Home Tuition Service is a statutory service providing home tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full time school.
- 22.2 It might be possible to reduce this budget if the Home Tuition Service offered more e-learning packages and reduced external support packages.
- 22.3 See Appendix 9 for information on the impact of the Home Tuition Service and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed	15-16 budget proposed	Possible saving
--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------

			Nov 14	Feb 15	
90315	Home Tuition	282,000	328,500	300,000	28,500

23. Vulnerable Children – NON STATUTORY

- 23.1 The Vulnerable Children Fund is a small budget used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short term basis.
- 23.2 It would be possible to reduce this budget if the number of schools able to access it were reduced (eg. primary only) and / or if the criteria were tightened, for example, funding given for shorter periods, no funding extensions.
- 23.3 See Appendix 10 for information about the impact of this funding and the possible impact / risks if this budget were to be reduced.

Cost centre	Description	2014/15 budget	15-16 budget proposed Nov 14	15-16 budget proposed Feb 15	Possible saving
90961	Vulnerable Children	80,000	80,000	60,000	20,000

APPENDIX 1

HNB Savings 2015-16 – Language and Literacy Centres (LALs)

The two LALs in West Berkshire (at Theale and Winchcombe schools) provide intensive literacy support for 48 primary children per year who attend for half a day per week for two and a half terms in Year 5.

Activity Data

48 children per year attend for half a day per week for two and a half terms in Year 5.

On average, over the last four years, there have been 24 children per year who were referred for a LAL place but were not allocated one as places are limited to 48.

Impact of Service.

- Over the last 3 years, children attending LAL have made the following progress in reading and spelling:
Salford Reading Test: between 16 and 78 months progress.
WRAT Reading Test: between 6 and 72 months progress.
Helen Arkell Spelling Test: between 15 and 81 months progress.
- In the 13-14 academic year, children who attended the LALs made average gains in reading and spelling of:
Salford Reading Test: 21 months gain
WRAT Reading Test: 14.5 months gain
HAST Spelling Test: 16.8 months gain
(Measured over an 8 month period)
- An example of parent feedback on LAL provision for the 2013-14 academic year is attached at Appendix 11.

Value for money

The annual cost of the LALs is £134,600. 48 children attend per year, therefore the unit cost per LAL place is £2804. This equates to an hourly cost of approximately £29 per hour including overheads.

Options / Recommendations

- It would be possible to close one LAL in April 2015 as the teacher in charge is due to retire. Saving £67,300

Possible impact of savings / risks

- LAL capacity would reduce by 50%
- Children who do not get LAL places may not have their needs fully met in their primary schools
- Funding pressure on primary schools to provide more specialist dyslexia support from their own SEN budgets (this can cost in excess of £60 per hour if bought in)
- Schools would need additional support and training
- Parental dissatisfaction and complaints
- Possible increase in requests for Education, Health and Care Plans
- Possible increase in appeals to the SEN Tribunal
- Increase in transport costs to the one remaining LAL

APPENDIX 2

HNB Savings 2015-16 – Specialist Inclusion Support Service (SISS)

The SISS Service (provided by Castle and Brookfields Schools) provides support to children in mainstream schools who have significant learning difficulties and may have other associated difficulties. Advice is given on teaching strategies and resources to enable children to access the mainstream curriculum.

Activity Data

The service supported 90 children during the course of the 2013-14 academic year.

49 schools used the service in the 2013-14 academic year.

Impact of Service

- Feedback from mainstream schools is as follows:
 - Overall satisfaction with service:*
 - 43% excellent
 - 29% good
 - Quality of advice:*
 - 50% excellent
 - 25% good
 - Progress of pupils:*
 - 8% excellent
 - 58% good
 - 34% satisfactory
- The table below shows progress made by children on the SISS caseload of one special school, *based on those who are still on the caseload in 2014-15* (hence the low numbers in previous academic years as some children will have come off caseload during that time).

SISS Progress data: for pupils on current caseload (2014-15)

Year	Subject	Average gain in sub levels across the year	Data based on this number of pupils and other comments
2010-11	Number	1.0	5
	Space, shape, measures	0.8	4
	Using and applying	1.0	5
	Reading	1.0	5
	Writing	1.0	5
2011-12	Number	1.2	5
	Space, shape, measures	0.6	5
	Using and applying	0.5	2
	Reading	0.6	5
	Writing	0.8	5
2012-13	Number	1.0	9
	Space, shape, measures	1.2	9

	Using and applying	1.0	1
	Reading	1.9	8
	Writing	0.4	4
2013-14	Numeracy	0.9	11 (From 2013, combined score for numeracy is used)
	Reading	1.2	11
	Writing	1.1	11

Value for money

The annual cost of the service is £105,650. 90 children were supported during the 2013-14 academic year, giving a unit cost per child of £1173.88. Levels of involvement can vary from a one off assessment to more sustained intervention and support.

Options / Recommendations

- It would be possible to either reduce the capacity of the service or charge schools for all or certain aspects of the service
- Reduce budget to £70,000. Saving of £35,650.

Possible impact of savings / risks

- Increase in demand for other services such as the ASD Mainstream Service and the Cognition and Learning Team
- Increase in EHC Assessment requests
- Increase in demand for special school places
- Financial impact on schools if charges are levied
- Inequity of access to the service for children depending on which schools are able to pay

APPENDIX 3

HNB Savings 2015-16 – SEN Pre School Children

This budget provides funding for one to one support to allow children with significant SEN to access early years settings and take up their 15 hours Government funded pre school provision.

Activity Data

In the 2012-13 financial year, 41 children accessed funding.

In the 2013-14 financial year, 42 children accessed funding.

In the 2014-15 financial year, so far 48 children have accessed funding.

Impact of Service

- 100% of the children who accessed funding were able to attend a pre school setting and would not have been able to do so without the one to one support funded from this budget as early years settings do not have delegated SEN budgets. All children who access funding have a SEN / disability of a severity which would render their attendance unsafe or impractical without 1 to 1 support.
- Most of these children are known to the Pre School Teacher Counsellor Service. Their progress towards targets in their individual plans is monitored by the Pre School Teacher Counsellor and the early years setting at the PSTC's regular monitoring visits.
- Early intervention provided through this budget can help to avoid the need for a Statement / EHC Plan. Of the 27 children who accessed funding in 2013-14, 44% went on to have a Statement / EHC Plan.
- Early intervention provided through this budget can help to avoid the need for specialist placements in resourced or special schools. The % of children who accessed funding from this budget and who went on to specialist placements in 2013-14 was just 11%.
- The Council received no complaints and no disability discrimination claims in respect of children with disabilities being unable to take up their free early years entitlement due to lack of one to one support to enable them to access it.

Value for money

The budget for one to one support in early years settings was £33,510 in 2014-15 and so far 48 children have accessed funding, giving a unit cost of £698 per child.

Options / Recommendations

- A small reduction in this budget could be made of £10,000 by reducing the number of children supported or reducing the amount of support available to each child
- It is not possible to make savings by reducing the hourly rate as support staff are paid minimum wage

Possible impact of savings / risks

- Some children with SEN may not be able to access early years education as they would not get any or enough support
- Children would therefore be ill prepared for their move in to school and may be more likely to need a special school placement
- More pressure on the PSTC Service as the service currently discharges children after a set period of time in an early years setting. Children would need to remain on caseload if they did not go in to an early years setting, increasing waiting times for other children to be allocated a Pre School Teacher Counsellor.

- Possible increase in requests for EHC assessments in order to access support through this route and therefore also additional pressure on the mainstream top up budget
- The Council could be vulnerable to claims of disability discrimination as some children with SEN could be prevented from accessing early years education.

APPENDIX 4

HNB Savings 2015-16 – Cognition and Learning Team (previously known as the Special Needs Support Team)

The CALT Team consists of 4.7 FTE SEN teachers and provides support and training for schools in relation to SEN provision and practice. Activities include support for SENCOs, modelling intervention programmes, training and assessments.

Activity Data

In 2013-14 the team undertook 727 school visits (637 primary, 76 secondary and 14 PRUs). This averages as 10 visits per year per primary school and 8 visits per year per secondary school.

Impact of Service

- Feedback from schools shows high levels of satisfaction:
 - Overall quality of service:*
 - 96% Excellent*
 - 4% Good*
 - Quality of reports:*
 - 85% Excellent*
 - 15% Good*
 - Quality of training:*
 - 87% Excellent*
 - 13% Good*
 - Impact on pupil progress:*
 - 8% Excellent*
 - 59% Good*
 - 33% Satisfactory*
- The Team supports schools with implementation of specific literacy and numeracy programmes, including modelling teaching strategies, training staff including TAs and carrying out pre and post intervention assessments of children. For example, in 2013-14, 29 schools participated in the Catch Up Literacy Programme, with a total of 340 pupils on the programme. The average gain in word reading accuracy per pupil per month was 3.31 months. The average gain in reading comprehension per pupil per month

was 3.33 months. Overall, the average total gain in literacy skills was 19 months over the course of an x month programme.

- Similarly, the team supported schools with implementation of the Fischer Family Trust Wave 3 (SPRINT) programme in 2013-14. 17 schools participated in the programme which is targeted at children in Year 1 working at level 1C or below. The average gain in reading accuracy per pupil per month was 4.5 months. The average gain in reading comprehension per pupil per month was 3.3 months.
- The Team supported 6 schools with the SNAP Programme (Maths intervention) in 2013-14. 87 pupils participated in the programme. During the course of the 14 week programme, the average NC sub level gain per pupil was 1.8.
- Feedback from centrally delivered training in 2013-14 was consistently graded 4 or 5 (good or excellent). Pre and post training confidence scores have shown increases in confidence between 2 and 7 points on a 0 to 10 scale.

Value for money

The budget for the CALT Team includes the salary of the Learning Support Services Manager and also the Elective Home Education Monitoring Teacher. When these sums are removed, the actual cost of the team, including Support Service Recharges, is £256,036. It is not possible to provide a unit cost per child as much of the team's work supports schools' general SEN provision rather than individual pupils. Expressed as a cost per annum per mainstream school it represents £3325 per school.

Options / Recommendations

- Reduce budget by £80,000 and set a £80,000 income target. Charge schools for assessments and possibly some other aspects of support such as in school training.

Possible impact of savings / risks

- Possible redundancy implications / costs if income target cannot be reached.
- Increase in EHC Assessment requests / Tribunals
- Financial impact on schools if charges are levied
- Inequity of access to the service for children depending on which schools are able to pay.

APPENDIX 5

HNB Savings 2015-16 – Sensory Consortium Service

<p>The Sensory Consortium Service is a pan Berkshire Service providing support for children with hearing impairment and visual impairment. The service provides qualified HI and VI teachers, audiology support and mobility officer support for</p>
--

sensory impaired children in mainstream, resourced and special schools.

Activity Data

In 2013-14 academic year there were 197 children on the SCS caseload, 42 with visual impairment and 155 with hearing impairment.

Impact of Service

- In the 2013-14 academic year, 89% of children on caseload fully met their individual targets and 11% partially met their targets.
- National data (from NATSIP) shows that the achievement of HI and VI pupils in Berkshire, both in terms of progress from KS2 to KS4 and also the percentage scoring 5 A* to C at GCSE including English and Maths, compares very favourably with the national average performance of children with HI and VI.
- For example, the gap in reading attainment at KS2 between HI and non HI pupils nationally is 10.7% but in Berkshire the gap is 5.3%.
- Similarly, the % of HI children in Berkshire who achieved 5 or more A* - C grades at GCSE in English and Maths in 2012-13 was 66.7% compared to 44.1% of HI children nationally.

Value for money

The annual cost of the contract in 2014-15 was £227,440. On average, approximately 200 children are supported each year, giving a unit cost of £1137 per child per annum. Levels of intervention can vary from termly monitoring to weekly direct support.

Options / Recommendations

- It is not possible to make any savings on this budget in 2015-16 as the current contract runs to 31st March 2016.
- Discussions are being held with the Sensory Consortium Service to identify potential efficiency savings which could be made to reduce the cost of the service from 2016-17. However, as the majority of the costs are teaching costs it is unlikely that significant savings could be made without eroding the levels of support which children receive from the service.

Possible impact of savings / risks

- Reduction in the amount of support available to children with HI and VI and to the staff who support them in school.
- Increased requests for EHC Assessments for those children on caseload who do not already have a Statement.
- Complaints from parents
- Possibility of litigation if HI or VI children with Statements are not receiving the level of support stipulated in the Statement
- Increase in requests for specialist placements in resourced schools and independent / non maintained special schools

APPENDIX 6

HNB Savings 2015-16 – ASD Advisory Service

The ASD Advisory Service provides support to mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with autistic spectrum disorder

Activity Data

460 children are currently on the caseload. The caseload has been increasing significantly due to the rise in ASD diagnoses.

Impact of Service

- *Feedback from schools:*
 - Overall rating:*
 - 46% excellent
 - 38% good
 - Quality of reports:*
 - 34% excellent
 - 62% good
 - Training*
 - 80% excellent
 - 20% good
 - Impact of service on pupil outcomes*
 - Excellent 64%
 - Good 36%
- The service helps to retain children with ASD in mainstream schools. The number of children who were moved to independent, non maintained or free special schools for children with ASD in 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively were 1, 1 and 6. The higher number in 2013-14 was due to our ASD resourced units reaching their capacity and the opening of The Thames Valley Free School. It is notable that numbers moving to independent provision prior to 2013-14 were so low given the significant rise in numbers of children with ASD.
- The number of exclusions of children with ASD since 2010/11 is shown below. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from this data. Numbers of exclusions of ASD children appear to be increasing, but this is likely to reflect the higher incidence of ASD in mainstream schools rather than any reduction in the ability of schools to meet the needs of children with ASD. It is possible that the number of exclusions of children with ASD would be higher if schools were not able to access support from the ASD Advisory Service. The service is often brought in by schools to give support in crisis situations and can help schools to avoid exclusions.

Academic Year	Type	Exclusions	Pupils
---------------	------	------------	--------

2010/11	FIXD	19	13
2011/12	FIXD	42	21
2012/13	FIXD	38	21
2013/14	FIXD	49	23
2014/15	FIXD	42	18 (so far)
2014/15	PERM	1	1

Value for money

The budget for this service was £119,950 in 2014-15. 460 children are on caseload, therefore the unit cost is £260 per child per annum. However, the service is very stretched and input for some children can be at a very low level as resources tend to be targeted at cases which are problematic.

Options / Recommendations

It is not recommended that any savings are made to this particular budget due to the high likelihood of additional pressure for expensive independent or non maintained special school placements.

Possible impact of savings / risks

The number of children diagnosed with ASD in mainstream schools has been increasing very significantly in recent years. It can be challenging for mainstream schools to meet the needs of children with ASD. If this service were to be reduced, there would be a number of risks:

- Increased requests for EHC assessments for children who currently have their needs met without a Statement / EHC Plan
- Possible exclusions of children with ASD
- Greater pressure for limited places in resourced ASD units at Theale Primary and Theale Green Secondary.
- Greater pressure for children to be placed in independent and non maintained special schools for ASD.

APPENDIX 7

HNB Savings 2015-16 – Early Intervention

This budget funds the Early Years Language Project. The project is staffed by a part time teacher and a part time speech and language therapist and delivers training on meeting the needs of children with speech and language difficulties to early years settings, Key Stage One staff and parents.

Activity Data

KS1 training (teachers and TAs) had 20 participants in 2012-13.

Let's Get Talking (Preschool staff) had 40 participants in 2012-13.

KS1 training (teachers and TAs) had 19 participants in 2013-14.
Let's Get Talking (Preschool staff) had 20 participants in 2013-14.

Impact of Service

- Training for teachers and TAs in 2012-13 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2.27 and 3.05 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for pre school staff in 2012-13 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2.9 and 2.93 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for teachers and TAs in 2013-14 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 1.75 and 2.75 on a 1-10 scale
- Training for pre school staff in 2013-14 showed an increase in confidence to identify and support difficulties of between 2 and 3 on a 1-10 scale
- Feedback from parent sessions run at Children's Centres showed an increase in confidence to identify difficulties and support difficulties of average 2.15 on a 1 to 10 scale and an overall rating for the training of 4.5 on a 0-5 scale.
- The number of children statemented with a primary need of speech and language difficulties is decreasing:

2010	117
2011	112
2012	115
2013	106
2014	96

One of the objectives of the Early Years Language Project was to improve early intervention for young children with speech and language difficulties. Whilst it is not possible to prove a direct link, the reduction in statements for this group could be seen as evidence of success.

- The Speech and Language Therapy Service reports a reduction in what they consider to be inappropriate referrals to speech and language therapy during the life time of the project. This could be attributed in part to early years settings and schools having a better understanding of normal language development and being better placed to provide interventions themselves as a result of engagement in the Early Years Language Project.

Value for money

The annual cost of the project is £19,300. The number of participants in training over a two year period was 99, so the unit cost per delegate was £389.

Options / Recommendations

- Cease the project at the end of 2014-15 financial year, giving a saving of £19,300.

Possible impact of savings / risks

- No redundancy costs as the teacher's post is fixed term and the speech therapy input is part of a contract with Health which can be renegotiated for 2015-16.
- Reduced access for early years settings and Key Stage One staff to training on meeting the needs of children with speech and language difficulties (a high incidence need)
- Possible increased pressure for speech and language therapy

APPENDIX 8

High Needs Block Savings 2015–16 - PRU Outreach

The PRU Outreach Service offers consultancy/outreach support mainly to students who have been attending the Reintegration Service and are starting to attend a mainstream school.

Application and impact this year so far:

- A designated tutor for LAC pupils to ensure rapid entry into the PRU for new admissions into the LA.

Cathy Burnham to provide updated information.

Savings could be made to this budget if schools were prepared to support pupils on reintegration into their schools, or reduce the number of outreach sessions they received. There are staffing implications.

Potential Impact of savings:

- i. Reduction in support for vulnerable pupils re-attending mainstream schools.
- ii. Potential increase in failed placements leading to an increased pressure on places at PRUs.
- iii. No additional support for Fresh Starts.
- iv. Pressure on other support teams.

Recommendations

1. A reduction to the budget of £80,000. This would include the sickness cover which was only required in 2013/14, and some reduction in staffing capacity. Retain the LAC Post to ensure LAC support. Remainder of budget to be

incorporated into the base RS budget and used flexibly according to total number of students in RS i.e. when bases are not full. Or

2. A total removal of budget and an expectation that Outreach will only be provided when there is 'flex' in the admissions of students to the RS, or purchased by schools on an individual student basis.

APPENDIX 9

High Needs Block Savings 2015-16 - Home Education on medical grounds

The Home Education Service is a statutory service providing Home Tuition to children with medical conditions and illness that prevent them accessing full-time school.

Application and impact this year so far:

Cathy Burnham to provide updated information.

This is a needs-led budget.

- The number of sick pupils requiring Home Tuition on medical grounds has increased and therefore there is a pressure due to increased supply/casual teachers.
- The statutory guidance has changed to require more than the previous 5hrs teaching time. The new rules state that pupils should have 25hrs education per week if they are able to access it, and should be increasing their education gradually.
- It may be possible to reduce the expenditure on external providers of £15,000. However, this is an important part of reintegration and it may cost more to provide casual teachers than the cost of the external providers.
- Some Local Authorities may be recouping funding from schools at a rate of one thirty-eighth of the AWPU per week.

Recommendations

1. No change to this budget, or
2. Consider recouping some costs from schools as above, or
3. Reduce by £28,500 (arbitrary amount) and request the Home Tuition Service investigate further e-learning packages and reduce external packages. Numbers may be lower next year but we have no way of forecasting.

APPENDIX 10

High Needs Block Savings 2015-15 - Vulnerable Children's Fund

The Vulnerable Children Fund is a small budget used to help schools support their most vulnerable pupils on an emergency, unpredicted or short-term basis.

Application and impact this year so far:

- 39 schools accessing fund (33 primary, 6 secondary)
- 59 pupils receiving support (50 primary, 9 secondary)
- Actual and estimated costs primary (£65,016) secondary (£13,816)
- Use of support:
 - Additional TA (91% of total)
 - External packages (4%)
 - Specialist holiday scheme (0.76%)
 - Medical support (3.6%)

- Pupils supported include those with:
 - Challenging behaviour
 - Unstable diabetes
 - In-year admissions with SEN or behaviour difficulties
 - Bereavement needs
 - early intervention in Foundation stage for those not 'school ready.'
 - 2 primary unaccompanied asylum seekers from Afghanistan
 - LAC pupils moving into the LA

Savings could be made to this budget up to the full amount of £80,000. There are no staffing implications.

Potential Impact of savings:

- v. Increase in permanent exclusions due to lack of additional TA support (and an increased pressure on places at PRUs)
- vi. No additional funding support for Fresh Start
- vii. No additional funding for unexpected admissions
- viii. No additional funding for pupils with challenging behaviour prior to an EHC assessment and plan
- ix. No additional early intervention support

A blanket reduction of this budget would affect small primary schools disproportionately.

Recommendations

3. A reduction to the budget of £20,000. Remainder (£60,000) used to support Primary Schools only. Or

4. A reduction to the budget of £20,000. Remainder (£60,000) used to support all schools, but with stricter criteria e.g. funding given for shorter periods, no funding extensions. Or
5. A total removal of budget.

APPENDIX 11

Feedback from parents of children who attended LAL in 2013-14:

What would you change about LAL?

Parent 1- 'Nothing except going on for longer'

Parent 2-

-'for it to continue through Year 6 until secondary school. From experience of my eldest (who is now at ACE) in year 6 he didn't get any support once LAL had finished until he arrived at secondary school. He felt like he had been left throughout year 6'

Parent 3- 'to be introduced at an earlier stage to have /get more benefit from it-to start a child at LAL in year 5 is maybe too late on in school'

She has come a long way since being in LAL.

Parent 4-'It would be better to have a monthly update in person rather than via books'

Parent 5-'I think X has made great progress, it has worked perfect and don't feel it needs to change'

Parent 6- 'It would be great if LAL could have continued up to the end of the school year'

Parent 7- ' more of it..would be brilliant and teachers trained up to LAL standard in all schools'

Parent 8- 'to be honest nothing, what LAL has done for X is great, she has come a long way and for me homework is an easier task now, not like before she started to come to LAL'

Parent 9- 'more sessions'

Parent 10- 'longer teaching. As a parent I am worried how X is going to progress next year'

Parent 11- 'nothing really, good feedback but maybe the chance to see it all working... would be amazing to watch'

Parent 12 –‘nothing’

If you had the chance would you continue with LAL?

Parent 1-‘it would be good if X could continue with LAL’

Parent 2-‘the progress X has made in the time at LAL has been brilliant. I would definitely continue from the progress made.’

Parent 3-‘Yes, I am really pleased with how LAL has helped X’

Parent 4- ‘yes, it makes a huge difference’

Parent 5- ‘I feel strongly about this as I fear for her falling behind again as she will not have this routine each week after LAL finishes’

Parent 6 – ‘X is a little disappointed that it is ending’

Parent 7 – ‘I think a longer time at LAL my child would progress to be at the same level as his peers’

Parent 8 –‘Although X has made great improvements I feel it would benefit her to carry on’

General comments

‘ I am very pleased with LAL happy for my child, it was the best thing for her.’

‘Very pleased and grateful for all the help we have had-many thanks!’

‘LAL has been absolutely amazing for X. It has been very interesting and informative meeting with you and completing the Dyslexic Action form. Can’t thank you enough.’

X has struggled for a very long time and we have tried all sorts of ways to get him help but we were always told ‘ but he is improving’ the problem was- so were his peers and Lewis was getting more and more frustrated as the gap with his peers was growing. By going to Lal we have seen the gap can reduce.